



INTERNATIONAL

JOURNAL of HUMAN STUDIES

ULUSLARARASI İNSAN ÇALIŞMALARI DERGİSİ

ISSN: 2636-8641

Cilt/VOLUME 3 Sayı/ISSUE 6 Yıl/YEAR: 2020

Alındı/RECEIVED: 21-05-2020 – Kabul/ACCEPTED: 10-10-2020

Relations between Right-wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, Individualism-Collectivism and Political Identities *

Sağ Kanat Yetkeçiliği, Toplumsal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Bireycilik-Toplulukçuluk ve Siyasal Kimlikler Arasındaki İlişkiler

Özgür GÜLDÜ¹

Abstract

This study compares university students who have nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist political identities in terms of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and individualism-collectivism values. The sample was composed of 125 students with “nationalist” identity, 102 students with “conservative” identity, 144 students with “social democrat” identity and 139 students with “socialist” identity. The right-wing authoritarianism scale (RWA), social dominance orientation scale (SDO) and individualism-collectivism scale (INDCOL) were used in this study. The results showed that the students with conservative political identity received higher

Öz

Bu araştırmada milliyetçi, muhafazakâr, sosyal demokrat ve sosyalist siyasal kimliklere sahip üniversite öğrencileri sağkanat yetkeçiliği, toplumsal baskınlık yönelimi ve bireycilik-topluluk değerleri bakımından karşılaştırılmıştır. Örneklem 125 “milliyetçi”, 102 “muhafazakâr”, 144 “sosyal demokrat” ve 139 “sosyalist” siyasal kimliğe sahip olan 510 üniversite öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada Sağ Kanat Yetkeçiliği Ölçeği, Toplumsal Baskınlık Yönelimi Ölçeği ve Bireycilik-Toplulukçuluk Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre muhafazakâr siyasal kimliğe sahip öğrenciler yüksek SKY kişilik özelliğinden diğer siyasal kimlik gruplarına göre daha yüksek puan almışlardır. Bu Benzer şekilde

¹Özgür GÜLDÜ, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Seyahat - Turizm ve Eğlence Hizmetleri Bölümü, guldu@ankara.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-7503-4251

*Author’s note: This paper is a summary of some parts of the PhD thesis prepared by the author.

scores in right-wing authoritarianism personality traits than students of other political identities. In a similar way, the students with nationalist identity also had higher levels of high RWA than those with social democrat or socialist identity. The low RWA scores received by the socialist identity group were found to be higher on comparing with other identity groups. The vertical individualism and vertical collectivist levels of students with nationalist identity were higher than those of identity groups. And finally, it was also found that the right-wing authoritarianism, vertical individualism and high RWA levels of students who attended numerical or science departments were higher than the levels of students who attended verbal departments. The findings obtained are discussed within the framework of previous studies and theoretical approaches.

Keywords: Political Identities, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation Individualism-Collectivism, University Students

milliyetçi kimliğe sahip öğrencilerin yüksek SKY düzeyleri de sosyal demokrat ve sosyalist kimliğe sahip öğrencilerden daha yüksektir. Sosyalist siyasal kimlik grubunun düşük SKY puanı diğer kimlik gruplarıyla karşılaştırıldığında daha yüksektir. Milliyetçi siyasal kimliğe sahip öğrencilerin ise dikey bireycilik ve dikey toplulukçuluk düzeyleri diğer kimlik gruplarından daha yüksektir. Araştırmada son olarak sayısal-fen bölümlerinde eğitim gören öğrencilerin sağ kanat yetkeliği (SKY), dikey bireycilik ve yüksek SKY düzeyleri sözel bölümlerde eğitim gören öğrencilerden daha yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu bulgular, daha önce yapılan araştırma ve kuramsal yaklaşımlar çerçevesinde tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyasal Kimlikler, Sağ-Kanat Yetkeliği, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Bireycilik-Toplulukçuluk, Üniversite Öğrencileri

Introduction

All individual and social identities go through a process of configuration and thus they develop. Those identities- which have a reflexive structure due to the fact that they are dependent on historical, social, and psychological processes- are not simple labels. They involve individuals' psycho-social investments and they have importance in degrees differing according to the levels of investments. Individuals categorise situations, events, objects and humans to be able to cope with environmental diversity and complexity and thus the differences between groups become apparent as a result of such cognitive efforts; and all this forms the basis of identity configuration. Identities- which are influential in individuals' getting informed and processing the information- also function as filters between individuals and the outside world. Identities influence our feelings and behaviours towards others, and they are like a compass in this respect (Bilgin, 2007). Several definitions of identity made by people

about themselves are available in modern societies. One of those identities is the “political identity” involving individuals’ political tendencies.

Political identity is the dimension of self which contains individuals’ political tendencies. It has a changeable structure since it has individual and contextual factors. While being a supporter of a political formation is the most important component of political identities for some people, the current social, political or economic environment- that is to say, the context- or personal traits are more influential in the development of political identity for some others. Therefore, political identity changes substantially from person to person and over time. Our political identity which we describe today may not be the same as the one which we described in the past or the one which we will describe in the future. The political identities of people who strictly adhere to a political formation or to an ideological approach are static and are resistant against short-term changes. In contrast to that, it has a changeable structure in the case of individuals who feel adherence to apolitical formation and ideology but who are influenced by current political, social and economic environment, by candidates and by social identities prioritised by them (Smith, 2004).

Political identities are closely related to individuals’ feelings about politics, their personal traits, and the current political and social reality. Therefore, it would be wrong to define political identity only as being a supporter of a political formation. It should be considered in an approach which goes beyond the concept. Apart from political partisanship, group membership such as race, gender, religion, social class, or age; personal traits, social and political values individuals have, principles and existing social and political context are also influential in the development of political identity (Jackson, 2005).

Jackson (2005), with “Political Identity Effect Model”- which was based on this approach, defines political identity as a structure which is influenced by current social, political and economic context, social group membership (social identities) and personal traits and values in addition to political partisanship. According to the model, social and political context prioritises the issues which are on current social and political agenda and thus it causes preparatory effects on social identities, political partisanship, and ideology and on personality traits and values. Therefore, context determines the extent to which each component- which also interacts with each other- is influential in the development of political identity. Besides, contextual factors influence our perceptions of the political system, the way we are involved in the political system and our decisions in addition to influencing our perceptions, choices, attitudes and beliefs (Brewer, 2001).

According to the model, social identities- which represent individuals’ position in the world- fulfil the functions of individuals’ belonging, gaining prestige, being meaningful, being distinctive and being a mediator (Simon and Klandermans, 2001). The effects of social identities on political identities are manifested in two ways. primarily, continuous and remarkable social identities such as gender, ethnic origin and race have strong effects on individuals’ political views. For example, ethnic identity is highly remarkable in environments where the members of a minority group constitute the majority (Jackson, 2005). According to Bulut, religious identity can be as decisive in the definition of social identity as ethnicity (2019). Besides, social identities can be remarkable and affect political identities as

a result of short-term contextual changes. Gender identity, for instance, can be remarkable in environments where approving or not approving of same-sex marriage is discussed (Jackson, 2005).

Identifying oneself with a political formation also has strong effects on the formation and development of political identity. Identifying oneself with a political formation has a two-pole structure. On the one hand, such individuals exaggerate mentally the properties of the group in which they belong, maximise the properties and favour their group; and on the other hand they emphasise and exaggerate the negative properties of another group and thus they scorn the group in a way that causes to be perceived negatively by others. Strong identification which emerges as a result of being a partisan for a political formation leads to an increase in differentiation between political institutions and to a reduction in the probability for individuals to abandon the political formation which they choose to support. With the strengthening of political identity, individuals' probability to vote for the candidate of the political party they support, to attend the meetings of the party, to donate money to the campaigns held by the party and to convince others to vote for the party also increases. As the differences between political formations increase, the probability for individuals to do activities in favour of the political institution they support also increases (Greene, 2004).

According to Jackson's (2005) model, individuals' personal traits are also a component influential in political identity. This paper considers such personality traits as right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and individualism and collectivism.

Right-wing authoritarianism is individuals' psychological obedience to people they regard as authoritarian in their life. This personality trait contains three elements of attitude which are inter-related. Authoritarian obedience, authoritarian aggression, and traditionalism. Authoritarian obedience is an individuals' high obedience to the authority who is approved by everybody in the community of which the individual considers himself/herself as a member and who is regarded as legitimate by law. Authoritarian aggression is the state of general aggression which is also approved by the authority towards people or groups who are seen to be different. Traditionalism is high loyalty to social traditions which are also supported by society and the authority (Altemeyer, 1996). The three elements of right-wing authoritarianism are reflective of individuals' emotional commitment to a social group. Internal group identification, which represents emotional commitment to a group, increases depending on conformity to internal group norms (traditionalism), obeying to group pioneers and authorities (obedience) and intolerance (aggression) to those who do not obey internal group norms and rules (Duckitt, 1993). Individuals who have this property have the following characteristics: Such individuals are the people who are highly obedient to the authority, who have high authoritarian aggression, who do not hesitate to display behaviours threatening democracy when they feel necessary and who are extremely traditionalist. Besides, people with right-wing authoritarianism support the views of the authority and they believe that the authority has extraordinary features and that they tell the truth in any case. They approach more critically to evidence which do not support authoritarian views than to the one which support, and thus they analyse the evidence in all aspects. They are forcing and oppressor when they have power over others. They cause conflicts between groups and they provoke the conflicts. They scupper environments of cooperation and they make efforts to dominate over others if they are in competition. They do not accept personal failure. They avoid learning the

reasons if they cannot achieve success. They believe that they have high support social support for their views and beliefs. Therefore, they are vulnerable to people with ill will who say what they want to hear. They generally have conservative views on economy. They have high social dominance (Altemeyer, 1996; Martin, 2001).

Altemeyer (1996) states that it is wrong to describe right-wing authoritarianism with a certain ideology and that individuals who have high levels of this feature tend to support the current political authority. It was found that such individuals supported the Conservative Reform Party in Canada, the Republican Part in the US and the Communist Party-the only authoritarian power- in former Soviet Union.

Another personal trait related to political identity is *social dominance orientation*. The property represents individuals' desire for the group they belong in to dominate over other groups, to be superior to and better than other others. It also reflects individuals' preference for hierarchy instead of equality and for sustaining the situation in relations between groups. Group-based social hierarchy observed in all communities according to social dominance orientation causes pressurising over other groups and to display aggression to them. Such hostile behaviours include behaviours containing negative evaluation of external groups, negative criticisms for failure and even violence. The higher the status of the group in which individuals belong is, the higher is their level of dominance (Pratto, Sidanius, Stalworth and Malle, 1994; Sidanius, Pratto and Bobo, 1994).

Individuals who are highly biased to this take on roles which increase inequality and which sustain it in order not to lose their social and political superiority. They also become a member to social institutions and organisations or political and ideological formations which make up, preserve and sustain the majority of hierarchies. The probability for those people who do not empathise with people or organisations having lower status to have conservative bias and to be racist and prejudiced. In contrast, individuals with low social dominance orientation take on roles diminishing inequality which stem from hierarchy. They take part in activities which eliminate and diminish inequalities in all areas- mainly in economy, education and health, they become members of social institutions and organisations which do such activities and they have high tendency to support such ideological and political approaches (Pratto et al., 1994; Haley and Sidanius, 2005).

The final property considered in this paper is *individualism and collectivism*. Individualism and collectivism values are one of the important differences between cultures. This system of values, which is regarded as important in estimating behavioural patterns beforehand, has been used by many scientists of differing areas to explain intercultural differences in many areas such as religion, politics, ideology, social and moral structure, economic development, modernisation and communication (Triandis, 2001; White, 2005). Individuals are emotionally independent of any group, organisation and formation in societies where the values of individualism are valid. Individuals in this culture have high self-confidence and they are pleased with being in a competitive environment. In a society where collectivism values are high, on the other hand, individuals are emotionally integrated into the groups in which they exist such as nation, family, relatives and friends. They adhere to the group in accordance with the intensity of their relations with the group; thus, the confidentiality of their private life decreases and their belief in the group increases. A strong tie and adherence between individuals and

their group which continues all through their life without questioning is formed (Göregenli, 1995; Triandis and Gelfand, 1998). Individualism and collectivism values are the concepts used frequently in explaining individual differences as well as intercultural differences (Wasti and Eser, 2007).

Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand (1995) argue that people with individualism orientation have self-perception independent of any group. Such people, who have high self-respect, tend to act according to their attitudes and choices. Their desire to self-actualise and to be different from others is high. They have individual goals regardless of whether or not they are consistent with the goals of the internal group. If there is no conformity between their goals and the goals of the group, their goals are prioritised. They have the tendency to accept their relations with the group as they are; and they do not hesitate to give up if they believe that such a pattern of relations brings them harm rather than benefits. Individuals with bias towards collectivism, however, consider themselves as a part of the group. They have perceptions of dependent self. They have low self-respect. They make efforts to secure that their individual goals are consistent with the goals of their group. They even ignore their requirements when necessary. They prioritise the goals of the group when there is inconsistency. They act according to group norms. They strictly adhere to their responsibilities and duties. Relations in the group are very important to them even if they cause harm to them and they make great efforts to sustain the relations.

Political Identity in Turkey

Political ideologies in Turkey and the identities prioritised by those ideologies are not only political but are also socio centric. Turkish people's perceptions of socio-centric political identity are considered in three main groups (Dalmış and Imamoğlu, 2000). Namely, secular-leftist, nationalist-conservative, and liberal. Secular-leftist identity contains such labels as "secular, social democrat, liberal in terms of sexual freedom and socialist"; nationalist-conservative identity contains such labels as "nationalist, secular-religious, religious, conservative and believer" and liberal identity contains such labels as "liberal in terms of economy, liberal in terms of social rights and statist". Accordingly, "nationalist and secular-religious" and "conservatism and religious"- which are in the domain of nationalist-conservative identity and which are in close relationship with each other- can be thought to be a sub-domain of "socialist" description- which is in the domain of secular-leftist identity. It is because there are significant and negative correlations between all these labels. Generally, there are no correlations between other descriptions of secular-leftist with nationalist and secular-religious apart from socialist. The availability of positive correlations between secular with secular-religious and between social democrat with nationalist- despite weak correlations- indicates that "being nationalist-secular religious" can accord with "being secular-social democrat", that at least they are not perceived as opposite to each other. Thus, the negative ties identified between secular-leftist and nationalist-conservative are also observed consistently between socialist identity and conservative-religious identity. It is remarkable that socialists consider themselves close to secularism but away from all forms of religious including secular-religious whereas conservative-religious people in particular consider themselves away from secularism but close to all forms of religious including secular-religious. As it is evident, those who perceive themselves as secular tend to adopt religious coalesced with secularism

and those who consider themselves as being conservative-religious adopt secularism coalesced with religious while socialist adopt a conception of secularism which does not accord with religious. It was found that the domain of liberal identity- which included such labelling as “liberal in terms of economy, liberal in terms of social rights and statist”- was represented the most consistently by liberal in terms of economy. Individuals who consider themselves to have nationalist-conservative identity tend to adopt the aspect of “economic liberalism” only while those who have secular-leftist identity are inclined to adopt both “liberal in terms of social rights” and “statist”. Dalmış and Imamoğlu (2000) claim in the light of these findings that the domains of secular-leftist, nationalist-conservative and liberal identities- despite lacking internal consistency- have complicated structures which contain sub-identities that can differ in perceptions of identities. Based on this view, this paper aims to determine the differences between the personality traits- the components of Jackson’s (2005) Political Identity Effect model (right-wing authoritarianism, individualism-collectivism and social dominance orientation)- of university students having nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist identities which emerge as the sub-identities of the domains of secular-leftist, nationalist-conservative and liberal identities. In accordance with its purpose, the study makes the following hypotheses:

1. Conservatives and nationalists will receive the highest scores in such personality traits as social dominance, high RWA, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism and vertical collectivist because rightist political ideology respects traditions, has commitment to the legitimate authority, establishes superiority over other groups, is prejudiced against external groups, supports hierarchical distribution of power and attaches importance to high adherence to the internal group. They will be followed by social democrats and socialists, respectively.

2. Social democrats and socialists will receive higher scores in low RWA and in horizontal individualism because leftist political ideology considers equality rather than hierarchical approaches, does not have aggressive attitudes towards other people or groups although it obeys the legitimate authority and because it refuses the practices of the past which hinder progress. They will be followed by conservatives and nationalists, respectively.

3. The participants attending the numerical and science (engineering, medicine and pharmaceuticals) departments at universities have lower sensitivity to social and political agenda of the country due to the fact that their knowledge and interest is in technical areas and that their circle of friends are also similar in this respect. Therefore, those participants will receive higher scores in such personal traits as high RWA and vertical individualism due to the fact that they display prejudiced behaviours towards people or groups different from them, that they stick to traditions and obey the legitimate authority, that they have desire to be different, to compete and to win because of their job. They will be followed by participants attending verbal (law school, educational faculty and politics) departments of universities.

Method

Participants

The study was conducted with the participation of 510 university students who attended the faculties of Ankara, Hacettepe, Gazi, Bilkent, Orta Doğu Teknik, Atılım, Çankaya and TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Universities. 300 (58.8%) of the students were female whereas 210 (41.2%) of

them were male. they were aged between 19 and 34 ($M=22.36$, $SD= 2.06$). Of them, 125 (24.5%) had “nationalist” political identity, 102 (20%) had “conservative” political identity, 114 (28.2%) had “social democrat” political identity and 139 (27.3%) had “socialist” political identity. 206 (40.4) of the participants attended numerical and science (medicine, science and engineering) departments and 304 (59.6%) of the them attended verbal (law school, educational faculty and politics) departments of universities.

Materials

Personal Information Form: The participants were asked to answer questions on gender, age, the university, and department they attended in the form. In addition to such demographic information, the items used by Dalmış and Imamoğlu (2000) to reveal socio-centric perceptions of political identities were also used in identifying the participants’ political identities. The items used by the above-mentioned researchers were listed as “liberal in terms of economy”, “believer”, “antiseccular-religious”, “nationalist”, “conservative”, “social democrat”, “religious”, “liberal in terms of social rights”, “secular-religious”, “secular”, “statist”, “liberal in terms of sexual freedom” and “socialist”. The participants were asked to choose and mark the one that was the most appropriate to describe them. Yet, the researcher had difficulty in determining in which of the political identity group among nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist identities the participants described themselves since some of them marked more than one option. The newspapers they read was used in such cases because political views can also be identified with the help of newspapers individuals read (Güldü, 1998 and Hasta, 2002). Thus, the participants who read “Yeni Çağ” and “Ortadoğu” were considered to have nationalist political identity the participants who read “Zaman” or “Yeni Şafak” were considered to have conservative political identity, those who read “Cumhuriyet” were considered to have social democrat political identity and the ones who read “Birgün”, “Evrensel”, “Aydınlık” or “Özgür Politika” were considered to have socialist political identity.

Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWAS): Right-wing authoritarianism scale- which was developed by Altemeyer (1996) was used so as to measure the level of individuals’ psychological obedience to someone they regard as an authority. The scale contained three sub-factors labelled as authoritarian obedience, authoritarian aggression and traditionalism and 22 items. The items required answers in a 9-pointed Likert type scale ranging between “I definitely disagree” (1) and “I definitely agree” (9). The scale was adapted into Turkish by Güldü (2009). Factors analysis demonstrated that the scale had two sub-factors in Turkish culture- namely, high RWA and low RWA. The internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the whole scale and for the sub-factors were .85, .82 and .78, respectively and split half reliability coefficients were .88, .83 and .77, respectively.

Individualism and Collectivism Scale (INDCOL): Individualism and collectivism values are frequently used concepts in intercultural studies and they are also used in determining individual differences (Wasti and Eser, 2007). This study uses Individualism-Collectivism Scale developed by Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand (1995). The scale distinguishes the factors of individualism

and collectivism as horizontal (equalitarian) and vertical (hierarchical) and thus it measures them individually. Based on this foursome classification, the scale contains four sub-factors and 32 items. The four sub-factors are horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC) and vertical collectivism (VC). The items require answers in 5-pointed Likert type scale ranging between “I definitely disagree” (1) and “I definitely agree” (9). The scale was adapted into Turkish by Wasti and Eser (2007). The internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the sub-factors of the scale was not found to be very high in this study. However, it is not surprising for scales which measure cultural factors. The internal consistency coefficients were found as .73 for horizontal collectivism, .72 for vertical collectivism, .71 for horizontal individualism and .67 for vertical individualism in a sample of 395 participants. The internal consistency coefficients for a sample of 1093 participants were .73, .69, .69 and .67, respectively (Wasti and Eser, 2007).

Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO): Social dominance orientation scale which was developed by Sidanius, Pratto and Bobo (1994) was used in determining individuals’ and their group’s levels of wishing to have dominance and superiority over other people or groups. The 16-item scale was evaluated in 7-pointed Likert type ranging between “very incorrect” and “very correct”. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Karaçanta (2002) by using it with a group of 300 university students with different ethnic identities (Turkish, Kurdish, Circassian, Laz). The researcher tested the construct validity of the scale and found that it had a one-factor structure. The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the scale was .85 for all groups whereas it was .84 for Turkish subjects, .73 for Kurdish subjects, .86 for Circassian subjects and .93 for Laz subjects (Karaçanta, 2002).

Procedure

The survey form consisting of explanation part, personal information form and scales was given to the university students in the meetings held by youth branches of the political parties in which they had membership and in the classrooms. Initially, the participants were informed of the research and their approval was received. It takes participants 30-45 minutes to answer the questions. The participants were not asked to give any information about their identity.

Results

This part includes the results for variance analysis done for the scores received from personal traits called right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and individualism-collectivism. The department of study and political identity were considered as independent variables in all variance analyses, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) which suited to the design 2 (department of study) X 4 (political identity) was done. The averages and *F* values for the basic effects of political identity are shown in Table 1 and the averages and *F* values for the basic effects of the department of study are shown in Table 2.

Table 1. The Averages, Standard Deviations and Significance Levels for the Basic Effects of Political Identity

	Nationalist (n=125)	Conservative (n=102)	Social democrat (n=144)	Socialist (n=139)	F ₃₋₅₀₂	η ²
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)		
SDO	65.83 (10.37)	67.49 (8.43)	66.93 (10.97)	67.22 (9.38)	.68	.00
RWA	85.60 (14.37)	87.29 (13.08)	88.14 (12.95)	88.53 (13.25)	1.58	.01
High RWA	47.53 (11.43)	51.31 (12.11)	38.96 (13.13)	34.16 (14.07)	44.05*	.21
Low RWA	44.01 (10.64)	42.32 (11.73)	54.03 (10.79)	59.04 (11.46)	62.20*	.27
Horizontal individualism	35.86 (4.75)	35.39 (4.65)	35.66 (4.27)	36.13 (4.91)	.93	.01
Horizontal collectivism	32.84 (3.73)	33.49 (3.26)	32.62 (3.73)	32.85 (4.06)	.56	.00
Vertical individualism	23.54 (5.09)	22.72 (3.58)	21.62 (5.09)	20.48 (5.46)	8.21*	.05
Vertical collectivism	24.58 (3.67)	24.33 (3.49)	23.44 (3.95)	21.94 (4.09)	12.43*	.07

*p<.05

As is clear from Table 1, the variance analysis done on high RWA scores demonstrated that the basic effects of political identity were significant. Thus, significant differences were found between groups with nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist identity according to high RWA ($F_{3-502} = 44.05; p < .05$). the comparison of groups made with Tukey Kramer test showed that the participants with conservative political identity higher average ($M=51.31$) than those with social democrat ($M=38.96$) and socialist ($M=34.16$) identities. In a similar way, the participants with nationalist political identity had significantly higher average ($M=47.53$) than the participants with social democrat ($M=38.96$) and socialist ($M=34.16$) political identities. As evident from these results, the group with the highest high right-wing authoritarianism score- which represented authoritarian aggression and authoritarian obedience- was the group with conservative political identity while the group with the lowest score was the group with socialist political identity.

The basic effects of political identity was found to be significant according to low RWA for all groups ($F_{3-502} = 62.20; p < .05$). Tukey Kramer analysis was done to find the groups with the source of difference. The results of the analysis showed that the participants with socialist political identity had higher low RWA average ($M=59.04$) than the other groups- that is to say, participants with conservative ($M=42.32$), nationalist ($M=44.01$) and social democrat ($M=54.03$) identities. In a similar vein, the participants with social democrat identity had higher low RWA average ($M= 54.03$) than the participants with conservative ($M=42.32$) and nationalist ($M=44.01$) identities. These results made it clear that the group with the highest low RWA score- which represented traditionalism and obedience-

was the group with socialist identity whereas the group with the lowest score was the group with conservative identity.

The basic effects of political identity cause significant differences according to vertical individualism. As a result, significant differences were found between groups with nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist identities ($F_{3-502} = 8.21; p < .05$). Tukey Kramer test was done to find the groups causing the effect. According to the analysis results, the participants with nationalist political identity had higher vertical individualism average ($M=23.54$) than those with socialist ($M=20.48$) and social democrat ($M=21.62$) identities. In addition to that, the conservative identity group also had higher average ($M=22.72$) than the socialist identity group ($M=20.48$) in vertical individualism. Hence, the group with the highest vertical individualism was the nationalist identity group while the group with the lowest vertical individualism was the socialist identity group.

Finally, as clear from Table 1, the basic effects of political identity were found in the scores received from vertical collectivist personality trait ($F_{3-502} = 12.43; p < .05$). The direction of the effect was tested with Tukey Kramer test. Following the analysis, it was found that the socialist identity group had significantly lower vertical collectivism average ($M=21.94$) than the social democrat ($M=23.44$), the conservative ($M=24.33$) and the nationalist ($M=24.58$) identity groups. The finding demonstrates that the group with the lowest vertical collectivism is the socialist identity group and the group with the highest vertical collectivism is the nationalist identity group. An examination of effect size (η^2) demonstrated that political identity caused the greatest difference in low RWA (.27) and in high RWA (.21) according to dependent variables. In other words, the strongest correlation was found in low RWA.

According to the analysis results, the students with conservative and nationalist identity displayed high RWA and vertical individualism more than the students with social democrat and socialist identities. Thus, the students with social democrat and socialist political identity are the groups displaying low RWA personality traits the most. The group with the highest level of vertical collectivism is the socialist identity group. No significant differences were found between identity groups according to such personal traits as social dominance orientation, right wing authoritarianism, horizontal individualism and horizontal collectivism. These were the results which supported hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2.

As clear from Table 2, the basic effects of the department of study on right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) scores are significant ($F_{1-502} = 6.17; p < .05$). Accordingly, the students attending numerical-science departments had higher averages ($M=89.20$) than the students attending verbal departments ($M=86.27$). That is to say, the participants attending numerical-science departments had higher levels of right-wing authoritarianism than those attending verbal departments.

The basic effects of the department of study on high RWA were found to be significant ($F_{1-502} = 16.23; p < .05$). The students of numerical-science departments had higher average ($M= 44.99$) than the students of verbal departments ($M=40.34$). This finding indicates that the students attending numerical-science departments have higher levels of RWA- which represents authoritarian aggression and obedience- than the students attending verbal departments.

Table 2. The Averages, Standard Deviations and Significance Levels for the Basic Effects of the Department of Study

	Numerical- Science (<i>n</i> =206)	Verbal (<i>n</i> =304)	<i>F</i> ₁₋₅₀₂	η^2
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)		
SDO	66.92 (9.86)	66.80 (9.98)	.05	.00
RWA	89.20 (12.86)	86.27 (13.70)	6.17*	.01
High RWA	44.99 (12.84)	40.34 (15.10)	16.23*	.03
Low RWA	49.95 (12.64)	51.04 (13.33)	1.00	.00
Horizontal individualism	36.14 (4.32)	35.54 (4.84)	.84	.00
Horizontal collectivism	32.87 (3.84)	32.93 (3.67)	.06	.00
Vertical individualism	23.01 (5.17)	21.31 (4.87)	10.81*	.02
Vertical collectivism	23.89 (4.02)	23.22 (3.91)	3.84	.01

**p*<.05

And finally, the basic effects of the department of study on the scores received from vertical individualism were found significant ($F_{1-502} = 10.81$; $p < .05$). Accordingly, there were significant differences between vertical individualism levels of students attending numerical-science departments and the levels of students attending verbal departments. The averages were $M=23.01$ and $M=21.31$, respectively. This finding indicated that the levels of vertical individualism of the students attending numerical-science departments of universities were higher than the levels of students attending verbal departments. On examining effect size (η^2), it was found that the department of study caused the most remarkable difference in high RWA (.03) in terms of dependent variables but that the difference was not very big.

The results showed that the students attending numerical-science departments have such traits as right-wing authoritarianism, vertical individualism and high right-wing authoritarianism than the ones attending verbal departments. Thus, hypothesis 3 in this study was supported. There were no significant differences according to the other personal traits. Besides, the analyses also demonstrated that the joint effects of political identity-the department of study were not significant.

Conclusion

This paper aimed to determine whether or not there were any significant differences between such personality traits as right-wing authoritarianism, individualism-collectivism and social dominance orientation of university students with nationalist, conservative, social democrat and socialist

identities. The results of multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA) demonstrated that the basic effects of political identity were significant in high RWA, low RWA, vertical individualism and vertical collectivism (See Table 1). Conservative students' and nationalist students' high RWA (obedient and aggressive bias) was higher than social democrat and socialist students' and social democrat students' high RWA was higher than socialist students'. On the other hand, socialist students' low RWA (traditional and obedient) was higher than nationalist, conservative and social democrat students', and social democrat students' low RWA was higher than nationalist and conservative students'. The fact that the conservative and nationalist students- who represented the rightist ideology displayed high RWA and that the socialist and social democrat students-who represented the leftist ideology- displayed low RWA was not surprising. There are deep differences between rightist and leftist ideologies in many issues including religion, economy, business life, social welfare, defence expenditures, world peace and capital punishment; and the differences also lead to differentiation in right-wing authoritarianism levels. As can be remembered, according to Altemeyer (1996), there are two aspects of right-wing authoritarianism (RWA)- which represents individuals' obedience to people they regard as authority in their life. The aspects are called high RWA and low RWA. High RWA- which involves individuals' obedience to the legitimate authority (authoritarian obedience) and their aggressive behaviours towards the members of external groups (authoritarian aggression)- is more prominent in individuals who adopt the rightist ideology; and is consistent with relevant literature (Hasta, 2002). In a similar way, the second aspect, low RWA, involves such elements as obedience and traditionalism. Accordingly, the participants who adopt the leftist political view obey the legitimate authority but they also stick to traditions. This finding indicates that socialist participants in particular are at least slightly loyal to traditions- which socialist political ideology describes as dilapidated and which is the imposition of political culture and of the system. Thus, right-wing authoritarianism is determinant in revealing the differences between political ideologies and it has formative effects on current political faction.

As mentioned before, individuals with high RWA trust the legitimate authority and they have high respect for the authority. Therefore, they do not hesitate to obey the authority. They are also more aggressive towards people of groups they describe as deviant and different. Such individuals are tightly loyal to traditions and customs, they have conservative religious beliefs and they are described as highly nationalist (Altemeyer, 1996). It was actually found that the individuals who supported the Republican Party in the USA and the individuals who supported Conservative Reform Party in Canada had high levels of right-wing authoritarianism. Duckitt (1993) also points out that individuals with high levels of RWA hold conservative and nationalist views, that they are biased against people or groups that are different from them- mainly against minorities and that they have more inclinations towards discriminant and destructive behaviours. Hasta (2002), in a study comparing the authoritarianism levels of students with extreme rightist, moderate and extreme leftist political views, found that the students with extreme rightist views had moderate levels of authoritarianism but that the students with extreme leftist views had higher levels of authoritarianism and that the extreme leftist group was followed by the moderate and extreme leftist groups. This was a finding consistent with the theory of authoritarian personality. According to the theory, individuals develop extreme

conservative political and economic attitudes to be able to cope with psychodynamic conflicts which date back to early childhood period, and those attitudes are generally directed to defending the ego. Therefore, individuals who adopt the rightist political ideology are more inclined to display such attitudes and are more authoritarian (Hasta, 2002).

The results showed that the university students with nationalist political identity had higher levels of vertical individualism than the university students with social democrat and socialist identities and that the students with conservative identity had higher levels of vertical individualism than the students with socialist identity. Thus, the group with the highest level of vertical individualism was the nationalist group while the group with the lowest level of vertical individualism was the socialist group. On comparing the socialist group with the nationalist, conservative and social democrat groups in terms of vertical collectivism, it was found that the socialist group received lower scores. Accordingly, the socialist group had the lowest level of vertical collectivism while the nationalist group had the highest level. It is apparent that the nationalist political identity group is the group with the highest inclinations towards vertical collectivism and vertical individualism.

The nationalist identity group is followed by the conservative, social democrat and socialist groups, respectively in both inclinations. While integration into the family and socialisation are still important for nationalist individuals, competition, winning and creativity accompany such integration and socialisation. In fact it is a finding which is not surprising because nationalism helps to the development and reinforcement of solidarity ties between member of a community where the sense of belonging develops, and because nationalism stresses the aspects different from and superior to others (Gökalp, 2007). Besides, as mentioned earlier, individualism and collectivism tendencies are not at two opposite extremes, but they are multidimensional cultural structures which can exist in an individual at differing levels. In other words, individuals can display an individualistic approach in a situation and a collectivistic approach in another (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand, 1995). Göregenli (1995), who considers the individualistic and collectivistic tendencies in Turkish culture, states that Turkish culture cannot be described as individualistic or collectivistic. It is because individualistic tendencies also emerged in Turkish society-in which loyalty to the family and the community is dominant- due to the changes which occurred in the period following 1980 in parallel to opening up to the world economically (Dengiz, 2008). According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1997), who also states that individualistic and collectivistic tendencies can occur simultaneously in a culture, collectivistic tendency diminishes as a result of modernisation in Turkish society- which is in the process of transformation from traditionalism into modernism- but individuals' emotional commitment to their internal group continues without diminishing.

As clear from Table 2, the basic effects of the department of study on RWA, on vertical individualism and on high RWA were found to be significant. Accordingly, the students attending such numerical-science departments as engineering, medicine and pharmaceuticals had higher levels of right-wing authoritarianism, high RWA and vertical individualism than the students attending such verbal departments as law, education and politics. As mentioned before, educational institutions, especially universities- which are of secondary importance after families and friend groups-have great impacts on individuals' political socialisation. The courses taught and the educational staff in the

department of study, the school environment and the circle of friends cause differing effects on individuals in terms of political socialisation (Çuhadar, 2006). It was an expected situation that that the students attending verbal departments such as law, education and politics had more comprehensive knowledge about the agenda and the politics in the country due to the fact that they were mostly in environments where social, political and economic issues were spoken. On the other hand, the fact that the students attending numerical-science departments such as engineering, medicine and pharmaceuticals were knowledgeable about and interested in mostly technical issues might have caused them to be less sensitive to the agenda in the country. Therefore, the students attending those departments can be more biased in behaving to people or groups different from them. They can also be expected to be more loyal to traditions and to be more obedient to the legitimate authority. Besides, the higher levels of students attending numerical-science departments can be considered as the indicator of the fact that they are more eager to be different, to have a special position, to compete and to win as a requirement of their job. The fact that their capabilities, feelings, thoughts, needs and choices determine and lead their behaviours indicates that they have relatively more autonomous structure of self. For such individuals, it is important to be more autonomous than and different from others and to achieve their personal goals- that is to say, the emphasis on being the self.

References

- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarianism specter*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Bilgin, N. (2007). *Kimlik inşası*. Ankara: Aşina Kitaplar.
- Brewer, M.B. (2001). The many faces of social identity: implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 115-125.
- Bulut, M. (2019). Immigrants' Access to Resources: The Case of Syrian Immigrants in Turkey. *International Journal of Human Studies*. 2, 89-98.
- Çuhadar, A. (2006). *Üniversite öğretim elemanları ve öğrencilerinin demokrasi anlayışlarının siyasal toplumsallaşma bağlamında cinsiyet, bilim alanı, akademik aşama ve siyasal katılımçılık değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Dalmış, İ. ve İmamoğlu, E.O. (2000). Yetişkinlerin ve üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyo-politik kimlik algıları. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(46), 1-14.
- Dengiz, G.M. (2008). *Yönetim yaklaşımlarına kültürel açıdan bakış. Proje Yönetim Derneği söyleşileri*. www.pyd.org.tr/001.pdf.
- Duckitt, J. (1993). Right-wing authoritarianism among White South African students: Its measurement and correlates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(4), 553-563.
- Gökalp, E. (2007). Milliyetçilik: Kuramsal bir değerlendirme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(1), 279-298.
- Göregenli, M. (1995). Kültürümüz açısından bireycilik–toplulukçuluk eğilimleri: Bir başlangıç çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 10(35), 1–14.
- Greene, S. (2004). Social identity theory and political identification. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 136-152.
- Güldü, Ö. (1998). *Aşırı uçlarda siyasal tutumlara sahip üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı psikolojik değişkenler açısından karşılaştırılması* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Güldü, Ö. (2009). Sağ kanat yetkeçiliği ölçeği: Uyarlama çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(2), 27-51.
- Haley, H. & Sidanius, J. (2005). Person-organization congruence and the maintenance of group-based social hierarchy: A social dominance perspective. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 8(2), 187-203.
- Hasta, D. (2002). *Yetkeci kişilik ve bilişsel karmaşıklık düzeyi ile siyasal ideoloji arasındaki ilişki* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

- Jackson, M.S. (2005). *Identity matters: Political identity construction and the process of identity influence* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1997). *Individualism and collectivism*. In handbook of cross-cultural psychology: social behavior and applications (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-49). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Martin, J.L. (2001). The authoritarian personality, 50 years later: What lessons are there for political psychology? *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 1-26.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stalworth, L.M. & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741-763.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F. & Bobo, L. (1994). Social dominance orientation and the political psychology of gender: A case of invariance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6) 998-1011.
- Simon, B. & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity. *American Psychologist*, 56(4), 319-331.
- Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.P.S. & Gelfand, M.J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29(3), 240-275
- Smith, R.M. (2004). Identities, interests and the future of political science. *Perspective on Politics*, 2, 3001-312.
- Triandis, H.C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69(6), 907-924.
- Triandis, H.C. & Gelfand, M.J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128.
- Wasti, A. ve Eser, S. (2007). Bireycilik ve toplulukçuluk değerlerinin ölçülmesi: Benlik kurgusu ve INDCOL ölçeklerinin Türkçe geçerliliği. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7, 39-66.
- White, C.J. (2005). Further support of the reliability and construct validity of the horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism framework. *Management Research News*, 28(1), 77-81.