Andreas Schneider, Texas Tech University

Complimentary Patterns of Dominance and Submission

Max Weber described authority, tradition and charisma as the three ways to establish dominance (*Herrschaft*). Taking a symbolic interactionist perspective, I argue that dominance is mutually established by the other engaging in submission.

Pattern of Submission Authority is reflected in an ideal-typical EPA pattern, which is potent, positively evaluated, and not expressive. "Because their power is legitimated by cultural rules, authorities are positively evaluated despite their ability to coerce. Because it is understood, authorities need not engage in expressive action to demonstrate their power (Schneider 2004)." While ideal-typical authority is described as a pattern of E+ P+ and A (neutral), the more general class of dominance is E+ P+ and A+. Defining submission as the inverse of dominance, I test if there is a pattern of E- P- A- that describes submission. If it holds true that higher-order patterns of affective meanings are complimentary, I not only identify another stabilizing structure in affective meanings, but a mechanism of complementation contributing to the stability of these structures.

Inverse Character of Submission Identities were rated on a 5-point ordinal scale reaching from definitely an authority to definitely not an authority. Listing identities with the highest authority rating and comparing them with the inverse that received negative authority ratings resulted in a list of identities that, if paired within their institutional setting, create partners of dominance and submission (see table 1).

Centrality of Power Correlations of EPA ratings with authority ratings indicate the centrality of the EPA dimensions in the definition of authority. The potency dimension correlates highest (0.80), the evaluation dimension less (0.31), and the activity dimension lowest (-0.13), but still significant. Investigating authority, power provides the most central explanation, followed by status. While expressivity has the lowest explanation power it is central in differentiating coercion, the expressive form of dominance, from the subtle form in which authorities exercise their power.

Cluster Analysis Revisiting a previous cluster solution that produced the authority cluster in the US 1978 and my German 1989 data I identified a cluster of submission. Conducting the same K-means six cluster analysis in the US data of 2003 and Schroeder's 2007 German data (see tables 2 and 3) reflects the hypothesized complimentary pattern of dominance and submission. In the US cluster solution, we see the authority with lower activity separated from dominance. Dominance and submission prove to be complementing central higher-order structures. Emerging in two cultures speaks for the generalizability of my findings. Identifying patterns of authority and submission in cluster solutions with older data in both cultures further supports the generalizability of these findings and speaks for the stability of cluster solutions.

Table 1: List of 5% of identities with the highest and lowest authority rating. Left column with highest authority ratings to lower ratings. Right column most negative to less negative ratings.

authority	beggar
boss	beginner
minister	doll
mother	newsboy
parent	nobody
policeman	peeping tom
principal	saphead
schoolteacher	scamp
scoutmaster	schoolboy
sheriff	schoolgirl
slavedriver	screwball
superior	servant
teacher	simpleton
tutor	sissy
airline pilot-	slave
attorney	subordinate
bodyguard	underdog
brute	vagrant
champion	applicant
construction foreman	apprentice

Table 2: Germany 2007 sex averaged cluster means

Affective Meaning	Cluster 1	Authority	Submission	Cluster 4	Cluster 5	Cluster 6
evaluation	0.27	1.77	-1.59	-2.62	1.52	-0.2
potency	1.8	1.03	-1.56	0.76	-1.01	0.26
activity	1.42	-0.14	-1.31	1.23	0.68	-0.1

Table 3: US Indiana 2003 sex averaged cluster means

Affective Meaning	Dominance	Authority	Cluster 3	Submission	Cluster 5	Cluster 6
evaluation	2.29	1.31	-2.38	-0.96	0.99	-1.1
potency	1.97	1.23	-0.5	-1.1	-0.11	0.54
activity	1.32	0.76	0.4	-0.87	0.36	1.16