

Investigating the Relationship Between Kernberg's Personality Organization and Obedience to Authority

Esmail. Namdari¹, Karim. Afsharineya^{2*}, Keyvan. Kakabraee³, Mokhtar. Arefi³


¹ PhD student, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran



³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: k.afsharineya@iauksh.ac.ir

Editor

Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti¹
Educational Administration, Faculty
of Psychology and Educational
Sciences, Semnan University,
Semnan, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja¹
Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador.
Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec
Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi¹
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,
Ecuador
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction could benefit from more contextualization of Kernberg's Personality Organization model. The current text primarily focuses on historical and experimental aspects but does not sufficiently introduce Kernberg's model in relation to the study's objectives.

The use of MAXQDA for thematic analysis is noted, but the process of coding and the development of themes could be described in more detail. For instance, how were themes derived, and what criteria were used to ensure they accurately represent the data?

The explanation of why Spearman's correlation was chosen over other statistical methods should be expanded. This would help clarify why this method is particularly suitable for the type of data and research questions being addressed.

The table presents valuable information, but the description of "Internal Conflict" seems broad. Could this category be further subdivided into more specific types of internal conflicts, if applicable? This would add depth to the analysis.

The standard deviations for personality organization components are quite high relative to the means, suggesting considerable variability among participants. This variability warrants further discussion, particularly in the context of the study's findings and implications.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence "This mechanism is evolutionarily advantageous for group acceptance, a necessity for socially living beings (Milgram & Gudehus, 1974)" requires additional elaboration. It would be helpful to connect this evolutionary perspective more explicitly to the study's focus on personality organization.

The choice of a convenience sample of 30 students needs further justification. Why was this sample size deemed adequate, and how does it compare to other studies in similar research areas? Addressing potential limitations due to sample size and selection bias is also recommended.

The sentence "This indicates that participants who disobeyed authority had lower scores in personality vulnerability" needs more clarity. It's crucial to define "personality vulnerability" more precisely and discuss its implications in the context of obedience and disobedience.

The connection between the quantitative and qualitative findings is briefly mentioned. A more detailed synthesis that explains how these findings complement or contradict each other would strengthen the discussion.

The statement "This suggests that an interactive model between personality components and environmental stimuli determines individual responses to authority's orders" is significant. However, it would be beneficial to provide more examples or theoretical support for this interactive model, perhaps referencing recent studies.

The discussion on "Low-level defenses" and their connection to obedience could be enhanced by referencing additional literature on defense mechanisms and their role in social psychology. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the concept.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's findings but could benefit from a more explicit discussion of the study's implications for future research, particularly in expanding the understanding of personality traits in various social contexts.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.