

On the Obedience of Argentinian Immigrants in Israel: An Exploration of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, Economic System Justification, Personality and Positive Affect.

Link, Ian; Tenenbaum, Ofelia; Yosef, Dorin

On the Obedience of Argentinian Immigrants in Israel: An Exploration of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, Economic System Justification, Personality and Positive Affect.

PSOCIAL, vol. 6, no. 1, 2020

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=672371458002>



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International.

On the Obedience of Argentinian Immigrants in Israel: An Exploration of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, Economic System Justification, Personality and Positive Affect.

Ian Link

Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), Argentina
ilink@sociales.uba.ar

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2071-2120>

Redalyc: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=672371458002>

Ofelia Tenenbaum

Tel Aviv University (TAU), Israel
opheliat@mail.tau.ac.il

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5962-7279>

Dorin Yosef

Tel Aviv University (TAU), Israel
dorinhayay@mail.tau.ac.il

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3737-5207>

Received: 30 April 2020

Accepted: 26 June 2020

ABSTRACT:

Israel was constituted as a State in parallel to the warlike conflict with the Arab world, and became the favorite destination for Jews from all over the globe. We will take Argentine immigrants, the largest Latin American contributor in this area, to explore obedience to authority, represented in obedience to the laws. The sample was made up of 204 participants between the ages of 20 to 79 years of both sexes (Men = 52.5%; Women = 47.5%). The results show that obedience to the laws is mainly explained by "Justification of the economic system" directly. Secondly, significant results were given by ?Positive affect? and ?Negative affect?. Although there are also other results to highlight, for example, RWA influences the belief that it is necessary to obey the laws, although later it does not explain effective obedience. This study aims to explore the connection between obedience and authority, represented in adherence to the laws, within the migratory logic.

KEYWORDS: Migration, Argentina, Israel, obedience, social dominance (SDO), authoritarianism (RWA), justification of the economic system (ESJ), personality, positive affect (APOS), fear.

INTRODUCTION

Using the understanding of authoritarianism as a personality trait as a starting point, (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi & Prado-Gascó, 2011), and from the analysis carried out by Milgram, a person with authoritarian personality will be more likely to obey than the "non-authoritarian" (Milgram, 1974). Now, if the personality is built through processes of subjectivity (Berger & Luckman, 1968), each culture has its own methods and contents (Mussen, 2000), and bearing in mind that the process of socialization lasts for a lifetime (Simkin & Becerra, 2003), a migrant immersed in another culture will be faced with the new culture and institutions.

We live in a globalized world where the migratory phenomenon is constantly increasing, even at a rate higher than those calculated by specialists in demography (OIM, 2018). Within this dynamic, it is well

studied how Argentina after WWII changed its demographic trend and ceased to be a simple receiver, especially during the 1970s, having periods of greater emigration over migration (Otero, 2007). In this sense, Israel was one of best countries to migrate to, from the 60's and on (Calvelo, 2007). It is estimated that in 2010, 4.97% of the Argentine emigrants were living in Israel (OIM, 2012). Furthermore, of the total number of Jewish Latin American emigrants in Israel since their formation in 1948, Argentines represent 58% (Babis, 2016), out of a total of 92.000 (Lesser, 2016). Migration is a phenomenon to which all countries are exposed to. The complexity of its influence depends highly on each society. Although previous studies of Argentine migration to Israel addressed this development, it was mainly from a historical or sociological standpoint (Krupnik 2020, 2011; Siebzehner 2016, 2010; Klor, 2016). In addition, the psychosocial perspective focused only on other nationalities, lacking to provide an adequate overview. (Tartakovsky, Patrakov & Nikulina, 2017; Tartakovsky, 2012; Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001). Due to this, the present study will focus on Argentinian migrants in Israel from a psychosocial perspective. While presenting our research, we leave the debate open for future research, about the Israeli society and Argentina as two different societies in regards to the social representation constructed and expressed around 'obedience to authority?'. In line with the aforementioned, we will justify this affirmation from a sociological point of view and then go deeper from a psychological point of view, in order to acknowledge the complexity of the social reality (Weber, 2012; Schutz, 1962).

It is important to clarify, although the relationship between 'obedience / disobedience' can be understood in abstract terms as 'opposites' on a scale that goes from 'absolute obedience to absolute disobedience?', we will make use of those bearing in mind that the limits of both are the necessary "subject" for the proper functioning of the capitalist system (Althusser, 1974). That is, respect for the State as the only legitimate authority, claimed and recognized, to command over a certain territory and the people who inhabit it. In other words, when we move throughout our work within the binomial "obedience / disobedience", the use of such terms will be taken as obvious within a common historical framework of "obedience" towards state authority. Beyond specific and duly pointed out historical situations, we will never assimilate 'disobedience' to 'crises' (Gramsci, 2013), as they can be 'double edged swords' (Tilly, 1993), among other conceptualizations of this type. Argentina's history in the 20th century has been the scenario of events that weakened authority and legitimacy of the State. Take for example the last military dictatorship; social, economic and political crises such as the one in 2001, or the accusations of state 'corruption' (Grimson, 2018; Leigram, 2004; Krause, 2000). In line with the above, some authors (Fondevila, 2003) characterized this 'civil disobedience' as a right of the popular will, that gained ground, which can be seen as an expression of the popular phenomenon 'que se vayan todos (have everyone leave)' (Dinerstein, 2003), or the 'el que no salta es un militar (he who does not jump is a military man)' (AUNO, 2019; Mayor, 2017; Greco, 2006). Both as a constant challenge to the law enforcement agencies already mentioned, and studied by various works (Izurieta Ferrer, 2015; Montalvo, 2009) that mark Argentina as the country that least trusts its armed forces in Latin America, disobedience to the laws (Colombo, 2003; Krause, 2000) could directly result not only from such experiences per se, but also from the reproduction of different institutions and agents.

Therefore, we believe that the hypothesis of permanent conflict in which Israel lives regarding the Arab world (Caplan, 2019; Gelvin, 2014; Brieger, 2014; Yiftachel, 2006), "constantly present" (through simulations, sirens, news in the media, etc.), built subjects crossed by "doubt" and fear of the "other", territorially close but symbolically distant (Morales & Bautista, 2017). We understand that it acted as a circumstance in the elaboration of obedient subjects towards the State, guarantor of the protection of its citizens (Santos, 2003). An example of this is that, as we said previously, while in Argentina the forces of order are questioned (Izurieta Ferrer, 2015; Montalvo, 2009), in Israel it is normal to see a military man with a weapon on the street or on public transport (Maoz & Eidelson, 2007). We should ask ourselves: Will the migrant subjects 'adopt' the perceptions of state authority and civil obedience of the receiving country, or will they maintain those of their country of origin? Due to this, our research objective will be to explore

obedience to the laws of Argentine migrants in Israel in 2020, taking into account if they perceive the State as fair, if they believe in the legitimacy of the laws, and if they really obey them.

Fear, Authoritarian Personality, Abdication of responsibility and Obedience.

Using the understanding of authoritarianism as a personality trait as a starting point, (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi & Prado-Gascó, 2011), and from the analysis carried out by Milgram, a person with authoritarian personality will be more likely to obey than the "non-authoritarian" (Milgram, 1974). Now, if the personality is built through processes of subjectivity (Berger & Luckman, 1968), each culture has its own methods and contents (Mussen, 2000), and bearing in mind that the process of socialization lasts for a lifetime (Simkin & Becerra, 2003), a migrant immersed in another culture will be faced with the new culture and institutions. the understanding of authoritarianism as a personality trait as a starting point, (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi & Prado-Gascó, 2011), and from the analysis carried out by Milgram, a person with authoritarian personality will be more likely to obey than the "non-authoritarian" (Milgram, 1974). Now, if the personality is built through processes of subjectivity (Berger & Luckman, 1968), each culture has its own methods and contents (Mussen, 2000), and bearing in mind that the process of socialization lasts for a lifetime (Simkin & Becerra, 2003), a migrant immersed in another culture will be faced with the new culture and institutions.

Foucault (1975) proposes a sociological explanation of obedience. This author starts from understanding that power is decentralized and not necessarily embodied in a person, while we are in a society in which we feel that we are constantly monitored and followed, producing in us the following of norms and laws. The feeling that we are supervised, of fear of being caught for deviating from the norm, and therefore being punished for it, would lead to compliance with the laws. Precisely, we understand that this trend is reinforced by the warlike cultures of the 21st century. Operating through psychosocial mechanisms, based on the fear of the creation of the figure of a "threatening other" (Palestinians), defined ontologically from their "possible acts", with a great moral burden, "intolerant for society" (Bonavena & Nievas, 2012). The social function of these mechanisms is to increase the control of the authority given the "exceptional situation" (Schmitt, 2009), as well as the social legitimation for any offensive action that guarantees "security" (Nievas, 2015). It would not only be the internalization of a behavior, but also of a need.

In the Israeli case, the "other" as a threat cannot be understood only from the materiality and objectivity of any war where conflict and threat are part of the past and present of society. It is also not only explained, in a Gramscian sense (Gramsci, 2013), as a product of subjective political intentions with material consequences, but also, as a combination of both factors. In this sense, following this reasoning, it can be concluded that in different circumstances the authoritarian and obedient personality is fostered, while in the face of increasing uncertainty the subject displaces his critical consciousness and replaces it with authority. As a psychological mechanism of tranquility, it gives up its responsibility (Santos, 2003), while "the dying condition" (Milgram, 1974) submits to the (Hobbesian) State, and disregards politics. In this sense, there are many studies that show the negative correlation between "Authoritarianism" and "Interest in politics" (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi & Prado-Gascó, 2011). From this "symbolic remoteness" that occurs with respect to the "intolerant enemy", it follows that the subjects will obey the State, and even more if said authority is physically close (Santos, 2003). Illustrative of this is compulsory military service, or the naturalization of the Armed Forces in civil life. For the present investigation we need to start from the hypothesis that "anyone can do evil" (Arendt, 1963; Milgram, 1974), or in this case, "anyone could legitimize evil" based on reasons of obedience (Wagon, 2019), although we do not want to fall into the notion of a "bureaucratic subject" (Canto Ortiz & Álvaro 2015), nor nullify the possibility of social change and "disobedience" (Santos, 2003). A government not only acts by its own characteristics, but because it is the result of social relations, and in this case, of subjective subjects with a certain ideology. In this sense, Trotsky's (2013) comment when he

refers to the causes of Hitler's rise to power seems illustrative. This author understands that although not all "exasperated petty bourgeois" could have become Hitler (highlighting his particular personality), in each "exasperated petty bourgeois" there was a particle of Hitler (his rise and legitimacy are explained as a product of social relations of specific histories that are condensed in the historical need on the part of the population of "a Hitler").

Social dominance, Justification of the economic system and Obedience.

From what has been said, the relationship that we hope to find between obedience and Social dominance, is reflected in various theoretical antecedents (Kandler, Bell & Riemann, 2016; Etchezahar, Ungaretti, Prado Gascó & Brusino, 2016; Duckitt, 2006; Whitley, 1999). The latter, is understood as the degree of agreement in which an individual supports a social system based on hierarchies, that is, on the mark of an inferior "outgroup" (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi & Prado-Gascó, 2011). Starting from understanding the asocial tendency, in Hobbesian terms, which is usually towards the "outgroup" (Etchezahar, Prado-Gascó, Jaume & Brussino, 2014), we believe that the study subjects who have internalized a greater distinction of the "outgroup" are predisposed to accept the aggressions towards it, which will be greater when a signifier such as "threat" and "intolerant" towards the "outgroup" is assigned, breeding ground for authoritarianism. In relation to this, besides the sociological phenomena before mentioned, where the dominant class produces psychosocial tendencies on other classes (Bonavena & Nievas, 2012; Gramsci, 2013; Marx & Engels, 1991; & Sidanius Pratto, 1999), there also is a psychological mechanism in which the individual justifies the social system in order to obtain relief from the emotional anguish that would appear while morally acting on the inequality or concerning the economic future (Jaume, Etchezahar & Cervone, 2012). In this sense, Social Domination serves as a conceptual-ideological framework for the Justification of the economic system (Jaume, Etchezahar & Cervone, 2012). In line with this, various authors that analyze this relationship (Jost, 2019; Rodriguez-Bailon, Bratanova, Willis, Lopez-Rodriguez, Sturrock & Loughnan, 2017; Khan, Moss, Quratulain & Hameed, 2018; Jost & Hunyady, 2005; Jost, Banayi & Nosek, 2004) and of it with Authoritarianism (Kelemen, Szabó, Mészáros, László & Forgas, 2014), state that individuals with a high level of social domination should have a greater predisposition to justify the economic system (Jaume, Etchezahar & Cervone, 2012), and to obey to guarantee social order.

Positive Affect, Personality and Obedience.

For Argentine immigrants to be incorporated into Israeli society, a shared and similar system of meaning, language and culture must be created (Durkheim, 1982). In this sense, from a sociological approach, it would be important to study the relationship between personal experience, the construction of subjectivity, and the community structure to which it belongs (Waller, 2002). However, in order not to exceed the limits of this work, we will simply study the relationship between personality and obedience, which gives us the possibility to characterize the individual according to certain stable and regular traits (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020). Nevertheless, it is not to be ignored that the personality of a subject, and his personal experience, are highly influenced by social interactions that give structure to all community life (Waller, 2002; Simkin & Becerra, 2003). As we said, an individual's orientation to authority is the product of the group of which he is a part, this being an extension of the "I". As part of a group, a collectivist culture is created forming exposure to new and different experiences and improving the level of comfort and self-esteem with regards to their belonging. In this sense, we understand that those subjects with greater positive affection, one of the emotional components of subjective well-being (Simkin, Olivera, & Azzollini, 2020; Diener et al., 2015; Eid & Larsen, 2008; Schimmack, 2008), represented by a set of emotions such as joy,

motivation, energy or self-confidence will be more obedient (Pozo Cujano, 2017) while showing a greater willingness to relate positively to others, engage socially, being optimistic, with high self-esteem (Noriega, Freire, Ortíz, & Figueroa, 2010), and therefore integrated into the rules (Pozo Cujano, 2017) Thus now, it should be noted that each person, according to his own personality, presents an "adjustment point" in relation to subjective well-being (Noriega, Freire, Ortíz, & Figueroa, 2010). In this sense, to study personality we will start from the "Big Five Factors" (Costa & McCrae, 1980). We will also focus on the direct relationship that we hope to find between Neuroticism, defined as the tendency to experience negative emotions such as fears, feelings of guilt, sadness or anger (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020), and obedience (Zeigler-Hill & Southard, 2013). People who perceive common situations as "threats" (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020), fit into the pronounced relationship between threat and obedience already mentioned (Santos, 2003).

Similarly, we can expect a positive relationship between Responsibility, compliance with social norms, impulse control, and direction towards a goal (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020), and obedience (Bégue, Béauvois, Courbet, Oberlé, Lepage & Duke, 2015). As Hagan and Ones say, from childhood, we learn that we receive approval for being orderly, obedient, and trustworthy. In this sense, we will continue repeating behaviors that bring such approval from the authority, internalizing them. Responsibility appears as a behavior that guarantees survival in the group (Hogan & Ones, 1997). We also expect a positive relationship between Kindness, a dimension through which an individual tends to cooperate with others, collaborating with group goals (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020) and obedience (Bégue, Béauvois, Courbet, Oberlé, Lepage & Duke, 2015), since although kindness is negatively related to intragroup conflict (Suls, Martin & David, 1998), alienating group goals in the sense stated by Santos (Santos, 2003), it coincides with the act of submission. Regarding Extraversion, it is a characteristic linked to the connection with the outside world through personal interaction (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020), which is found in happy people who exceed in forming groups (Anderson & John, 2012). Although we could think of a positive association with obedience, since these people tend to show active or dominant social behaviors (Ashton, Lee & Paunonen, 2002), and in tune with positive affection (Noriega, Freire, Ortíz & Figueroa, 2010), we also have to state that there is not necessarily a significant relationship between extraversion and obedience (Bégue, Béauvois, Courbet, Oberlé, Lepage & Duke, 2015; Miranda, Caballero, Gomez, & Zamorano, 1981). Likewise, Openness to experience is usually associated with creative people, with artistic and intellectual interests, and a pronounced search for stimuli and feelings, both positive and negative (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020). Taking the analysis made by Bégue (2015) as a reference, we think that there should not necessarily be a relationship between said construct and obedience.

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 204 Argentine immigrants living in Israel, with ages ranging from 20 to 79 years ($M = 51.76$, $SD = 14.21$) of both sexes (men = 52, 5%; Women = 47.5%).

Measures

Right-Wing Authoritarianism

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA). RWA is a construct that assesses the extent to which people have a high degree of willingness to authorities that they perceive as legitimate, adhere to conventions and social

norms, and are hostile towards people who do not adhere to them. This self-administered questionnaire is made up of 6 items (for example: "Our country needs a powerful leader who can confront the extremists and immoral people who currently prevail in our society"). The response format is Likert-type with five anchors according to the degree of agreement of the participants, with one being "Completely Disagree", five "Completely Agree". Specifically, the short version adapted and validated to the Argentine context (Etchezahar, Cervone, Biglieri, Quattrocchi and Prado-Gascó, 2011) was used. In this study, the reliability of RWA is adequate ($\alpha = .812$).

Social Dominance Orientation Scale

Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO). SDO is a scale that assesses an individual's preference for hierarchy within any social system and dominance over lower status groups based on two factors: a) Group Dominance and b) Equality Orientation. This self-administered questionnaire is made up of 8 items (for example: "The higher status groups should dominate the lower status groups"), with a Likert-type response format with five anchors according to the degree of agreement of the participants, one being "Completely disagree", five "Completely agree". We used the scale adapted and validated to the Argentine context (Etchezahar, Prado-Gascó, Jaume, & Brussino, 2014). In this study, the reliability of SDO is adequate ($\alpha = .836$).

Economic System Justification Scale

Economic System Justification Scale (ESJ). ESJ is a self-administered questionnaire that assesses the extent to which people perceive the status quo as good, legitimate, and / or desirable. Composed of 7 items (for example: "If someone tries hard enough, they can move up the social ladder."), with a Likert-type response format with five response anchors according to the degree of agreement of the participants, being one "Strongly disagree", five "Strongly agree". We used the scale adapted and validated to the Argentine context (Etchezahar, Jaume, & Cervone, 2012). In this study, the reliability of ESJ is adequate ($\alpha = .863$).

Mini International Personality Item Pool

Mini International Personality Item Pool (Mini-IPIP). Mini IPIP is a self-administered questionnaire of 20 items with a response in Likert-type format with five response anchors depending on the degree of agreement of the participants, one being "Completely Disagree" and five "Completely Agree". It evaluates five dimensions of personality, namely: a) Openness (for example: "I have a great imagination"), b) Responsibility (for example: "I do my homework right away"), c) Extraversion (for example: "I am the life of the parties"), d) Kindness (for example: "I empathize with what others feel"), e) Neuroticism (for example: "I have frequent changes in my state of mind"). We have used the scale adapted and validated to the Argentine context (Simkin, Borchardt Duter & Azzollini, 2020). In this study, the reliability of Mini-IPIP is adequate (Openness: $\alpha = .621$; Responsibility: $\alpha = .751$; Extraversion: $\alpha = .720$; Friendliness: $\alpha = .682$, Neuroticism: $\alpha = .552$).

Affective Balance Scale

Affective Balance Scale (ABS; Bradburn, 1969). ABS is an 18-item self-administered questionnaire that evaluates positive affective experiences (for example: "Does it make sense things went as you wanted?") And

negative (for example: "Have you been afraid of what might happen?") perceived during the last weeks. Its response format is Likert type, with five anchors according to the degree of agreement, where one is "Completely disagree", and five are "Completely agree". We have used the scale adapted and validated to the Argentine context (Simkin, Olivera & Azzollini, 2016). In this study, the reliability of both positive experiences ($\alpha = .857$) and negative experiences ($\alpha = .832$), is adequate.

Fear of an external threat

Fear of an external threat (MAE): This variable (MAE) was designed based on a self-administered question ("I fear that my family or I will be injured in Palestinian terrorist attacks"), with a Likert-type response format according to the degree of agreement of the participants, where one is "Strongly disagree", and five "Strongly agree". The objective is to analyze the degree to which the participants are afraid of an external threat. Abdication of responsibility (AR): The purpose of this variable (AR) is to study the degree of attachment to politics. To this end, participants were asked to choose an option among three response possibilities according to the statement that most coincided with their opinion (namely: "Politics does not matter to me, politicians exist for some reason", "I try to inform myself of political issues, although I do not do it so often", "Politics matter to me, and I regularly inform myself").

Justice of the laws

Justice of the laws (JL): The purpose of said variable (JL) is to understand the perception of the participants towards the laws according to their degree of justice, in order to know their vision on the word of the State, as the supreme institution. Therefore, according to the degree of agreement, where 1 is "Completely agree", and 5 is "Completely disagree", the State dictates fair laws.

Legitimacy of obedience before the law

Legitimacy of obedience before the law (LOB): The purpose of Legitimacy of obedience before the law (LOB) is to know how the participants perceive the character of the law, as its obedience is necessary, obligatory. With a Likert-type response option according to their degree of agreement, where one is "Completely agree", and five "Completely disagree", the participants were asked to answer the statement "As a citizen I must obey the laws regardless of their severity".

Effective compliance with the law

Effective compliance with the law (CEL): The purpose of this variable (CEL) is to analyze the participants' perception of themselves in the effective compliance with the laws. For this reason, the question "I comply with all established laws" was asked, where the participants answered according to a Likert-type scale of responses according to their degree of agreement with said statement, where one is "Completely agree", and five "Strongly disagree".

Procedure

A self-administered and anonymous questionnaire was applied, made up of a majority of phrases with Likert-type scales, but with the presence of other types of questions, through the "Google Forms" platform. This advertisement was published on different social networks ("Facebook", "Instagram") according to certain pre-established criteria (age range between 18 and 80 years, Argentine immigrants in Israel). A non-probability sampling was performed for these cases, obtaining a declaration of consent from the participants after applying the questionnaire. For this, it was explained to the respondents that the data collected from the study would be used exclusively for scientific purposes, in an academic context. The results obtained were subjected to a correlation and regression analysis method.

Data analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25 and EQS 6.4 for Windows.

RESULTS

At first, we wanted to analyze how the different variables were related. For this, a correlational analysis was carried out among our selected variables, namely: a) SDO, b) RWA, c) ESJ, d) Personality, e) Affective balance, f) Justice of the laws, g) Legitimacy of obedience before the law, h) Effective compliance with the law i) Fear of an external threat. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1
Correlation between selected variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.SDO	1													
2.RWA	,28**	1												
3.EJS	,49**	,45**	1											
4.O	-,18*	-,24**	-,20**	1										
5.R	-,00	,14*	,12	,04	1									
6.E	-,05	-,03	,02	,14*	,07	1								
7.K	-,31**	-,06	-,12	,21**	,25**	,37**	1							
8.N	,04	,11	-,04	-,21**	-,14	-,18*	-,17*	1						
9.AN	,17*	,07	-,13	-,13	-,17*	-,03	-,01	,47**	1					
10.AP	-,10	,04	,17*	,13	,10	,24**	,30**	-,19**	-,24**	1				
11.JL	,07	,18*	,32**	-,11	,12	-,10	-,01	-,12	-,18**	,27**	1			
12.LOB	,11	,27**	,32**	-,16*	,08	,03	-,04	-,15*	,21**	,05	,31**	1		
13.COB	,00	,08	,26**	,00	,14*	,00	,10	-,07	-,21**	,27**	,26**	,48**	1	
14.MAE	,18*	,25**	,10	-,14*	-,03	,00	,04	,15*	,24**	-,06	,01	,06	-,02	1

Notes: RWA = Abbreviated Scale of Right Wing Authoritarianism; SDO = Orientation Scale to Social Dominance; ESJ = Scale of Justification of the Economic System; O = Openness; R = Responsibility; E = Extraversion; K = Kindness; N = Neuroticism; AN = Negative affect; AP = Positive affect; JL = Justice of the laws; LOB = Legitimacy of obedience before the law; COB = effective compliance with obedience; MAE = Fear of an external threat.

When looking at the data, we can draw the following conclusions: With Justice of the laws they positively correlate with RWA (weakly), ESJ (moderately) and Positive Affect (moderately), and indirectly with

Negative Affect (weakly). RWA (moderately), EJS (moderately), and indirectly Openness (weakly), and Neuroticism (weakly) correlate with Legitimacy of obedience before the law. With Effective compliance with the law, EJS (moderately), Responsibility (weakly) and Positive Affect (moderately), and indirectly Negative Affect (weakly) correlate directly. In other words, we can highlight the great relationship that our variables have especially positively with RWA, ESJ, Positive Affect, and negatively with Negative Affect. Less presently, certain features of Personality (Openness, Responsibility, and Neuroticism). Also, it is worth noting the absence of relationships between the variables that measure obedience with respect to both Fear of threat and SDO. Although this analysis exceeds the present work, it is worth noting the relationship that we found between SDO and RWA (weakly), EJS (moderately), and Kindness (weakly), although in the latter case indirectly, between RWA and EJS directly (moderately), and indirectly with Openness (moderately), and between EJS and Openness (moderately) indirectly. As a next step, a regression was performed between the outstanding variables (independent variables) and each of the respective dependent variables, resulting in the following (See Table 2): Justice of the laws is explained moderately and directly by ESJ and by Positive Affect, while Negative Affect indirectly influences it in a weaker way; Legitimacy of obedience before the law is explained especially by ESJ, and indirectly by Negative Affect. RWA was more affected; Effective compliance with the law can be explained, in a moderate way, by ESJ and AP. Then, we wanted to see if there was a relationship between Abdication of responsibility and our three dependent variables that refer to obedience to the laws (Justice of the laws, Legitimacy of obedience before the law, Effective compliance with the law). The result was null. We did not find a relationship between these variables.

TABLE 2
Regression analysis for Justice of the laws, Legitimacy of
obedience before the law and Effective compliance with the law

		B	Beta	Sig.
JL	(constant)	1,695		,001
	ESJ	,036	,248	,001
	AN	-,020	-,154	,023
	AP	,033	,212	,002
LOB	(constant)	3,244		,000
	RWA	,029	,153	,038
	ESJ	,044	,265	,000
	AN	-,031	-,206	,002
COB	(constant)	2,311		,000
	ESJ	,036	,257	,000
	AP	,036	,245	,000

Note: JL = Justice of the laws; LOB = Legitimacy of obedience before the law; COB = effective compliance with obedience; RWA = Abbreviated Scale of Right-Wing Authoritarianism; ESJ = Scale of Justification of the economic system; AN = Negative affect; AP = Positive affect.

DISCUSSION

First of all, we hope to have provided an overview of a topic that we believe is of primary importance, that is, obedience to the authority of migrants. However, it will be of vital importance to continue the debate in future works, deepening some of the points proposed here. In future research, it would be useful to include the measurement of democratic institutions, trust in them and their representatives, and civil involvement in politics, or to add other variables to apprehend this phenomenon that we wanted to address here in a presentation mode. Social reality is complex, and its study requires investigations of the same tenor, combining scientific objectivity and imagination (Weber, 2012; Schutz, 1962). It is necessary to mention that we worked with a small sample, 204 participants, which makes it very difficult to extrapolate these results to other scenarios since they are not representative of the population. As stated, although it was useful for our exploratory purpose, we believe it is necessary to carry out the study including larger samples, and also to take our conclusions with due caution. That said, we believe the results we reached were ambivalent regarding our hypothesis. On the one hand, both SDO, Fear before threat, and Abdication of responsibility are not related to Obedience before the laws. Without a doubt, we mention the relationship between greater fear, sublimation of the State and Abdication of responsibility (Bonavena & Nievas, 2012; Schmitt, 2009; Nievas, 2015; Santos, 2003), and all this with greater social dominance, and an asocial attitude to the "outgroup" (Etchezahar, Prado-Gascó, Jaume, & Brussino, 2014). However, in the course of this investigation these results were not reflected. Three paths remain for future research: deepen this question, perhaps unfolding the question on "Fear before the threat" between fear and perception of threat, study the relationship between perception of fear with socialization, to see in what terms this question was incorporated into the Migrants' subjectivities, or thinking about the impact of Fear in the face of threat is not so much regarding obedience to the laws, but rather obedience to the forces of order, as a need for intervention of the force in the civil life, before the "outgroup". For its study, we propose the need to divide this variable for its correct apprehension into two, namely: the legitimacy of intervention in the face of an "internal threat", and the legitimacy of intervention in the face of an "external threat". On the other hand, when analyzing which independent variables influence obedience, we can draw the following conclusions: obedience is explained in regards to the different variables analyzed during this work, especially by ESJ and by the Positive Affect, and inversely by the Negative Affect. Those who see the socio-economic system as fair, legitimize both the role of the State as justice provider, as well as the status of the laws, and at the same time obey the laws. It is the most harmonious relationship that we have found, coinciding with what was said in the introduction. Similarly, those who have a happy tendency, good mood, optimism, among other characteristics, see the State as fair in its role as legislator and obey the laws, something that would also verify what was said previously (Pozo Cujano, 2017), and totally inversely influences the Negative Affect. At this point we can hypothesize a difference between those who do not see the need to obey the institutionality of the State, but rather by the rules themselves. In this study we can see how RWA affects in this sense, which corresponds to the proposal made by Lhullier (1995), in as much as it raises the existence of "more developed moral consciences", or in another way, speaks of "moral autonomy", where the subject has the ability to critically and morally judge social relations, the subject no longer obeys an authority (either through coercion or because its seen as "legitimate"), but rather certain values or principles considered universal for good social functioning (on a theoretical scale, it would be closer to Locke's conception of the "social contract" than Hobbes's). To conclude, it would be interesting to study obedience by comparing the Argentine migrant population in Israel with the Argentine population in their native country. To not only know the explanation of the obedience of the population treated here, but also "how much" more or less they obey (differences in quantitative terms), and "what" they obey or do not obey (differences in qualitative terms). Or, also, we could address this issue by comparing the entire immigrant population in Israel with the Israeli population itself. For both cases, it would also be interesting (Simkin & Becerra, 2003) based on these variables, which would be a key component when

studying migration and integration in a society (García-Yepes, 2017; del Barco, Castaño, Carroza, Delgado, Pérez, 2007). Our objective was to present an overview of the subject. We leave the debate open and look forward to further research.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L., Gruppi, L., & Paredes, A. (1974). *Ideología y aparatos ideológicos de Estado*. Nueva visión.
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., & Keltner, D. (2012). The Personal Sense of Power. *Journal of Personality*, 80 (2), 313-344.
- Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. Penguin.
- ?What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity?
- AUNO (24 de marzo de 2019). Una multitud colmó la Plaza de Mayo para gritar ?son 30.000?. AUNO.
- . C., Lee, K., & Paunonen, S. V. (2002). ?What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(1), 245-252. doi: 10.1037/0022- 3514.83.1.245
- AUNO (24 de marzo de 2019). ?Una multitud colmó la Plaza de Mayo para gritar ?son 30.000??. AUNO. Recollected from: <https://auno.org.ar/una-multitud-colmo-la-plaza-de-mayo-para-gritar-so/>
- Babis, D. (2016).
- León del Barco, B., Felipe Castaño, E., Gómez Carroza, T., Gozalo Delgado, M., & Latas Pérez, C. (2007). Socialización y autoconcepto en una muestra de alumnos inmigrantes marroquíes. *Apuntes de Psicología*, 25 (1), 53-65.
- Bègue, L., Beauvois, J.-L., Courbet, D., Oberlé, D., Lepage, J., & Duke, A. A. (2015). Personality predicts obedience in a Milgram paradigm. *Journal of Personality*, 83, 299?306.
- Bentler P. M. (2006). *EQS 6.0 Structural Equations Program Manual*. Multivariate Software.
- Bonavena, P. & Nievas, F. (2012). La guerra contrainsurgente de hoy. *Revista Pacarina del sur*, (10), 1-25.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Aldin.
- Brieger, P. (2014). *El conflicto palestino-israelí*. Capital Intelectual.
- Byrne, B. M. (1994). *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Sage Publications.
- Calvelo, L. (2007). La emigración en Argentina: 1960-2000. En S. Torrado [Ed], *Población y Bienestar en la Argentina del primero al segundo Centenario*(pp. 601-634). Editorial Edhasa.
- Canto Ortiz, J. M., & Álvaro, J. L. (2015). Más allá de la obediencia: reanálisis de la investigación de Milgram. *Escritos de Psicología*, 8(1), 13-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5231/psy.writ.2015.0701>
- Caplan, N. (2019). *The Israel-Palestine conflict: contested histories*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Colombo, A. (2003). *¿De la protesta social a la desobediencia civil?, ¿Del señoreaje a la soberanía?: Dos reflexiones sobre la política argentina*. Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2015). National accounts of subjective well-being. *American psychologist*, 70 (3), 234?242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038899>.
- Dinerstein, A. C. (2003). ¡Que se vayan todos! Popular insurrection and the asambleas barriales in Argentina. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 22 (2), 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1470-9856.00072>.
- Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(5), 684-696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205284282>.
- Durkheim, E., & Lukes, S. (1982). *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Eid, M., & Larsen, R. J. (Eds.). (2008). *The science of subjective well-being*. Guilford Press.
- Etchezahar, E., Cervone, N., Biglieri, J., Quattrocchi, P. & Prado-Gascó, V. (2011). Adaptación y validación de la versión reducida de la escala de autoritarismo de derechas (RWA) al contexto argentino. *Anuario de Investigaciones*, XVIII, 237-242.

- Etchezahar, E., Prado-Gascó, V., Jaume, L., & Brussino, S. (2014). Validación argentina de la Escala de Orientación a la Dominancia Social. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 46 (1), 35-43.
- Etchezahar, E., Ungaretti, J., Prado Gaseó, V., & Brusino, S. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Attitudes Toward Gay men scale in Argentinian context: The influence of sex, authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 9(1), 21-29.
- Fondevila, G. (2003). La desobediencia civil en argentina. *Signos filosóficos*, (9), 155-172.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Vigilar y castigar*. Siglo XXI.
- García-Yepes, K. (2017). Procesos de integración social de inmigrantes en escuelas de Huelva, España: Diversidad cultural y retos educativos 1. *ALTERIDAD. Revista de Educación*, 12(2), 188-200. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v12n2.2017.05>.
- Gelvin, J. L. (2014). *The Israel-Palestine conflict: One hundred years of war*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grimson, A. (2018). Argentina y sus crisis. *Revista Nueva Sociedad*, 273, 1-19.
- Gramsci, A. (2013). *Cuadernos de la cárcel*. Ediciones Era.
- Greco, A. (2016). Fútbol contra el golpe. *Página 12*.
- Hogan, J., & Ones, D. S. (1997). Conscientiousness and integrity at work. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology*, (pp. 849-870). Academic Press.
- Izurreta Furir, O. (2015). Percepciones sobre las fuerzas armadas en el continente americano. *Revista Política y Estrategia*, 126, 133 - 171. <https://doi.org/10.26797/rpye.v0i126.65>
- Jaume, L., Etchezahar, E., & Cervone, N. (2012). La justificación del sistema económico y su relación con la orientación a la dominancia social. *Boletín de Psicología*, 106, 81-91.
- Jost, J. T. (2019). A quarter century of system justification theory: Questions, answers, criticisms, and societal applications. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58 (2), 263-314 <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12297>
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political psychology*, 25 (6), 881-919. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x>.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current directions in psychological science*, 14 (5), 260-265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00377.x>.
- Kandler, C., Bell, E., & Riemann, R. (2016). ?e structure and sources of right?wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *European Journal of Personality*, 30 (4), 406-420. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2061>
- Kelemen, L., Szabó, Z. P., Mészáros, N. Z., László, J., & Forgas, J. P. (2014). Social cognition and democracy: ? e relationship between system justification, just world beliefs, authoritarianism, need for closure, and need for cognition in Hungary. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 2, 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jssp.v2i1.208>
- Khan, A. K., Moss, S., Quratulain, S., & Hameed, I. (2018). When and how subordinate performance leads to abusive supervision: A social dominance perspective. *Journal of Management*, 44 (7), 2801-2826. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316653930>.
- Krause, M. (2000). La desobediencia argentina, *Estudios Públicos*, 78, 1-40.
- Klor, S. (2016) "Marginal Immigrants": Jewish-Argentine Immigration to the State of Israel, 1948-1967. *Israel Studies*, 21 (2), 50-76. <https://doi.org/10.2979/israelstudies.21.2.03>. DOI:10.2979/israelstudies.21.2.03
- Krupnik, A. (2011). Cuando camino al Kibbutz vieron pasar al Che. In E. Kahan, L. Schenquer, D. Setton, & A. Dujovne (Eds.), *Marginados y Consagrados. Nuevos Estudios sobre la vida judía en la Argentina*. Ediciones Lumiere.
- Krupnik, A. (2020). Migrants, Refugees, and Asylum Seekers in Latin America. In R. Rein, S. Rinke, & D. M.K. Sheinin (Eds.), *Migrants, Refugees, and Asylum Seekers in Latin America* (pp. 160-188). BRILL.
- Legrain, M. (2004). *La crisis argentina de diciembre de 2001: Debilidad institucional y falta de legitimidad del estado*. [Working Papers; n° 08, 2004.]

- Lesser, J. (2016). Jews and Judaism in Latin America. In *The Cambridge History of Religions in Latin America*, (pp. 709-713). Cambridge University Press.
- Luckmann, T. (1968). *La construcción social de la realidad*. Amorrotu.
- Lhullier, L. (1995). Autoritarismo, autoridad y conciencia moral. Un análisis psico-social. *Psicología política*, (11), 69-84.
- Marx, C. & Engels, F. [1846] (1991): *La ideología alemana*. Ediciones de la Universidad de Valencia.
- Maoz, I., & Eidelson, R. (2007). Psychological Bases of Extreme Policy Preferences: How the Personal Beliefs of Israeli-Jews Predict Their Support for Population Transfer in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50 (11), 1476-1497.
- Mayor, S. (2017). Las voces de la misa ricotera en Olavarría. *Notas, Periodismo Popular*.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2012). *Personality in adulthood*. The Guilford Press.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An experimental view*. Harper and Row.
- Miranda, F. S. B., Caballero, R. B., Gomez, M. N. G., & Zamorano, M. A. M. (1981). Obediencia a la autoridad. *Psiquis*, 2, 212-221.
- Montalvo, D. (2009). ¿Confía usted en las fuerzas armadas? *Perspectivas desde el Barómetro de las Américas* (27), 1-5.
- Morales, T. G. R., & Bautista, F. J. (2017). Hacia las sociedades del miedo: los casos de EE. UU. e Israel. *Revista de Cultura de paz*, 1, 161-187.
- Mussen, P. H. (2000). La personalidad y el desarrollo social: socialización en la familia. En *Desarrollo de la personalidad en el niño*, (pp. 321-352). Trillas.
- Nievas, F. (2015). Terrorismo: en búsqueda del concepto. *Revista Cuadernos de Marte* (9), 173 ? 202.
- Noriega, J. A. V., Freire, H. B. G., Ortíz, P. L., & Figueroa, D. G. (2010). Satisfacción con la vida y afectos positivos en jóvenes universitarios. *Revista Psicología e Saúde* 2(1).
- OIM (2018). ¿Informe sobre las migraciones en el mundo?.
- OIM (2012). ¿Perfil Migratorio de Argentina?.
- Otero, H. (2007). El crecimiento de la población y la transición demográfica. In S. Torrado, *Población y Bienestar en la Argentina del primero al segundo Centenario. Una historia social del siglo XX*, (pp. 339-366).
- Pozo Cujano, L. M. (2017). *La conducta positiva y la obediencia de los niños de 4 años de la escuela Marcial Augusto Soria* (Bachelor's thesis, Universidad Técnica de Ambato. Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación. Carrera de Educación Parvularia).
- Rodriguez-Bailon, R., Bratanova, B., Willis, G. B., Lopez-Rodriguez, L., Sturrock, A., & Loughnan, S. (2017). Social class and ideologies of inequality: How they uphold unequal societies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 73 (1), 99-116.
- Santos, M. (2003). Obediencia a la autoridad. Algunas aportaciones desde la psicología. *Cuadernos África, América Latina, "Militarismo global, antimilitarismo y desobediencia global"*, (39), SODEPAU-SODEPAZ.
- Schimmack, U. (2008). The structure of subjective well-being. *The science of subjective well-being*, 54, 97-123.
- Schmitt, C. (2009). *Teología Política*. Editorial Trotta.
- Schutz, A. (1962). *El problema de la realidad social*. Amorrotu.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999): *Social Dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge University Press.
- Siebzehner, B. (2010). Un imaginario inmigratorio: ideología y pragmatismo entre los latinoamericanos en Israel. In H. Avni, J. Bokser Liwerant, S. Della Pergola, M. Bejarano, & L. Senkman (Eds.), *Pertenencia y alteridad. Judíos en América Latina: cuarenta años de cambio*, (pp. 389-416). Iberoamericana Vervuert.
- Siebzehner, B. (2016). Destellos de nostalgia: inmigrantes ideológicos de América Latina en el Israel de hoy. *Cuadernos Judaicos*, 33, 301-322.
- Simkin, H. & Becerra, G. (2013). El proceso de socialización. Apuntes para su exploración en el campo psicosocial. *Ciencia, Docencia y Tecnología*, XXIV(47), 119-142.

- Simkin, H., Borchardt Duter, L. & Azzollini, S. (2020). Evidencias de validez del Compendio Internacional de Ítems de Personalidad Abreviado. *Liberabit*, 26 (1), 1-24.
- Simkin, H., Olivera, M., & Azzollini, S. (2016). Validación argentina de la Escala de Balance Afectivo. *Revista de psicología*, 25(2), 1-17.
- Suls, J., Martin, R., & David, J. P. (1998). Person-Environment Fit and its Limits: Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Emotional Reactivity to Interpersonal Conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24 (1), 88-98.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2012). Factors affecting immigrants' acculturation intentions: A theoretical model and its assessment among adolescent immigrants from Russia and Ukraine in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(1), 83-99.
- Tartakovsky, E., Patrakov, E., & Nikulina, M. (2017). The emigration intentions of Russian Jews: the role of socio-demographic variables, social networks, and satisfaction with life. *East European Jewish Affairs*, 47 (2-3), 242-254.
- Tartakovsky, E., & Schwartz, S. H. (2001). Motivation for emigration, values, wellbeing, and identification among young Russian Jews. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36 (2), 88-99.
- Tilly, C. (1993). *Las revoluciones europeas (1492-1992)*. FCE.
- Trotsky, L. (2013). *¿Qué es el nacionalsocialismo? La lucha contra el fascismo en Alemania*. CEIP-IPS.
- Wagon, M. (2019). El uso de analogías en el análisis arendtiano del concepto de autoridad. Reflexiones sobre el experimento de Stanley Milgram. En *VI Jornadas de Investigación en Humanidades: homenaje a Cecilia Borel*. Editorial de la Universidad Nacional del Sur. Ediusn.
- Waller, J. (2002). *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (2012). *La ética protestante y el espíritu del capitalismo*. FCE.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126-134.
- Yiftachel, O. (2006). *Ethnocracy: Land and identity politics in Israel/Palestine*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Southard, A. C., Archer, L. M., & Donohoe, P. L. (2013). Neuroticism and negative affect influence the reluctance to engage in destructive obedience in the Milgram paradigm. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 153, 161-174.