

Maja Vukadinović*
Biljana Ratković Njegovan**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TYPES OF AUTHORITY AND AUTHORITARIANISM

***Abstract:** In this paper relationship between different types of authority and authoritarianism is investigated. Six hundred and sixty five participants, students of the Higher School of Professional Business Studies in Novi Sad, had a task to assess on 15 ten-degree scales: Charismatic, Traditional and Bureaucratic type of authority. Upitnik AutoritarNoSt (Mihčić, Čolović, Bodroža, Biro, Smederevac, 2009) was employed for the purposes of estimation of the participants' authoritarianism. The results have revealed that Charismatic type of authority is assessed as more favourable than Bureaucratic and Traditional type of authority. Average expressed authoritarianism may be seen with the participants of both sexes. There is significant relationship between estimations of the types of authority and participants' dimensions of the authoritarianism. The implications of obtained results are discussed with respect to the up-to-date concept of authority.*

***Key words:** authority, authoritarianism, young people*

ODNOS VRSTE VLASTI I AUTORITETA

***Sažetak:** U radu se istražuje odnos između različitih tipova autoriteta i autoritarnosti. U istraživanju je učestvovalo 665 ispitanika, studenata Visoke poslovne škole strukovnih studija u Novom Sadu. Zadatak ispitanika se sastojao u tome da na 15 desetostepenih skala procene harizmatički, tradicionalni i birokratski tip autoriteta. Za ispitivanje autoritarnosti primenjen je Upitnik AutoritarNoSt (Mihčić, Čolović, Bodroža, Biro, Smederevac, 2009). Rezultati su pokazali da se harizmatički tip autoriteta procenjuje višim vrednostima, u poređenju sa birokratskim i tradicionalnim tipom. Autoritarnost je prosečno izražena kod ispitanika oba pola, a postoji i značajna povezanost procena različitih tipova autoriteta sa dimenzijama autoritarnosti. Diskutovane su implikacije dobijenih rezultata u kontekstu savremenog koncepta autoriteta.*

***Ključne reči:** autoritet, autoritarnost, mladi*

* Dr Maja Vukadinović, profesor strukovnih studija, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija, Novi Sad, Srbija, e-mail: llubicica@gmail.com.

** Doc. dr Biljana Ratković Njegovan, profesor strukovnih studija, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija, Novi Sad, Srbija, e-mail: biljananj@neobee.net.

This research will attempt to provide an answer whether different types of authority are related to dimensions of the authoritarian person. In this paper by the principle of authority will be assumed its voluntary acceptance without the external coercion (Ratković Njegovan, Bajac, 2007) and normative threat (Đorđević, 1973).

According to different authors many different types of authority could be distinguished. Sorm (2010) following the authors (Woods, Walton, 1974; Schellens 1985; Schellens, Verhoeven, 1994; Wilson, 1983) states that the concept of the authority is ambiguous and points out to de facto and de iure authorities, executive authority and non-executive authority, expertise-based and power-based authority, cognitive (epistemic, de facto) and administrative (deontic, de iure) form of authority. In that sense De George (1985) supports the pluralistic concept of the authority, that is to say more forms, functions and the justifications of the authority, so apart from the epistemic, expertise-based authority, he mentions parental, political, moral and religious authority. Goodwin (1998) differentiates three types of authority based on command, expertise and dignity. Bocheński (1974) recognizes only two fundamental types of the authority: epistemic authority, which is expertise-based, and deontic authority, which is the authority of obligations and control. These two forms of the authority are closely related to each other, with the fact that deontic authority must be based on knowledge and competence.

According to the principle of legitimacy Weber (1976) distinguishes three forms of the authority: traditional, charismatic and rational-legal. Traditional form of authority strengthens authoritative powers. It is based on the relations of strong personal respect, on acceptance of the tradition which has always existed in the same form, on the acceptance of norms, not legal based, but based on the holy tradition. Charismatic form of authority (Weber, 1976) only values the legitimacy which has derived from the personal power. Its mission must be certified and must bring the welfare to its followers. The power of charisma is based on the emotional belief in importance and value of its own action. Charisma proposes internal subjection to something that has not yet happened, which is absolutely unique. Charisma is revolutionary, based on the personal belief and authority contrary to the institutional model. There is an affectionate inspiration by the personality of leader. The rational-legal form (Weber, 1976) is featured by abstract legality, patrimonial qualities and persistence in the sense of every day deeds. It is based on everyday needs which are constantly repeating. Legal structure is actually the rational copy of patriarchal structure and it represents the eternal creation. It contains rational rules directed to the fulfilment of eternal rational needs by normal instruments while subjected to the rational norms.

In addition to the mentioned theoretical research on different types of authority (Weber, 1976), a recent study (Ratković Njegovan, Vukadinović, Grubić Nešić, 2011) suggest that similar types of authority may be empirically specified as well. In their factor

analysis study Ratković Njegovan, Vukadinović, Grubić Nešić (2011) suggest that the authority may be differentiated in Charismatic type (described with characteristics such as reliability, progressiveness, determination, dignity and charisma), Traditional type (described with characteristics such as: familiarity, esteem, categoricalness, tradition and habitualness) and Bureaucratic type of authority (described with characteristics such as: credibility, exclusiveness, uniqueness, omnipresence and validity). According to this research (Ratković Njegovan, Vukadinović, Grubić Nešić, 2011) it seems that Weber's (1976) typology of authorities is still recognizable, not only in the field of management as was previously mentioned (Houghton, 2010), but also when an individual accepts authority as a projected value (Životić, 1969).

This research aims to expand the field of studying authority by investigating the correlation between the types of authority and dimensions of the authoritarian person.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether the different types of authority, defined in previous study (Ratković Njegovan, Vukadinović, Grubić Nešić, 2011) are related with one of the dimensions of an authoritarian person.

On the basis of these goals the following research hypotheses have been defined:

- there are differences in estimations of different types of authority;
- there is a strong trait of authoritarianism among the participants;
- there is a link of different types of authority with the dimensions of the authoritarian person.

METHODOLOGY

THE PARTICIPANTS

There were 655 participants in this research and they are students of Higher School of Professional Business Studies in Novi Sad, Serbia. There were 326 female students (49.8%) and 329 male students (50.2%). The average age of the participants is approximately 22. The participants were the students of the first year (55%), then of the second year (23.2%), whereas the students of the third year accounted for 21.7%.

INSTRUMENTS

There were two questionnaires used in this research. Types of Authority were measured by the instrument for measuring the types of authority, constructed in the previous study (Ratković Njegovan, Vukadinović, Grubić Nešić, 2011). The instrument consists of 15 ten-degree scales. Each of 3 types of authority was measured with 5 rating scale: Charismatic authority (*reliability, progressiveness, determination, dignity and charisma*), Traditional type of authority (*familiarity, esteem, categoricalness, tradition and habitualness*), and Bureaucratic type of authority (*uniqueness, credibility, exclusiveness, omnipresence and definiteness*).

The other questionnaire, *Upitnik AutoritarNoSt* (Mihčić, Čolović, Bodroža, Biro, Smederevac, 2009) was employed for the purposes of estimation of the participants' authoritarianism.

PROCEDURE

The research was carried out while the participants attended a regular session at school. Having been clarified about the procedure, the participants filled out the questionnaire in the same order. First they completed the questionnaire about the Types of Authority, and then they proceeded to *Upitnik AutoritarNoSt*. The time allotted for completing the questionnaire was 25 minutes.

RESULTS

ESTIMATIONS OF TYPES OF AUTHORITY

The results of T – Test [*Paired Samples T – Test*] revealed that participants assess Charismatic type of authority ($M = 8.24, SD = 1.76$) with statistically significant higher values than Traditional type of authority ($M = 6.95, SD = 1.89$) and Bureaucratic type of authority ($M = 7.09, SD = 1.78$) as well. Traditional type of authority is assessed with lower statistically significant values on than the other two types of authority.

Table 1. Results of t – test (Paired Samples Test), $N = 655, df = 654$

Types of Authority (pairs)	95% C I		t	p
	LL	UL		
Charismatic and Traditional	1.15	1.43	18.309	.000
Charismatic and Bureaucratic	1.03	1.27	18.959	.000
Traditional and Bureaucratic	-0.27	-3.30E-03	-2.011	.045

* CI= Confidence interval; LL= lower limit; UL= upper limit

As far as sex is concerned, the results of T-Test [*Independent Sample Test*] showed that the participants differ only in case of charismatic authority ($t(653) = -2.132, p < .033$). The female students ($M = 8.39, SD = 1.69$) assess charismatic authority higher than the male students do ($M = 8.09, SD = 1.82$).

The results of one-way analysis of variance [*ANOVA*] showed that among participants regarding the year of studies there are statistically significant differences in the estimation according to the types of authority.

When speaking about Charismatic authority ($F(2,654) = 4.342, p < .013$), the application of Tukey's post hoc test showed that the third-year students assess charismatic authority ($M = 8.53, SD = 1.73$) higher than the second-year students do ($M = 7.93, SD = 1.68$).

Concerning the estimations of Bureaucratic type of authority ($F(2,654) = 5.400, p < .005$), the application of Tukey's post hoc test revealed that the third-year students assess Bureaucratic type of authority ($M = 7.52, SD = 1.83$) higher than the first year ($M = 6.95, SD = 1.77$) and second-year students do ($M = 7.03, SD = 1.70$).

As far as the Traditional type of authority ($F(2,654) = 3.867, p < .021$) is concerned, the application of Tukey's post hoc test revealed that the third-year students assess Traditional type of authority ($M = 7.32, SD = 1.92$) higher than the first year ($M = 6.88, SD = 1.87$) and second-year students do ($M = 6.76, SD = 1.86$).

AUTHORITARIANISM

The raw scores for participants were calculated on the *AutoritarNoSt* Questionnaire. The raw scores for female students are 129.81 whereas for male students raw scores are 142.28. When all the scores are compared to norms (Mihic et al., 2009), the results show that average expressed authoritarianism may be seen with the participants of both sexes, which is according to these authors characterized by "medium flexibility in expressing opinion, respecting the rules but not blindly, medium empathy and understanding the differences, accepting the requests from the authority which are understood as justifiable specially from formal authority, unwillingness to abrupt changes and inclination to stability in life" (Mihic et al., 2009: 159).

Likewise, our results showed that when the participants are compared to their social characteristics (the year of study), authoritarianism is average expressed [Appendix A]. Hence the examined social characteristics of the participants are not significant markers of the degree of their authority.

Correlation analysis was here employed for the purpose of examining a correlation between these three types of authority and the subscales of the questionnaire on authoritarianism including a subscale of authoritarian submissiveness, a subscale of authoritarian aggression and a subscale of rigidity (Mihic et al., 2009).

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TYPES OF AUTHORITY AND SUBSCALES OF THE AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE

The results of correlation analysis of the three types of authority and subscales of AutoritarNoSt Questionnaire (Table 2) showed that Pearson Correlation Coefficient is statistically significant for all examined correlations except for the correlation between Charismatic authority and the subscale of authoritarian submissiveness. It is assumed that such significant but low correlations are obtained due to the different level of general nature of the applied questionnaires. The *AutoritaNoSt* Questionnaire refers to examining stable characteristics of an individual, whereas the other questionnaire examines the estimation of the characteristics referring to imaginary abstract authority.

Table 2. Correlation between three types of authority and subscales of AutoritarNoSt Questionnaire

	Charismatic type of authority	Traditional type of authority	Bureaucratic type of authority
Subscale of authoritarian submissiveness	$r = - .004$	$r = .241^{**}$	$r = .086^*$
Subscale of authoritarian aggression	$r = - .099^*$	$r = .181^{**}$	$r = .078^*$
Subscale of rigidity	$r = .371^{**}$	$r = .296^{**}$	$r = .246^{**}$

Note: $*p < .05$. $**p < .001$

The subscale of rigidity shows significant but low correlation with charismatic authority. The direction of correlation is positive, which means the higher result in the subscale of rigidity is, the higher assessment of the characteristics describing charismatic authority are. The other correlations are too low so they were not taken into consideration.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Regarding the way that participants estimate various types of authority the results of the research suggested that there are significant differences among their estimations. Charismatic type of authority is assessed as more favourable than Bureaucratic and Traditional type of authority. Also, charismatic authority is assessed as acceptable more by female than by male students. Third-year students are more in favour of types of authorities than first-year and second-year students, and his results may suggest that students who are to complete their studies are more willing to accept authority regardless of the type.

There are the findings that average expressed authoritarianism may be seen with our participants, which was expected since they are undergraduate students. This anticipation is supported by the fact that it has previously been proved that there are

strong links of authoritarianism with education and intelligence (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, Sanford, 1950), and especially by the results of an earlier study in Serbia (Biro, Molnar, Popadić, 1997) which showed that low-educated participants express extremely authoritarian attitudes and values, whereas more educated people show democratic inclination. In other words, higher level of education is followed by less authoritarianism and being better informed. As has been seen, authoritarianism is more a personal characteristic connected to prejudices, conservatism and national identity (Mihić et al., 2009). Even though the extent to which authoritarianism is expressed can be influenced by political context (Petrović, 2003), it is possible to see its link with other numerous phenomena (see more in Petrović, 2003).

What is an interesting result of this research is a significant but low and positive correlation of subscale of rigidity in *AutoritarNoSt* with Charismatic type of authority, which means that if the dimension of rigidity within authoritarian tendency is more expressed, the characteristics describing charismatic authority are assessed higher. The obtained result is not surprising because rigidity (Mihić et al., 2009) is determined, on the one hand, by the items which state about the person who will endure all the pressure without complaint and, on the other hand, by the items which state inflexibility in expressing opinion. In this paper Charismatic type of authority is described with the characteristics such as reliability, progressiveness, determination, dignity and probably all these characteristics describe the component of people's strength necessary for "enduring all the pressure without complaint" (Mihić et al., 2009: 155) so it can be the basis for the form of charisma (Weber, 1976) based on their personal and always proved power. It is worth mentioning that the obtained result is more acceptable in the previous context (Životić, 1969) where an individual accepts authority as the projected value.

To sum up, from the obtained results, it can be concluded that authority as a value, regarding young people, has a tendency to the Charismatic type of authority. Revealed correlation between Charismatic type of authority and dimensions of authoritarianism suggests possible basis for the form of contemporary charisma based on personal and always proved power.

Since there are limitations concerning the sample and instruments of the research, it would be necessary to continue the research in order to clarify and understand all aspects of the problem of authority. However, this research may be considered as an insight into attitudes and value framework of young people whose way of thinking would possibly serve in future as a model for the development of professional, cultural and social identity of the community.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., Sanford, R. N., (1950) *Authoritarian Personality*, New York, Harper and Row.
- [2] Bocheński, J. M., (1974) *An analysis of authority*, in: Adelman, F. J., (ed.), "Authority" (pp. 56–85), The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.
- [3] Biro, M., Molnar, A., Popadić, D., (1997) *Stavovi građana Srbije prema pravnoj državi* [*The attitudes of citizens of Serbia towards legal state*], „Sociologija“, No. 39(2), pp. 207–221.
- [4] De George, R. T., (1985) *The Nature and Limits of Authority*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas.
- [5] Đorđević, J., (1973) *Autoritet i vlast*, in: „Politički sistem“, pp. 102–105, Beograd, Privredni pregled.
- [6] Goodwin, J., (1998) *Forms of authority and the real ad verecundiam*, "Argumentation", No. 12, pp. 267–280.
- [7] Houghton, J. D. H., (2010) *Does Max Weber's notion of authority still hold in the twenty-first century?*, "Journal of Management History", No. 16(4), pp. 449–453.
- [8] Mihić, V., Čolović, P., Bodroža, B., Biro, M., Smederevac, S., (2009) *Procena Autoritarnosti (Upitnik AutoritarNoSt)* [*The Estimation of Authority (Upitnik AutoritarNoSt)*], u: Biro, M., Smederevac S., Novović Z. (eds.) „Procena psiholoških i psihopatoloških fenomena“, pp. 153–164, Centar za primenjenu psihologiju, Beograd.
- [9] Petrović, N., (2003) *Pregled pristupa za izučavanje autoritarnosti i srodnih fenomena* [*Survey of the approaches to authoritarianism and similar phenomena*], „Sociološki pregled“, No. 37(1–2), pp. 101–105.
- [10] Ratković Njegovan, B., Bajac, M., (2007) *Sociološke teme*, Novi Sad, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija.
- [11] Ratković Njegovan, B., Vukadinović, M., Grubić Nešić, L., (2011) *Characteristics and types of authority: the Attitudes of Young people*, A Case Study, "Sociológia", No. 43(6), pp. 657–673.
- [12] Schellens, P. J., (1985) *Redelijke argumenten: Een onderzoek naar normen voor kritische lezers* [*Reasonable arguments: A study on criteria for critical reading*], Dordrecht, Foris.

- [13] Schellens P.J., Verhoeven, G., (1994) *Argument en tegenargument. Analyse en beoordeling van betogende teksten* [*Argument and counterargument. The analysis and evaluation of argumentative texts*], Groningen, Martinus Nijhoff.
- [14] Sorm, E., (2010) *The good, the bad and the persuasive: Normative quality and actual persuasiveness of arguments from authority, arguments from cause to effect and arguments from example*, Janskerkhof: LOT.
- [15] Weber, M., (1976) *Privreda i društvo I, II*, Beograd, Prosveta.
- [16] Wilson, P., (1983) *Second-hand knowledge: An inquiry into cognitive authority*, Westport Conn., Greenwood Press.
- [17] Woods, J., Walton, D., (1974) *Argumentum ad Verecundiam*, "Philosophy and Rhetoric", No. 7, pp. 135–153.
- [18] Životić, M., (1969) *Čovek i vrednosti*, Beograd, Prosveta.

APPENDIX A

THE RAW SCORES CALCULATED ACCORDING TO SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS – SEPARATELY FOR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS

According to the norms (Mihčić et al., 2009, p. 159), average expressed authoritarianism includes the scores from 98 to 150 for male students and from 90 to 142 for female students.

Characteristics of participants	Male students Raw scores	Female students Raw scores
The year		
First	144.89	131.25
Second	140.29	131.91
Third	136.03	122.63

Primljeno: 24.11.2011.

Odobreno: 05.12.2011.