

# ***RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND NATIONALIST ATTITUDES***

by Bojan Todosijevic

Paper presented at symposium: Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, June, 1998

It is the distant man who pays for your love of your neighbour;  
and when there are five of you together, a sixth always has to die.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*

Brian: *You don't have to obey the orders!*

Soldier: *I like orders!*

Monty Python's *The Life of Brian*

The rise of nationalism in the post-Communist era, particularly the violent breakup of the former Yugoslavia, has put the problems of the ethnocentrism and nationalism at the top of research agenda. However, although it is frequently assumed that ethnic and national conflicts in Yugoslavia have something to do with psychology, in sense of the existence of a specific 'Balkan mentality', it seems that serious research on the topic is still lacking.<sup>1</sup>

*The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Sanford and Levinson, 1950; in further text TAP) represents one of the most known studies and explanations of the psychological, or more specifically personality, foundations of prejudice and ethnocentrism. Decades following its publication proved that Adorno et al. developed one of the most popular<sup>2</sup> concepts in social psychology, though many of the problems they inaugurated are still intriguing research questions, including the focus of the study: personality foundation of prejudice. The present study aims at exploring the relevance of the concept of authoritarianism for the explanation of individual differences in ethno-nationalist attitudes in Yugoslavia.

The endeavor is relevant, on the one side, for the theory of authoritarianism as *the* psychological basis of ethnocentric attitudes (i.e., inter-cultural validity of the authoritarianism theory), and on the other side for the exploration of psychological foundation of nationalism in Yugoslavia. While the cross-cultural comparisons support the Adorno et al's hypotheses (e.g., Meloen, 1993), the case of Yugoslavia seems particularly interesting. Namely, at the time of the data collection for the present study (1992) ethnic conflicts in Yugoslavia were at their peak. This particular social framework could be taken as a 'natural experiment' allowing to test whether authoritarianism is still important predictor of ethnic attitudes even under conditions of ethnic and national conflicts and intensive nationalist mobilization throughout the region. Authors of TAP themselves suggested for further research "to ascertain how far the inter-relationships found are interculturally valid or whether they are restricted to certain specific cultures or subcultures" (TAP, p. 473-474). Present research follows their proposal. It involves different culture and special conditions: ethnic conflicts and multi-national sample.

Additional theoretical and methodological relevance of the present study is represented by its multivariate methodological approach. Namely, the problem of the "meaning of authoritarianism"

---

<sup>1</sup> Quasi-psychological analyses are, of course, abundant (e.g., Puhar, 1993a,b). However, they tend to contribute toward the maintenance of prejudice about the Balkans, rather than to the analysis of prejudice in the Balkans.

<sup>2</sup> According to Meloen (1993), between 1950 and 1989 appeared more than 2000 publications dealing with authoritarianism.

(Stone, Lederer, Christie, 1993b, p. 230) points towards the factor-analytic approach to measuring authoritarianism. Here, this has been done on the both sides of the examined relationship: authoritarianism and nationalism scales are factor-analyzed, and the extracted factors are then correlated in order to examine which aspects of authoritarianism are related to which dimensions of ethno-nationalist attitudes. Furthermore, particular attention has been directed towards the role of socio-economic status (cf., Lipset, 1959, Dekker and Ester, 1993), and to the Forbes' (1985) hypothesis about the different psychological basis of nationalist attitudes in ethnic minorities and majority.

The following sections contain: (1) brief presentation of the authoritarianism theory, with special reference to the (a) dimensionality of authoritarianism and (b) to the studies on the relationships between authoritarianism and various measures of ethnocentrism, prejudice and nationalism; (2) review of the studies on the structure of ethnic/nationalist attitudes; and (3) results of the present research.

## Authoritarianism

Authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950) started from the general hypothesis that "an individual is most receptive to those ideologies which afford the fullest expression to his over-all personality structure" (Frenkel-Brunswick *et al.*, 1947, p.536), which basically represents Freud's *credo* that nothing is accidental in psychological life.<sup>3</sup> Through the application of various methodological tools, like questionnaires, in-depth interviews, projective techniques, they found that there exists a stable ideological orientation, consisting of antisemitism, ethnocentrism and conservatism, which strongly correlates with certain pattern of personality structure and dynamics, named *authoritarianism*.

Authoritarianism was operationalized by the famous F scale, which included various indicators that "were thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic propaganda" (TAP, p. 228). The following nine 'variables' were listed: 1) *Conventionalism*, defined as rigid following of conventional, middle-class values; 2) *Authoritarian submission*, manifested in submissive, uncritical attitudes towards idealized authorities of the ingroup; 3) *Authoritarian aggression* - expressed in condemnation and rejection of those who violate conventional values, and in request for their severe punishment; 4) *Anti-intraception* - opposing to everything subjective, imaginative, not dealing with own inner psychic life and experience; 5) *Rigid thinking, Superstition and stereotypy* - tendency to think in rigid categories and belief in mystical causes of the individual's fate; 6) *Power and "toughness"* - identification with those who own power, exaggeration of the importance of strength, toughness, discipline; 7) *Destructiveness and cynism* - rejection of humane and empathy, generalized hostility; 8) - *Projectivity* - projection of inner unconscious impulses onto the outer world, belief that world is dominated by secret and dangerous forces; and 9) *Sex* - overemphasized interest in sexual deviations, false morality (Adorno *et al.*, 1950). It was emphasized that binding element of these traits is not their content or logical connection, but rather their underlying psychological dynamics, which "expressed itself on the surface in ethnocentrism as well as in diverse *psychologically* related opinions and attitudes (TAP, p. 228, italics added).

Following the psychoanalytical path, they treated extreme prejudice as symptoms, and attempted to describe their "specific function within the individual's psychological economy - (...) as a rule, a vicarious wish-fulfillments of, or as defenses against, repressed urges" (TAP, p. 617). Internal instability, insecurity and repressed aggressiveness of authoritarian individuals is channeled against various social groups:

---

<sup>3</sup> Or, as it is quoted in TAP: "*dass alle unsere erlebnisse einen Sinn haben*"(p. 748)

"...once the individual has convinced himself that there are people who ought to be punished, he is provided with a channel through which his deepest aggressive impulses may be expressed, even while he thinks of himself as thoroughly moral. If his external authorities, or the crowd lend their approval to this form of aggression, then it may take the most violent forms, and it may persist after the conventional values, in the name of which it was undertaken, have been lost from sight" (TAP, p. 233).

This personality type was understood as potential supporter of various 'antidemocratic' movements and ideologies, where antisemitism and ethnocentrism are only a part of a broader social orientation. Its origin was placed in family relationships, especially child upbringing patterns.<sup>4</sup> Fathers of the authoritarians are described as domineering, mothers as punitive, both requiring strict discipline and obedience through punishments, threatening and manipulation with the expression of warmth and love. The consequence is insecure, fearful and dependent child, with ambivalent attitude towards parents. On the one side is its dependence, and on the other is accumulated aggression towards parents. Intrapsychical conflict is resolved through the *repression* of aggressive impulses and uncritical idealization of parents, which is then *displaced* onto other authority figures, while repressed urges are *projected* onto outgroups (see particularly Frenkel-Brunswik's chapter on the family patterns among 'high' authoritarians, TAP, 1950; for the reinterpretation of the findings see Hopf, 1993).

Personality features developed in early childhood later find expression in specific individual's relation to the social world: submissiveness towards up and aggressiveness toward down. Or, in the authors' words:

"Thus a basically hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitively dependent parent-child relationship is apt to carry over into a power-orientated, exploitively dependent attitude toward one's sex partner and one's God and may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but desperate clinging to what appears to be strong and a disdainful rejection of whatever is relegated to the bottom. The inherent dramatization likewise extends from the parent-child dichotomy to the dichotomous conception of sex role and of moral values, as well as to a dichotomous handling of social relations as manifested especially in the formation of stereotypes and of ingroup-outgroup cleavages. Conventionality, rigidity, repressive denial, and the ensuing breakthrough of one's weakness, fear and dependency are but other aspects of the same fundamental personality pattern, and they can be observed in personal life as well as in attitudes toward religion and social issues" (TAP, p.971).

Ethnic minorities and various other underprivileged or negatively stereotyped groups are particularly suitable targets for expressing repressed hostility, while preserving positive self-image.

Various aspects of the Adorno *et al's* study have been criticized. While *The Authoritarian Personality* is theoretically deeply rooted in Freud's psychoanalysis, most of the later scholars abandoned hypothesized psychodynamic foundation of authoritarianism, without merited examination (see Stone et al., 1993a). Since early days of the field, other authors have been proposing different concepts and their operationalizations instead of authoritarianism. Famous and well known are Rokeach's more cognitively based concept of Dogmatism and his D Scale (Rokeach, 1956), Eysenck's *tender-tough mindedness*<sup>5</sup> (e.g., Eysenck, 1954, 1975), and Christie's *Machiavelianism* (e.g., Christie and Geis, 1970). Altemeyer retained the concept of authoritarianism though in qualified form, but adopted social learning approach (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988). Smither (1993) proposed evolutionary explanation of the phenomenon of authoritarianism. Similarly related to sociobiology is concept offered by Sidanius and his coworkers termed Social Dominance Orientation (e.g., Sidanius *et al.*, 1994).

---

<sup>4</sup> However, causation of authoritarianism and prejudice was in final instance attributed to the culture and society, though it has not prevented accusations of the psychologism.

<sup>5</sup> Eysenck claims that tough-mindedness, i.e., authoritarianism, is an attitudinal reflection of the basic personality trait of *psychoticism*. Many studies found that psychoticism is related to authoritarianism and its correlates, including ethnocentrism (e.g., Eysenck, 1954; Eysenck and Wilson, 1978; Powel and Stewart, 1978).

Few theoretical and many methodological objections have been made to the F Scale. For example, it has been objected that it measures only the Right-wing authoritarianism (Shils, 1954; Eysenck, 1954; see Stone and Smith, 1993, for recent analysis of the issue). Different but related critique of the construct validity of the F Scale was made by Rot (1989) and Rot and Havelka (1973) after its application in Yugoslavia. They concluded that it measured acceptance of beliefs characteristic for patriarchal environment, not the degree and existence of some stable *personality* traits<sup>6</sup>. Likewise, Ray has argued that the F scale is only an imperfect measure of conservatism, i.e., that it measures “primarily and old fashioned orientation” not any personality trait (e.g., Ray, 1990, 1985). If nothing else, the demand for understanding of authoritarianism resulted in increased supply of its alternative psychometric operationalizations offered at the scientific market.<sup>7</sup>

Among methodological objections, most frequent have dealt with the (lack of) representativeness of the samples, acquiescence response set, methodologically improper interpretation of interviews, and failing to control relevant external variables, like intelligence, education, socio-economic status (e.g. Christie and Jahoda, 1954, Snyder and Ickes, 1985, Rot, 1989, Vivian and Brown, 1994).

Without entering the numerous disputes around *The Authoritarian Personality*, two issues are presently important. The first is related to the conceptual status or dimensionality of authoritarianism, and the second to the relationship between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism.

### ***Dimensions of authoritarianism***

Although authoritarianism has been originally conceived as consisting of 9 interrelated components, in most studies it has been operationalized via single score, as if it were unidimensional construct. It is problematic from two aspects. *Unidimensionality* does not fully capture relative heterogeneity of authoritarianism, while *unidimensionality* does not fit typological and structural approach in TAP. In fact, methodologically more suitable factor analytical studies show that various sub-dimensions of authoritarianism could be successfully operationalized and measured.

A number of studies examined the factorial nature of authoritarianism (measured by the F or some other related scale) (e.g., O'Neil and Levinson, 1954, Kerlinger and Rokeach, 1966, Altemeyer, 1981, Raden, 1981, Kline and Cooper, 1984, Đuric, 1987, Goertzel, 1987, Billings et al, 1993, Majstorovic *et al.*, 1994, Todosijevic, 1995). Depending on the included variables and methods of factor analysis results have been different. When shorter scales are analysed and more restrictive criterion for the number of factors used, fewer factors were obtained. For example, Raden (1981) obtained two factors: *authoritarian aggressiveness* (compatible with the Berkeley study) and *attitude toward welfare* factor. When more comprehensive scales were applied and more factors retained, obtained factors more resembled components of authoritarianism from TAP. Đuric(1987), for example, factor-analyzed Yugoslavian version of the F scale and interpreted six orthogonal (!) factors: 1) cynism and destructiveness, with elements of conventionality; 2) authoritarian submissiveness, including respect towards authority, obedience of children, etc.; 3) destructiveness and cynism with elements of anti-intracativity and authoritarian aggressiveness; 4) tendency towards authoritarian aggressiveness, rigidity and projection; 5) overemphasized interest in sexual deviance; and 6) stereotyped thinking. Perhaps, if an oblique rotation had been used, the factors could have even more resembled the originally described components of authoritarianism.

---

<sup>6</sup> Stankov (1977) offered the same interpretation of unusually high average scores on the F Scale of Yugoslavians in those years.

<sup>7</sup> Ray (1984) reviewed 37 different scales that were developed as alternative measures of authoritarianism!

Although it is difficult to generalize on the basis of the reviewed studies, it seems that accumulated evidence supports Altemeyer's three-component model of authoritarianism (1981, 1988).<sup>8</sup> In his view, three related but distinctive *attitude clusters* received replicated confirmation as the dimensions of authoritarianism: *conventionalism*, *authoritarian submission* and *authoritarian aggression*. The problem of the content validity implies the use of factor analysis in order to clearly define the subject of measurement. It seems justified, therefore, to expect that different ethnic attitudes are related, for example, to the obsessional type of authoritarians (Kline and Cooper, *Ibid.*) or to followership authoritarianism (Billing et al, *Ibid.*). Here, it is hypothesized that relatively separate dimensions of authoritarianism are factorially definable, and that aggressive aspects of authoritarianism are primarily related to ethnocentric aspects of nationalist attitudes.

### ***Ethnonationalism as a correlate of authoritarianism***

Significant relationships between various ethnic attitudes<sup>9</sup> and authoritarianism have been reported in a number of studies following *The Authoritarian Personality* (e.g., Altemeyer, 1988, Van Ijzendoorn, 1989, Scheepers *et al.*, 1990, 1989, Meloen, 1993; for Yugoslavia see Rot and Havelka, 1973, Wolf, 1989, Todosijevic, 1995). However, it seems that although in most studies they are strongly correlated, it is not always the case, particularly when prejudices are either an outstanding, or relatively irrelevant part of the intergroup relations. The former applies to, for example, South Africa (e.g. Heaven, 1976, 1984) or southern states in the USA (Pettigrew, 1959), where prejudices might be transmitted through socialization regardless of specific family environment and personality traits. The latter case can be illustrated by Forbes' (1985) finding of very small or insignificant correlation between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism in Canada. Probably the reason is that both studied groups, i.e., the English and French-speaking communities, have relatively equal status within society. It is not the same meaning of an 'outgroup' applied for Blacks from the Adorno *et al.*'s study, and 'outgroup' defined as English speaking Canadians.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, inconsistencies like these suggest hypothesis that ethnification of politics in Yugoslavia decreased connection between authoritarianism and nationalism.

In addition, it worth to examine Forbes' (1985) views about possible differences in the relationship ethnocentrism-authoritarianism between majority (dominant) and minority (oppressed) groups. Because conformism is one of the essential parts of the authoritarian syndrome, non-conformism of some minority nationalist movements should be reflected in the absence or in low correlation with authoritarianism. Ethnic heterogeneity of the sample in present study will allow testing of this hypothesis.

Despite of some continuously opposing authors (Ray, 1972, Heaven, 1984), several recent large scale studies show that authoritarianism is indeed related to ethnocentrism and nationalism. Kindervater (1997) confirmed Adorno *et al.*'s findings both regarding the relationship between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism ( $r=.52$ ) and the hypothesis that antisemitism and ethnocentrism form an integrated syndrome ( $r=.65$  between them). Billing and Cramer (1990) reported findings

---

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted, however, that Altemeyer's model has been confirmed only in the sense that those three dimensions really exist as a psychological reality, but not that *only* three factors sufficiently represent authoritarianism, or even less that they exhaust personality sources of prejudice and antidemocratic orientation. Of course, it is another question whether all factorially definable dimensions are relevant for the explanation of prejudice in contemporary culture. For example, superstition could be less relevant than 50 years ago.

<sup>9</sup> The term refers to different ethnic and national attitudes, like nationalism, ethnocentrism and patriotism.

<sup>10</sup> Perhaps, authoritarianism of Canadian college students is differently projected onto social field, not as ethnocentric rejection of French speakers by English speakers, or vice versa. However, it would be interesting to see whether the correlation increased during the referendum for the independence of Quebec.

obtained on the representative sample of British respondents (N=1099), and concluded that "authoritarian attitudes are the strongest predictor of racial attitudes, refuting findings of earlier studies ... that have emphasized the importance of demographic variables" (p. 199). The same results were obtained in the Netherlands (Dekker & Ester, 1991, on the sample of N=2.000; also: Scheepers, Felling and Peters, 1990, 1992). Enyedi *et al.* (1997) concluded that "Hungarian authoritarianism in 1994 had rather a nationalist... face" (p. 26). [iber (1991), Katunarić (1987), Rot and Havelka (1973), Stankov (1977), and Todosijević (1995), report similar findings for Yugoslavian respondents.

### Previous research on the structure of ethnic and national attitudes

In TAP, ethnocentrism is conceptualized as simultaneous identification and glorification of the ingroup *and* rejection and devaluation of the outgroup. There are also occasional references to other related attitudes, like 'genuine patriotism'. This implicitly suggests that ethnic attitudes could be conceived as being multidimensional, although the authors of TAP were primarily interested in one dimension - ethnocentrism. In spite of some later criticisms of the concept (e.g., Heaven, Rajab and Ray, 1985), there is evidence that it can be successfully operationalised and measured (Scheepers *et al.*, 1989).

In certain respects one-dimensional models of national and racial attitudes correspond to TAP conception of ethnocentrism. Kleinpenning and Hagendoorn (1993) present evidence that patriotism, nationalism and ethnocentrism are ordered in the continuum of rejecting outgroups, i.e., that different forms of out-group rejection can be regarded as steps in a "single cumulative dimension of ethnic attitudes" (p.21). On the one extreme is biological racism, where "fundamental civil rights are denied and the request for segregation of races is found" (p.34), it is followed by symbolic racism, ethnocentrism, aversive racism, and egalitarianism on the other extreme. Dekker and Malova (1997) presented a model in which national attitudes form a cumulative hierarchy of empirically distinguishable attitudes, ordered according to the degree of extremeness. The hierarchy begins with a neutral attitude of *national feeling*, than continues with increasingly more positive national attitudes: *national liking*, *national pride*, *national preference*, *national superiority* and *nationalism*<sup>11</sup>. They tested the model cross-culturally (in the Netherlands, Spain and Basque community), and the examination of the scalability of the applied scales generally supported the model.

However, for more elaborated analysis of the relationships between personality and ethnic and national attitudes it seems useful to treat the latter as a multidimensional construct. Rot and Havelka (1973) distinguished five forms of national attachment: "1. *ethnocentrism* (or exclusive national attachment) - exclusive attachment to one's own nation, viewing the nation as being exceptional and superior; 2. *national idealization* - emphasizing the significance of national attachment *per se*; 3. *divided national attachment* - simultaneous attachment to one's own nation and to a humankind, support for inter-national co-operation; 4. *attachment to humanity* - priority of the attachment to human community over narrow national attachment; 5. *absence of any national attachment* - denying the importance and value of any kind of national attachment" (p. 262). As it was predicted, authoritarianism correlated primarily with more exclusive forms of national attachment: ethnocentrism and national idealization. In follow-up research, Đurić (1980) generally confirmed the findings.

While Rot and Havelka's classification was created in deductive way, the problem has been approached in more inductive and empirical manner. Methodologically, it corresponds to factor-analytical explorative studies of multi-item scales of nationalist attitudes, containing representative item-pools.

---

<sup>11</sup> Their model is actually more complicated, because they include also negative and neutral national attitudes, regional attitudes, etc. (Dekker and Malova, 1997).

Although there are no studies which would satisfy the requirement of the representativeness of initial item sets, there are factor-analytical studies whose results suggests their potential usefulness.

Scheepers *et al.* (1989) tested a hypothesis on two-dimensional structure of ethnocentrism in The Netherlands. The two dimensions were (a) "unfavorable attitude towards ethnic minorities, or outgroups" and (b) "favorable attitude towards the ingroup". The structure of ethnocentrism was examined by the principal factor analysis, oblique rotation method. A 22-items scale was applied on the representative sample of Dutch population (N=1799). The results partly confirmed two-dimensional model of ethnocentrism, because the correlation between the dimensions was 0.58 (p. 294). However, this fact can also be interpreted in the favor of the existence of a general factor in the space of ethnocentric attitudes.

Kosterman and Feshbach (1989) conducted a study in the USA on an ad hoc sample (N=239) of mainly college students who completed the 120-item Patriotism/Nationalism Questionnaire, in order to investigate "the multidimensionality of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes". Six obtained factors were labeled as: (1) *Patriotism*, i.e. general positive evaluation and affect for America, (2) *Nationalism*, or "America-first" or American-superiority" opinions, (3) *Internationalism*, consisted of items that apply to world sharing or global welfare (p.264), (4) *Civil Liberties*, (5) *World Government* and (6) *Smugness*. Although the authors emphasized orthogonality of the factors, their intercorrelations in the oblique solution allow the hypothesis about higher order dimensions.

Forbes (1985) factor analyzed various measures of nationalist attitudes on the samples of French and English Canadians. He concluded that "(a) positive attitudes towards one's own nation (patriotism, defensive nationalism, national loyalty, etc.) are not the same as (b) negative attitudes towards outgroups (xenophobia, aggressive nationalism, chauvinism, etc.), but that "nationalism" should not be defined in such a way to suggest that these are independent dimensions of variation" (p.135).

Uzelac *et al.*(1987) factor analyzed joint scale of attitudes towards religion and nation on the representative sample of male Yugoslav population aged 19-27. Four oblique factors were obtained: (1) religiosity, (2) national exclusiveness, (3) ethnocentrism and (4) a-national atheism. High intercorrelations between all factors, especially between the second and the third and significant saturations of all items of the first unrotated principal component indicated the existence of one general dimension, defined as general-human orientation versus ethnocentric orientation.

Todosijevic (1995) factor-analyzed 60-item scale of ethno-nationalism in Yugoslavia. Extracted were four factors: (1) Patriotism, (2) Minorities' Rights, (3) Ethnocentrism and (4) Hegemonist Nationalism. Their correlation, and strong principal component, confirm also the hypothesis on the existence of one general ethno-nationalist dimension. The four factors showed relatively distinct patterns of relationships with various personality traits, including authoritarianism factors.

Although it is difficult to generalize from the presented studies because of differences in the applied scales, samples and methods of data analysis, some common features can be found. It seems that ethnic attitudes can be conceived as a hierarchical structure, with (usually) culturally specific dimensions at the lower level, and with more general dimension(s) of the higher order, which tend to resemble the Adorno et al's conception of ethnocentrism. For different purposes concentration on different levels of generality could be more useful. For the purpose of the present research, it seems useful to focus on more specific national attitudes. It is hypothesized that more exclusive, ethnocentric attitudes will be related to aggressive aspects of authoritarian traits.

## **HYPOTHESES**

The following general hypotheses are derived from the previous presentation of the research on authoritarianism and nationalist attitudes:

1. Authoritarianism is a multidimensional construct, consisting of several related clusters of attitudes and traits.
2. Nationalist attitudes are multidimensional<sup>12</sup>.
3. There is significant correlation between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism.
4. Authoritarianism is differently correlated with various dimensions of national attitudes: more with exclusive ethnocentric attitudes, less with 'patriotic' attitudes.
5. Nationalist attitudes are more strongly related to authoritarianism in subsample of ethnic majority (Serbs).

## METHOD<sup>13</sup>

### *Sample of respondents*

In the Autumn of 1992 an extensive survey was conducted in Subotica, Yugoslavia, dealing with social and political attitudes. The sample consisted of approximately 400 high-school students, 17 to 19 years old. 56.9% of the respondents were female. Ethnic composition is presented in the Table 1.

Table 1 Ethnic composition of the sample

Nationality	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative percent
Magyar	147	42.0	42.0
Croat	23	6.6	48.6
Serb	79	22.6	71.1
Yugoslavian	74	21.1	92.3
Montenegrin	16	4.6	96.9
Bunjevac	11	3.1	100.0
	42	Missing	
Total	392	100.0	100.0

Proportions of the nationalities in this sample approximate the proportions of nationalities in secondary schools in Subotica. Questionnaires were administered during regular classes, and full anonymity and confidentiality for respondents was secured.

### *Instruments*

Authoritarianism is operationalized by the AUT Scale, consisting of 22 items. It has been designed specifically for this survey, but it contains a number items from the original F scale (to be specified later). Nationalism scale consists of 17 items. Both scales are of the Likert type, with six possible degrees of dis/agreement.

### *Analysis*

In the first part of the analysis, factor analysis is performed on both AUT and Nationalism scales. Initial factor extraction solution is performed according to Principal Component (PC) method, number of significant factors is determined according to Guttman-Keiser's criterion. Extracted

<sup>12</sup> The abstractness of the first two hypotheses corresponds to the exploratory use of factor analysis in this research.

<sup>13</sup> The research is based on secondary data analysis. Data have been made available by Prof. Zlatko [ram of the Center for Social research, Subotica, Yugoslavia.

factors are rotated in Oblimin (oblique) terminal solution, because it is not justified to impose orthogonality between latent dimensions within a space of specific group of attitudes. Afterwards are examined correlations between authoritarianism and nationalism factors.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Latent Structure of the AUT Scale*

According to the G-K criterion extracted are 6 factors. In the Table 2 are shown eigenvalues and corresponding raw and cumulative percentages of the explained variance.

**Table 2 AUT scale: Eigenvalues, raw and cumulative percentages of variance**

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.75	26.2	26.2
2	1.79	8.1	34.3
3	1.37	6.2	40.5
4	1.32	6.0	46.5
5	1.20	5.5	51.9
6	1.05	4.8	56.7

Figures in the Table 2 have two implications for the concept of authoritarianism. Relatively strong first principal component (accounting for 26.2% of total variance) suggests the existence of a general factor of authoritarianism and acceptability of single-score measures<sup>14</sup>. However, the other five factors account for 30.5% of variance suggesting the need for measuring other, relatively independent components of authoritarianism. Therefore, all six factors are retained for the further analysis.

### *Oblimin rotated authoritarianism factors*

Here are presented structure matrixes of the rotated factors, with loadings above .30. The first factor is shown in the Table 3.

**Table 3 First authoritarianism factor**

Item	Authoritarian submissiveness (obedience)	Loading	F*
AUT11	Obedience and respect of authorities is what all children should learn.	.76	AS, C
AUT13	That what is the most necessary for the youth is strong discipline, in order to be determined and have strong will, to be able to fight for the homeland and family.	.74	PT, AG
AUT10	I am obedient and disciplined.	.72	
AUT15	What this country needs more than laws and political programs are few courageous, tireless and devoted leaders to whom people can trust.	.64	AS, PT
AUT16	There is nothing worse than a man who does not feel a great love, gratitude and respect towards his parents.	.63	AS, AG
AUT2	Creation of a harmonious and strong family should be the main goal of one's life and work.	.52	
AUT4	Children should be educated in the spirit of obedience.	.55	AS, AG
AUT14	Nowadays, when people of different kinds are moving all around and mix, one has to be careful not to get some infectious disease.	.44	P
AUT6	In every moment I am ready to defend the honesty of my family, even using the force.	.44	PT
AUT22	If the interest of the people is endangered, even life should be sacrificed.	.38	
AUT20	Everything that is worth is earned by suffering.	.31	AS

<sup>14</sup> Of course, this applies to the analyzed scale/sample.

\* F column shows clusters to which particular items were classified in TAP. This applies only to the items that appear in the original F scale, whether as direct or reformulated translation. Abbreviations signify: AS - authoritarian submission, C - conventionalism, PT - power and toughness, AG - authoritarian aggression, P - projectivity, SS - stereotypy and superstition, Sex - deviant sex, DC - destructiveness and cynicism.

Items with the highest loadings express request for obedience, discipline, respect for family and political leaders. It also includes self-description as being obedient and disciplined (item 10). Various items imply negative or aggressive attitude towards those who show disrespect of established authorities, like family and homeland (items 13, 6, 16). Item 14 slightly departs from the general content of the factor, expressing suspiciousness towards unspecified out-groups (indicating projectivity, according to TAP). While on the purely semantic level this factor could be interpreted as conventionalism, its underlying psychological foundation seems to be the *authoritarian submissiveness*. In fact, a number of items that were originally classified to the submissiveness cluster concentrate on this factor, though it contains a bit narrower spectrum of attitudes than in the original description. In general terms this factor resembles also the description of the same concept given by Altemeyer (1981). More specific and precise name could be *obedience*.

The second factor (Table 4) contains more heterogeneous set of items. On the one hand, first several items imply certain religiosity (love towards God, supernatural power, condemnation of abortion and homosexuals, woman virginity), though it seems to be of the authoritarian kind due to the items with lower saturations. On the other hand, those items also are representative of conservative, traditional values.

Table 4 Second authoritarianism factor

Item	Authoritarian traditional values	Loading	F
AUT8	Love towards God is the basis for all other loves.	.73	
AUT12	Every man should believe in some supernatural power to which he will submerge.	.69	AS, SS
AUT9	Abortion is a shameful act which should be prohibited by law.	.69	
AUT1	Woman should enter the marriage as a virgin, because it is the only warranty that she will devote all of her love to her husband.	.62	
AUT19	Homosexuals are nothing better than criminals and should be severely punished.	.51	AG, Sex
AUT10	I am obedient and disciplined.	.34	
AUT2	Creation of a harmonious and strong family should be the main goal of one's life and work.	.32	
AUT13	That what is the most necessary for the youth is strong discipline, in order to be determined and have strong will, to be able to fight for the homeland and family.	.30	PT, AG

It is tempting to label this factor as conventionalism because it resembles the original description in TAP. However, in the socialist Yugoslavia these values and attitudes did not represent the officially supported ideology, they rather belonged to the traditional community. On the other hand, it may be better to define authoritarianism not only as submission to official authority (as Altemeyer does) but also to the unofficial - community, immediate social surrounding. As the official authority has power to approve or sanction individuals so has the community. In a psychological sense, the latter could be even stronger. Thus, the attitude that underlies such apparently different statements, like a belief in supernatural power, condemnation of abortion, demand that women should enter marriage as virgins, seems to be the *authoritarian traditional value system*. It implies authoritarian religiosity, superstitiousness, specific attitudes toward women, dislike of homosexuals, glorification of the obedience, family and

homeland. It is useful to add the qualification of ‘authoritarian’ because ‘traditional values’ alone are rather broad concept, including also some non-authoritarian aspects.

Similar factors of the authoritarian morality have been reported in other Yugoslavian studies (Majstorovic et al., 1994, Todosijevic, 1995). Aspects of conventionalism in which the authors of TAP were interested were those “based upon the individual’s adherence to the standards of the collective powers with which he, for the time being, is identified” (TAP, 1950, pp.230). Thereby, it could be hypothesized that this factor corresponds to their conception of conventionalism, but in local cultural and social conditions, and as expressed through the available items in the scale.

The third factor (Table 5) is also relatively heterogeneous, again dealing with homosexuals, women virginity, discipline, but also with willingness to sacrifice for the ‘people’ (item with the highest loading), and with harsh treatment of criminals.

**Table 5 Third authoritarianism factor**

Item	Authoritarian aggressiveness	Loading	F
AUT22	If the interest of the people is endangered, even life should be sacrificed.	-.75	
AUT21	Death penalty is the best solution for punishment of notorious criminals.	-.74	
AUT19	Homosexuals are nothing better than criminals and should be severely punished.	-.56	AG, Sex
AUT1	Woman should enter the marriage as a virgin, because it is the only warranty that she will devote all of her love to her husband.	-.56	
AUT20	Everything that is worth is earned by suffering.	-.51	AS
AUT7	Most jobs in household by their nature are more suited to women.	-.32	
AUT9	Abortion is a shameful act which should be prohibited by law.	-.31	
AUT13	That what is the most necessary for the youth is strong discipline, in order to be determined and have strong will, to be able to fight for the homeland and family.	-.30	PT, AG

The common ingredient, however, seems to be the *authoritarian aggressiveness* - rejection and rigid attitude towards sanctioned minorities (women, homosexuals, criminals). This interpretation is supported by the appearance of ‘power and toughness’ and aggressiveness items from the original model (items 20, 19 and 13). It seems likely that contemporary conditions in Yugoslavia have put the item 22 at the top of this factor. Punitiveness of the authoritarian (item 21) is also well documented fact (e.g., Christie, 1993).

*Superstition* is clearly represented by the factor four (Table 6). Presence of the item 15 (belief in authoritarian leadership), though with lower projection, reveals the authoritarian nature of superstitiousness, as hypothesized by Adorno *et al.*

**Table 6 Fourth authoritarianism factor**

Item	Superstition	Loading	F
AUT17	Most probably, one day it will be proved that astrology can explain many things.	.75	SS
AUT18	All wars and social crises could be one day finished by an earthquake or flood which will destroy the world.	.69	SS, P
AUT15	What this country needs more than laws and political programs are few courageous, tireless and devoted leaders to whom people can trust.	.40	AS, PT

In the fifth factor (Table 7) are joined items containing pessimist attitude (item 5), suspiciousness towards others (item 14), aggressiveness (item 6, disguised as readiness to defend the family honesty; item 19 - rejection of homosexuals) and high evaluation of the obedience.

**Table 7 Fifth authoritarianism factor**

Item	Resentment	Loading	F
AUT5	After every change in society things become worse than they used to be.	.71	DC
AUT14	Nowadays, when people of different kinds are moving all around and mix, one has to be careful not to get some infectious disease.	.64	P
AUT6	In every moment I am ready to defend the honor of my family, even using the force.	.63	
AUT7	Most jobs in household by their nature are more suited to women.	.63	
AUT19	Homosexuals are nothing better than criminals and should be severely punished.	.48	AG, Sex
AUT16	There is nothing worse than a man who does not feel great love, gratitude and respect towards his parents.	.36	AS, AG
AUT4	Children should be educated in the spirit of obedience.	.35	
AUT11	Obedience and respect of authorities is what all children should learn.	.32	AS, C

Emotional basis for such cluster of attitudes could be resentment, feeling of insecurity, anxiety and disappointment, and consequent ‘generalized hostility’, which is, according to the Berkeley study, an element of the ‘destructiveness and cynicism’. In order to capture two aspects of this factor - pessimism and anxiety, and latent aggressiveness - the label proposed is *resentment*<sup>15</sup>. In fact, the first syndrome described in TAP among the ‘high’ authoritarians is labeled as “surface resentment” (p. 753). Although the emphasis was put on social and economic frustration and resulting aggressiveness, the content of this factor suggests that its foundation may be more of psychological nature: anxiety, feeling of threat and insecurity.

The sixth factor (Table 8) contains items which, similarly to the factor 2, are expressive of traditional world-view. However, it seems that this factor is of the less authoritarian nature. It includes respect of the ‘wisdom’ of ancestors (3), evaluation of the obedience, hard work (implied in the item 20), and strong family (2 and 6).

**Table 8 Sixth authoritarianism factor**

Item No.	Traditionalism	Loading	F
AUT3	Wisdom of our ancestors overcomes today’s way of thinking.	.77	
AUT4	Children should be educated in the spirit of obedience.	.59	AS
AUT20	Everything that is worth is earned by suffering.	.51	AS
AUT2	Creation of a harmonious and strong family should be the main goal of one’s life and work.	.49	
AUT11	Obedience and respect of authorities is what all children should learn.	.33	AS, C
AUT6	In every moment I am ready to defend the honesty of my family, even using the force.	.33	PT, AG

According to TAP classification it contains primarily authoritarian submission items (4, 20, 12), though it seems that they could be also interpreted as reflecting traditional values via socialization (cf., Rot and Havelka, 1973). Since this factor lacks aggressive component (item 6 has much lower loading), this factor is labeled as *traditionalism*, though conventionalism seems also applicable. However, the concept of conventionalism, meaning the ‘rigid adherence to middle-class values’ (Adorno *et al.*, 1950) should be differently defined in the condition of Yugoslavia. Attitude expressed in this factor more resemble rural traditional values. It may be noted that this factor resembles Fromm and Maccoby’s definition of the ‘traditional authoritarian type’ specific for rural societies and not based on pathological psychodynamics, which they thought should be separated from proto-fascist authoritarianism (1970).

<sup>15</sup> It is interesting that Greenfeld (1992) attributes the driving force of ‘Eastern’ nationalisms to this concept.

Correlations between the factors are given in the Table 9. Most factors are significantly positively related (minus sign for the third factor is due to negative projection of items on the factor, it is a mathematical artifact). It seems that superstitiousness (factor 4) is not really a part of the authoritarian syndrome, for it is the factor most unrelated to the others.

Table 9 Correlations between six authoritarianism factors

Authoritarianism factors	1	2	3	4	5
1. Authoritarian submissiveness					
2. Authoritarian traditional values	.18**				
3. Authoritarian aggressiveness	-.23**	-.20**			
4. Superstition	.13*	.01	-.03		
5. Resentment	.32**	.16**	-.22**	.09	
6. Traditionalism	.21**	.15**	-.16**	.07	.12*

(\*\*p<.01; \*p<.5)

Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale is .86. However, because the analysis is performed on separate factors, for each of them is calculated reliability coefficient<sup>16</sup>. Table 10 shows alpha coefficients for factors, with the number of items entered in the scale analysis (only items with highest saturations are included; reliability for the superstition factor is not calculated for it would be based only on two items).

Table 10 Alpha reliability coefficients for authoritarianism factors

Authoritarianism factors	Alpha	No. of items
1. Authoritarian submissiveness	.78	6
2. Authoritarian traditional values	.68	4
3. Authoritarian aggressiveness	.69	5
4. Superstition		
5. Resentment	.59	4
6. Traditionalism	.51	3

Taking into account that the applied method of calculation is the most restrictive, reliabilities are acceptable.<sup>17</sup>

#### *Summary of the factor analysis of the AUT Scale*

The analysis generally supported the empirical reality of the authoritarianism concept, as a set of relatively related attitudes. The following six factors are obtained: 1. *Authoritarian submissiveness (obedience)*, 2. *Authoritarian traditional values*, 3. *Authoritarian aggressiveness*, 4. *Superstition*, 5. *Resentment* and 6. *Traditionalism*. Some factors closely resemble components of authoritarianism as described by the Berkeley group (factors 1, 3 and 4), while the others are derivatives of these and some of other authoritarian traits. It is interesting that none of the factors is interpreted as conventionalism. One reason for that may be that the scale does not contain enough representative items (only one of the items from the AUT scale corresponds exactly to conventionalism items from the F scale (AUT11, but it is also classified as an indicator of submissiveness). Here, it appears on several factors (1, 5 and 6). To

<sup>16</sup> It is important to note that reliabilities for factors are calculated by simple summation, therefore decreasing their actual magnitude.

<sup>17</sup> Especially taking into account the number of items. Reliabilities for such a short scales are rarely reported in the literature.

a certain extent factors Traditional Authoritarian Values and Traditionalism capture part of the concept of conventionalism from TAP. An additional problem is how to define conventionalism in a rapidly changing society where the old social system with its system of values collapsed and a new one has not crystallized. As the sample is culturally and ethnically heterogeneous, it makes the problem of defining conventionalism still more difficult. So, it could be concluded that conventionalism factor did not emerge, instead of it appeared several factors that could be interpreted as bearing some of its aspects. Nevertheless, to the extent that factor 2 could be interpreted as conventionalism, the first three factors support Altemeyer's three-dimensional model of authoritarianism (1981).

These findings are, of course, restricted by and to the applied AUT scale. Factor analysis could not reveal dimensions which are not sufficiently represented by the item pool. Some topics are underrepresented, especially those concerning the anti-intraceptiveness, rigidity, concern with power and toughness, destructiveness, projectivity and sexuality. Authoritarianism is a concept which integrate both attitudinal and personality aspects, but in the AUT scale the former is better represented. Nevertheless, the usefulness of the factor analytical approach seems obvious: it is clear which aspects of authoritarianism are measured and which are not.

### ***Latent Structure of the Nationalism Scale***<sup>18</sup>

According to the G-K criterion, 2 factors were extracted. The first principal component (47.2% of the total variance) is much stronger than the second (6.7%). All items significantly saturate the first principal component, loadings ranging from .78 to .51. It is a strong evidence about the existence of one general dimension underlying the variability of answers to the Nationalism scale. Nevertheless, both factors are retained for the further analysis, hoping that in the rotated position two factors will represent different aspects of nationalist attitudes.

### ***Oblimin rotated Nationalism factors***

Table 11 shows the pattern of the first Oblimin factor. It consists of several groups of items: identification with nation or ethnic group (13, 12, 15, 10), demand for discriminative rights (11, 17), national closedness (3, 5), and belief in national inequality. Although this makes the interpretation quite difficult, it seems that the factor can be named *ethnocentric nationalism*.

Table 11 Nationalism Oblimin factor I.

Ethnocentric nationalism	Loading
11 In our country our nation should be privileged regarding the employment.	.75
12 One's most important characteristics come from his nationality.	.75
3 It is not good to be too open towards the other nations.	.73
17 National majority should always have more political rights than minorities.	.68
13 One's destiny equals with the nation's destiny.	.67
1 It is nonsense that all nations are equal. Some peoples are more, some less honest.	.66
5 Nationally mixed marriages are in advance determined to failure.	.55
15 Putting our nation above the others is nothing evil, it is just an expression of love for our people.	.54
10 All great deeds are inspired by the national feelings.	.51

<sup>18</sup> Detailed factor analysis of the Nationalism scale has been presented elsewhere (Todosijevic *at al.*, 1997).

The second factor consists of two groups of variables (Table 12). Items 7, 6, 2, 9, 16, and 14 express positive feelings or attachment towards nation, and items 8 and 4 national closedness or exclusiveness. However, the first group of items has higher projections, so the proposed alternative names for the factor are *romantic nationalism*, or *national attachment*.

Table 12 Nationalism Oblimin factor II.

Romantic nationalism	Loading
7 Feeling of national attachment is one of the most valuable feelings one can ever experience.	-.99
9 One should respect his nation and its tradition.	-.75
6 An important thing children should learn in schools is to love their nation.	-.74
16 One should always put national interests above the personal.	-.65
2 To be without a nation is like to be without a family.	-.64
14 Renewing of our national ideals is our most important task.	-.60
8 One should be reserved and cautious towards other nations, even when they appear to be friendly.	-.51
4 Every nation should live in its own state.	-.36

Underlying element in this factor is probably emotional identification with the nation or ethnic group, and corresponds to Dekker and Malova's (1997) concepts of national liking, national pride and national preference. Item 4 would fit to their highest attitude in the hierarchy - nationalism. The existence of the first factor here suggests that ethnocentric, exclusive, or discriminatory elements may be missing in Dekker and Malova's model. These two factors are similar to factors 2 and 3 from Uzelac et al. (1987) indicating their replicability at least in Yugoslavian samples.

High correlation between the factors ( $r=-.64$ ) suggests that to a great extent they have the common foundation, perhaps general ethno-nationalist orientation (negative sign is because of the negative projections of items on the Factor 2). This result suggests that ethnocentric, exclusive, nationalism largely merged with more benevolent, romantic nationalism, possibly under the pressure of ethnic conflicts<sup>19</sup>.

Alpha coefficient of reliability for the whole nationalism scale is .93, for ethnocentric nationalism factor .87 (9 items), and for romantic nationalism .89 (8 items).

### ***Relationships between dimensions of authoritarianism and nationalism***

Relationships between authoritarianism and nationalism factors could be examined in different ways. For the assessment of the degree of relatedness of these two sets of attitudes canonical correlation analysis could be appropriately applied. However, for the goal here is to examine to what extent specific dimensions of authoritarianism are related to nationalist attitudes, only the very basic results of canonical analysis will be presented. There are four statistically significant canonical dimensions ( $p<.05$ ), which account for 38% of the variance of these two 'spaces'. Canonical correlation coefficient is  $R_C=.61$ . Obviously, authoritarianism and nationalist attitudes have much in common.

In more details will be interpreted correlations between dimensions of authoritarianism and nationalism. Table 13 shows correlation coefficients calculated for the entire sample.

<sup>19</sup> Factor analysis of the same scale on the sample from Hungary yielded three factors (Todosijevic et al., 1997).

Table 13 Zero-order correlation coefficients between authoritarianism and nationalism factors<sup>20</sup>

Authoritarianism factors	Ethnocentric Nationalism	Romantic Nationalism
1. Authoritarian Submissiveness	.20**	-.18**
2. Authoritarian Traditional values	.32**	-.20**
3. Authoritarian Aggressiveness	-.40**	.40**
4. Superstition	.20**	-.06
5. Resentment	.13*	-.18**
6. Traditionalism	.14*	-.05

(\*\*p<.01; \*p<.05)

Both nationalism factors are significantly correlated with authoritarianism dimensions, but the largest coefficients are for authoritarian aggressiveness and authoritarian traditional values. These results generally support the Berkeley-group's hypothesis that authoritarianism is an important cause of individual differences in ethnic attitudes. It seems that aggressive component of the authoritarian syndrome (primarily embedded in factors 2 and 3) is essentially responsible for that relationship.

Interesting additional information is obtained when authoritarian dimensions are regressed onto nationalist factors. Multiple R for Ethnocentric Nationalism is .51 (26% of variance), but significant predictors are factors 2, 3 and 4, with Beta coefficients of .24, -.34 and .18 respectively (p<.01). It shows the importance of authoritarian aggressiveness in even clearer way. For the romantic nationalism, multiple R is .43 (19% of variance). Significant predictor is only authoritarian aggressiveness (Beta=.36, p<.01). When partial correlations between the authoritarian and nationalist factors are calculated controlling for one of the nationalist factors, coefficients are naturally quite lower due to their strong relatedness, but the decrease is more visible for romantic nationalism. All these results suggest that both ethnocentric and romantic nationalism are based on authoritarianism, but that it more holds for the former.

#### *The role of socio-economic status*

Various authors noted that authoritarianism is related to socio-economic status, or at least to education (e.g., Lipset, 1959, Dekker and Ester, 1993, Schuman *et al.*, 1992). Present analysis shows that father's occupational status, as an indicator of the socio-economic status, is indeed negatively correlated with some of the authoritarianism dimensions (-.27 with submissiveness; -.17 with authoritarian traditional values; and -.26 with resentment; all p<.05). Therefore, partial correlations between authoritarian and nationalist factors are calculated, controlling for father's occupational status (Table 14).

Table 14 Partial correlations between authoritarianism and nationalism factors, controlling for father's occupational status

Authoritarianism factors	Ethnocentric nationalism	Romantic nationalism
1. Authoritarian submissiveness	.21**	-.23**
2. Authoritarian traditional values	.32**	-.21**
3. Authoritarian aggressiveness	-.42**	.44**
4. Superstition	.23**	-.08
5. Resentment	.13*	-.21**

<sup>20</sup> Authoritarian aggressiveness and Romantic Nationalism factors are mathematically defined by negative item projections, therefore signs of coefficients where they appear should be taken in the opposite meaning.

(\*\*p<.01; \*p<.05)

It seems that socioeconomic status (as indicated by father's occupational status) actually suppresses the authoritarianism-nationalism relationship, because the coefficients are slightly higher. It could be explained in the way that *within* socio-economic strata nationalist attitudes are more based on personality, i.e., authoritarianism. In a sense, the interaction of class and authoritarianism obscures the authoritarian foundation of nationalist attitudes.

#### *The role of minority status*

Analysis also showed that there is interaction between authoritarianism, nationalist attitudes and respondents' ethnic background. Different ethnic groups (nationalities) have different average levels on the analyzed dimensions. It is possible that aggregate analysis blurred the actual relationships. Therefore, separate analyses are performed on subsamples of Magyars (ethnic minority), Serbs (majority) and declared Yugoslavs (presumably those with low or supra- ethnic identification). Table 15 presents these results.

Table 15 Correlations in subsamples of Magyars, Serbs and declared Yugoslavs

Authoritarianism factors	Magyars		Serbs		Yugoslavs	
	Ethn. nat.	Rom. nat.	Ethn. nat.	Rom. nat.	Ethn. Nat.	Rom. nat.
1. Authoritarian submissiveness	.17	-.09	.54**	-.52**	.04	-.12
2. Auth. trad. values	.15	-.13	.67**	-.39**	.18	-.32
3. Authoritarian aggressiveness	-.42**	.26*	-.46**	.64**	-.19	.32*
4. Superstition	.23*	-.14	.20	.01	.20	.06
5. Resentment	.21*	-.11	.37**	-.55**	.08	-.19
6. Traditionalism	-.08	-.10	.33*	-.15	.08	-.06

(\*\*p<.01; \*p<.05)

The coefficients generally decreased in subsamples of Magyars and especially Yugoslavs, while considerably increased among Serbs. In the subsample of Serbs, ethnocentric nationalism is most strongly related to authoritarian traditional values ( $r=.67$ ), authoritarian submissiveness ( $r=.54$ ) and authoritarian aggressiveness ( $r=-.46$ ), while romantic nationalism is related also to aggressiveness and submissiveness (.64 and -.52 respectively) and to resentment factor ( $r=-.55$ ). In the subsample of Magyars aggressiveness remained a robust predictor of both nationalist attitudes. In the sample of declared Yugoslavs only authoritarian aggressiveness is related to romantic nationalism, though quite weakly ( $r=.32$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

### **General discussion**

Findings of Adorno *et al.* (1950) and of various other authors that authoritarianism and ethnocentrism (nationalism) are correlated, received another inter-cultural confirmation in this study. It has been found that both 'ethnocentric' and 'romantic' nationalism are related to authoritarian dimensions. It could have been hypothesized, following Pettigrew's reasoning (1959) that under particular social conditions authoritarianism ceases to be related to prejudice. The present results

show that within the framework of ethnic conflicts and intensive nationalist propaganda authoritarianism still predicts individual differences in nationalist attitudes.

Aggressive component of authoritarianism seem to be the most robust predictor of nationalist attitudes across minority and majority subsamples. It justifies the emphasis that has been given to the aggressiveness aspect of the authoritarianism (TAP, Altemeyer, 1988, Stone et al, 1993a). Other authoritarianism factors remained related to nationalism only in the Serbian subsample. There, ethnocentric nationalism is based on authoritarian traditional values, submissiveness, aggressiveness and to a lesser extent on resentment factors. Romantic nationalism is based primarily on the authoritarian aggressiveness, resentment and authoritarian submissiveness. If more speculative psychological interpretation is allowed, it could be hypothesized that individuals experiencing frustration and *resentment*, who are *submissive* to established authorities, and direct *aggressiveness* towards outgroups assigned as (potential) national enemies, tend to strongly identify with their own nation (high romantic nationalism). At the same time they are likely to endorse ethnocentric nationalist attitudes, which are similarly based but comparably more on the rigid acceptance of traditional authoritarian values. It could be further speculated that at the root of the former relationship (romantic nationalism) lies anxiety, while of the latter more intrinsic aggressiveness.<sup>21</sup>

Slight differences between the two nationalist dimensions in their authoritarianism correlates suggests that ethnocentric aspect of nationalism is more authoritarian in nature, while romantic nationalism, though similarly based, is comparably more based on resentment (especially in the Serbian subsample). Similar results have been obtained by Todosijevic (1995), where for example, Patriotism factor was related primarily to Authoritarian Submissiveness, and Ethnocentrism to Aggressive Conventionalism and Psychopathic Aggressiveness. Although nationalism factors are strongly related in this sample and differences in their relationships with authoritarianism are a matter of nuances, the results indicate that it is useful to analyze various aspects of nationalist attitudes separately because they seem to be differently based in personality.

The obtained differences between subsamples fit the hypothesis proposed by Forbes (1985), that majority nationalism should be more based on authoritarianism than minority nationalism. However, it should be qualified in the sense that it does not hold for authoritarian aggressiveness, but primarily to authoritarianism factors with more specific content. Another qualification could be that in groups with low or non-existent national attachment (Yugoslavs), even authoritarian aggressiveness ceases to be predictive of nationalist attitudes (cf., Rot and Havelka, 1973).

Finding that minority nationalism is less based on authoritarianism does not mean that there are fewer authoritarians among them or that they are less nationalist and ethnocentric<sup>22</sup>. It means primarily that their authoritarianism is less expressed in nationalist attitudes (as measured by the applied scales). One possibility is that differences are due to cultural traditions transmitted via socializing agencies. Also, at the time of the survey (1992) actual social processes, i.e., nationalizing of the Serbian state, ethnic mobilization of the Hungarian minority, and ethnic conflicts in other parts of Yugoslavia, perhaps differently influenced different groups. If the influence was in the direction of decreasing authoritarian character of minority nationalism, than Forbes' hypothesis is confirmed. Additionally, it is possible that these differences reflect different content of nationalist propaganda in two groups. The latter interpretation could be supported by the content of the Nationalism scale. Its

---

<sup>21</sup> This corresponds to a two dimensional models of aggressiveness, in which primary aggressiveness is based on anger, while secondary on fear (cf., Momirovic et al., 1992, Ignjatovic, 1989).

<sup>22</sup> Actually, although Magyars indeed have lower average levels on nationalist factors than Serbs, differences are not significant for authoritarianism factors 1, 4 and 5. On the factor 3 (authoritarian aggressiveness) and marginally on the factor 6 (traditionalism) Serbs have significantly higher average scores. On the factor 2 Magyars have higher average score.

items are rather representative for the Serbian nationalist propaganda. Nationalist and ethnocentric attitudes of minorities could be perhaps better elicited by different items.

Although it has been confirmed that authoritarianism and nationalism are related, it does not mean that the *theory* of the Berkeley group is confirmed, particularly its psychoanalytical aspects. Of course, the applied methodology is not very helpful in this regard. It is possible to put the findings in the framework of different theoretical perspectives, not necessarily the psychological and particularly psychoanalytical. Whether the Oedipus complex plays the crucial role, or social learning, political propaganda, cultural tradition, or genes, simply cannot be answered only using this methodological approach. However, due the fact that items referring to sexual matters, obedience, superstition, abortion, traditional family, or readiness to follow leaders are all related to nationalist attitudes, although there is no logical connection between them, it is very tempting to resort to psychoanalysis.

According to the canonical analysis, authoritarianism explains 38% of the individual differences in nationalist attitudes, but large part still remained unexplained. It could be partly improved by the expansion of the authoritarianism operationalization. Anti-intracaptiveness, overinterest in deviant sex, destructiveness and cynicism, are only some of the topics which should be included.<sup>23</sup> Likewise, nationalism scale should be diversified and more theoretically informed. On the other hand, additional social and psychological variables should be included. For research with more explanatory objective, longitudinal approach is suggested. Finally, in order to generalize findings beyond the studies sample, cross validation is needed.

After fifty years authoritarianism proves to be still useful concept for understanding individual differences in ethnic attitudes. Though it might be proved that nationalism in Yugoslavia can be partly explained by the theory of specific “Balkan mentality”, it obviously contains certain rather universal elements.

### Summary of the main findings

1. Authoritarianism can be operationalized as a multidimensional construct, and its separate aspects can be measured. Factor analysis of the AUT scale resulted in six factors.
2. Within the limits of the applied AUT scale, it has been confirmed that authoritarian submissiveness, aggressiveness and conventionalism (traditionalism) are components of authoritarianism, as argued by Altemeyer (1981), though it is useful to include other aspects of authoritarianism.
3. Nationalist attitudes in Yugoslavia tend to form one general ethno-nationalist dimension, consisting of two strongly related components, defined as *ethnocentric* and *romantic* nationalism.
4. Dimensions of authoritarianism are significantly correlated with nationalist attitudes. The strongest relationships include authoritarian dimensions that imply aggressiveness (*authoritarian aggressiveness* and *authoritarian traditional values*).
5. Ethnocentric nationalist attitudes are generally more related with (aggressive) authoritarianism than romantic nationalist attitudes.
6. Relationships between nationalist and authoritarian dimensions are stable after introducing the control for socio-economic status (indicated by father's occupation). The control actually slightly increased the relationships.

---

<sup>23</sup> Of course, some of the 9 components of authoritarianism may prove to be irrelevant for ethnic attitudes, like superstitiousness proved here.

7. Forbes' (1985) hypothesis that minority and majority nationalism are differently related to authoritarianism) is confirmed. Relationships between authoritarianism and nationalism are much stronger in the subsample of Serbs (majority) than in the subsample of Magyars. The relationship is almost nonexistent in the sample of declared Yugoslavs.

## References:

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, N. S., (1950) *The Authoritarian Personality*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981) *Right-wing Authoritarianism*, Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988) *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right -Wing Authoritarianism*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Billing, M. & Cramer, D. (1990) Authoritarianism and Demographic Variables as Predictors of racial Attitudes in Britain. *New Community*, 16, 2, 199-211.
- Billings, S. B., Guastello, S. J. & Rieke, M. L. (1993). A Comparative Assessment of the Construct Validity of Three Authoritarianism Measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 27, 328-348.
- Christie, R. (1993) Some experimental Approaches to Authoritarianism: II. Authoritarianism and punitiveness. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), 1993a, pp. 99-118.
- Christie, R. and Geis, F. (1970) *Studies in Machiavellism*. Academic Press, New York.
- Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (Eds.) (1954). *Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality"*. Free Press, Glencoe IL.
- Dekker, H. & Malova, D. (1997) *Nationalism and its Explanations*. Paper presented at the XX Annual Scientific Meeting of the ISPP, Krakow, Poland.
- Dekker, P. & Ester, P. (1991) Authoritarianism, Socio-Demographic Variables and racism: A Dutch Replication of Billing and Cramer. *New Community*, 17, 2, 287-293.
- Đurić, Đ. (1987). Prilog proučavanju strukture autoritarnosti kod studenata. (A contribution to the study of the structure of authoritarianism in students). *Zbornik Instituta za pedagogiju*, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, p. 13-21.
- Enyedi, Zs., Eros, F. & Fabian, Z. (1997) Authoritarianism and the Ideological Spectrum in Hungary. *Discussion Papers No. 40*, Collegium Budapest, Institute for Advanced Studies, Budapest
- Eysenck, H. J. (1954) *Psychology of Politics*. Routledge and Kegan, London.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1975) The Structure of Social Attitudes. *The British J. of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 323-331.
- Eysenck, H. J. & Wilson, G. D. (Eds.) (1978) *The Psychological Basis of Ideology*. MTP Press Ltd. Lancaster.
- Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, R.N. (1947) 'The Antidemocratic Personality', in: Newcomb, T.M. and Hartley, E.L. (Eds.) *Readings in Social Psychology*, Henry Holt & Co., New York.
- Forbes, H. D. (1985) *Nationalism, Ethnocentrism and Personality*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fromm, E. and Maccoby, M. (1970) *Social Character in a Mexican Village*. Prentice- Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Goertzel, T. G. (1987) Authoritarianism of personality and political attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127, 1, 7-18.
- Greenfeld, L. (1992) *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1976) 'Personality Factors and Anti-Semitism among a Group of Afrikaans-Speaking Students', *Humanitas*, Vol. 3, No.4, 483-484.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1984) 'Afrikaaner Patriotism Today: The Role of Attitudes and Personality', *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, Vol. 11, No.1, 133-139.
- Heaven, P. C. L., Rajab, D. & Ray, J. J. (1985) Patriotism, Racism and the Disutility of the Ethnocentrism Concept. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 2, 181-185.
- Hopf, C. (1993) Authoritarians and their Families: Qualitative Studies on the Origins of Authoritarian Dispositions. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), (1993a).
- Ignjatović, I. (1989) Skala za procenu agresivnosti VAPO, Savez društava psihologa Srbije, Beograd. (VAPO Scale for Aggressiveness Assessment).
- Katunarić, V. (1987) Autoritarnost - etnocentrizam - seksizam i društvene grupe. *Sociologija*, Vol. 39, No. 4. (Authoritarianism - ethnocentrism - sexism and social groups).
- Kerlinger, F. and Rokeach, M. (1966). The Factorial Nature of the F and D scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 391-399.
- Kindervater, A. (1997) *Measuring Antisemitism: An Example of Austrian Youth in 1992*. Paper presented at the XX Annual Scientific Meeting of the ISPP, Krakow, Poland.
- Kleinpenning, G. and Hagendoorn, L. (1993) 'Forms of Racism and Cumulative Dimension of Ethnic Attitudes', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol.56, No.1, 21-36.
- Kline, P. and Cooper, C. (1984). A Factorial Analysis of the Authoritarian Personality. *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 75/2, 171-176.
- Kosterman, R., Feshbach, S., (1989) 'Toward a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes', *Political Psychology*, Vol.10, 2, 257-274.
- Lipset, S.M. (1959) Democracy and Working Class-Authoritarianism. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 482-502.
- Majstorović, N., Salaj, M. and Ignjatović, I. (1994) Struktura autoritarnosti merena skalom "A" iz upitnika MK-240 kod učenika uzrasta 16 i 18 godina. *Licnost u višekulturnom društvu I*. Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad.
- Meloen, J.D. (1993) The F Scale as a Predictor of Fascism: An Overview of 40 Years of Authoritarianism Research. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), (1993a).
- Momirović, K., Wolf, B. and Džamonja, Z. (1992) KON 6: Kibernetička baterija konativnih testova, SDPS, Centar za primenjenu psihologiju, Beograd (KON 6: Cybernetic battery of conative tests).
- Nietzsche, F., (1961), *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Penguin Books Ltd. London.

- O'Neil, W. M. and Levinson, D. J. (1954). A Factorial Exploration of Authoritarianism and Some of Its Ideological Concomitants. *The Journal of Personality*, 22, 449-463.
- Powel and Stewart (1978) The relationship of Age, Sex and Personality to Social Attitudes in Children Aged 8-15 years. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 4, 307-317.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1959) 'Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudices', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol.59, No.1, 28-36.
- Puhar, A. (1993a). On childhood origins of violence in Yugoslavia: II. The zadruga. *Journal of Psychohistory*, 21, 171-197.
- Puhar, A. (1993b). Childhood origins of the war in Yugoslavia: I. Infant mortality. *Journal of Psychohistory*, 20, 373-379.
- Raden, D. (1981) Authoritarianism Revisited: Evidence for an Aggression Factor. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 9, 2, 147-153.
- Ray, J. J. (1990) AIDS, authoritarianism, and scientific ignorance: A comment of Wit. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 20, p. 1453-1455.
- Ray, J. J. (1985) Authoritarianism of the Left revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 2, 271-272.
- Ray, J. J. (1984) Alternatives to the F Scale in the Measurement of Authoritarianism: A Catalog. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 122, 2, 105-119.
- Ray, J. J. (1972). Non-Ethnocentric Authoritarianism. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 8, 2, 96-102.
- Rokeach, M. (1956) Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. *Psychological Monographs*, 70.
- Rot, N. (1989), *Osnovi Socijalne Psihologije*, ZUNS Beograd (Foundations of Social Psychology).
- Rot, N. and Havelka N. (1973), *Nacionalna vezanost i vrednosti kod srednjoškolske omladine*, Institut za psihologiju, Beograd (National Attachment and Values in High-school youth).
- Scheepers, P., Felling, A., Peters, J. (1989) 'Ethnocentrism in The Netherlands: a typological analysis', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.12, 3, 289-307.
- Scheepers, P., Felling, A., Peters, J. (1990) 'Social Conditions, authoritarianism and ethnocentrism: a theoretical model of the early Frankfurt School updated and tested', *European Sociological Review*, Vol.6, No.1, 15-26.
- Scheepers, P., Felling, A. Peters, J. (1992) 'Anomie, Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism: Update of a Classic Theme and an Empirical Test', *Politics and the Individual*, Vol.2, No.1, 43-59.
- Schuman, H., Bobo, L. and Krysan, M. (1992) 'Authoritarianism in the General Population: The Education Interaction Hypothesis', *Soc. Psychology Quarterly*, Vol.55, No.4, 379-387.
- Shils, E. (1954) 'Authoritarianism: "Right" and "Left"', in: Christie, R. & Jahoda, M. (Eds.) *Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality"*, (1954) Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.
- Siber, I. (1991) Review of Research on the "Authoritarian Personality" in Yugoslav Society. *Politics and the Individual*, 1, 1, 21-28.
- Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M. & Malle, B. F. (1994) Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 4, 741-763.
- Smither, R. D. (1993) Authoritarianism, Dominance, and Social Behavior: A Perspective from Evolutionary Personality Psychology. *Human Relations*, 46, 1, 23-43.
- Snyder, M. and Ickes, W. (1995) 'Personality and Social Behaviour', in: Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, (1985) Random House, New York.
- Stankov, L. (1977) Some experiences with the F Scale in Yugoslavia. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 16, 2, 111-121.
- Stone, W.F., Lederer, G. and Christie, R. (Eds.) (1993a) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Stone, W.F., Lederer, G. and Christie, R. (1993b) The Status of Authoritarianism. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), 1993a, p. 229-245.
- Stone W.F and Smith, L.D. (1993) Authoritarianism: Left and Right. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), 1993a, p. 144-156.
- Todosijevic, B. (1995) *Some Social and Psychological Correlates of Ethno-Nationalist Attitudes: Yugoslavia 1995*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, Central European University, Prague.
- Todosijevic, B., Bacic, O. & Žigmanov, T., (1997) *The Latent Structure of Nationalist Attitudes: A Comparison of Yugoslav and Hungarian Youth*. Paper presented at the XX Annual Scientific Meeting of the ISPP, Krakow, Poland.
- Uzelac, S., Hofman, E., Ignjatovic, I. (1987) *Latentna struktura stavova prema religiji i naciji* (Latent structure of the Attitudes Towards Religion and Nation) (unpublished paper)
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., (1989).Moral judgment, Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.129, No.1, 37-45.
- Vivian, J. and Brown, R. (1994) Prejudice and Intergroup Conflict. In: Colman, A.M. (1994) (Ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 2. Routledge, London.
- Wolf, B. (1989) *Relacije primarnih konativnih faktora i stavova prema religiji i naciji*, Filozofski fakultet Novi Sad. (Relations between Primary Conative Factors and Attitudes Towards Religion and Nation, research report).