2017

Voter Worldview and Presidential Candidate Choice.

Thomas Allen Kulbickas
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Developmental Psychology Commons, Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Thomas Kulbickas

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Rachel Piferi, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Brian Uldall, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Hannah Lerman, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Voter Worldview and Presidential Candidate Choice

by

Thomas Kulbickas

BA, Case Western Reserve University, 2004

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

General Research and Evaluation

Walden University

January 2017

Abstract

Research has shown a relationship between having a strict father upbringing, defined by

rules reinforcement and self-discipline beliefs, and the presence of high levels of social

dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). The relationship

between these variables and issue choice has been established, but no study has explored

the connection between parental upbringing and moral foundations. Furthermore, the

connection to political candidate choice has not been shown. This study investigated the

relationship between people's parental upbringing beliefs, their adult morality, and their

rating of ideal presidential candidate characteristics. Based on the moral foundation

theory, a mixed methods study was conducted to examine the relationship among

upbringing, moral foundations, RWA, SDO, socioeconomic status (SES), and candidate

selection by surveying 221 adult participants recruited online and in the community.

Linear regression analysis was conducted to examine how levels of SDO, RWA, and the

strict father variables predict the 5 five moral foundations. Qualitative analysis, through

the use of open-ended questions, explored presidential candidate choice by rating

people's preference of the 5 moral foundations, the strict father nurturing parent

worldviews, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES, as expressed in their ideal president.

Results indicated that upbringing is related to RWA for conservatives and inversely

related to SDO for liberals. Also, participants exhibited a rules reinforcement versus self-

discipline left–right political dichotomy. Participants favored a tough-minded president

on foreign affairs.

Voter Worldview and Presidential Candidate Choice

by

Thomas Kulbickas

BA, Case Western Reserve University, 2004

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

General Psychology Research and Evaluation

Walden University

January 2017

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the advancement of study in political psychology. While much has been uncovered concerning how people and their groups relate to one another and how this influences public policy decisions, much still needs to be uncovered.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Background of the Problem

A person's worldview may be largely determined by their upbringing and the example set by their parents, teachers, and others (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008). This worldview, once formed, is likely to become the basis for forming beliefs on major issues in a person's life. In addition, it also can become the basis for the relationships a person forms with others and help to determine who is chosen for those relationships (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008). Such associations in turn may also provide additional shaping of the person's worldview. When this happens, the beliefs that are formed help determine what rules, policies, and actions are deemed appropriate in any given situation (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

People are also often socialized into the position they occupy in society's interpersonal ecosystem. As a result, they usually feel more familiar with others with whom they share similar experiences (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Some people also have higher social status, resources, better opportunities, and social connections than others (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). These status differences often lead to differences in interest between different social groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The combination of the above factors helps shape individuals' rationale and agenda in dealing with social and political issues that affect their lives.

One area in which a people's worldview is revealed is in political office candidate selection (McAdams et al., 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Research has shown that

individuals and groups at all levels of society seek out and support the candidates who they believe will enact their values and interests (Jost et al., 2003).

Social Dominance, Authoritarianism, and Worldview Indoctrination

Two worldview constructs that have yielded much research are social dominance orientation (SDO) and right- wing authoritarianism (RWA). Altemeyer (1996) and Sidanius and Pratto (1999) have examined what they labeled SDO and RWA in relation to people's perception of the world around them, to their treatment of others under their authority, and to their treatment of those from outside groups and are different from them (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). SDO has been defined as the tendency to dominate out-group members (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), while RWA has been defined as the tendency to exhibit loyalty towards a person's in-group and its leaders and to defend them against perceived outside attack (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). People rated highly in SDO may oppose government policies that increase the status and well-being of out-groups (Pratto & Shih, 2000). People rated highly in RWA may support harsh policies in the war on terror and in the treatment of minority group members who they deem to pose a threat (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1996). While much work has been done to relate these variables to conservative and liberal worldviews, issue choices, and stereotyping and prejudice (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), the authors of this research and other researchers in this field have not yet used these concepts to directly assess a person's political candidate choice. Past explorations have only provided a partial picture of how people's attitudes affect their worldview and how these attitudes developed (Lakoff, 2002; Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

McAdams et al. (2008) have provided some explanation for how these attitudes may develop. In their research, they have shown how indoctrination into the world.00view of either a strict father or a nurturing parent can shape people's interaction with the world around them by partially enhancing or reducing their levels of SDO and RWA (McAdams et al., 2008). They assert that the strict father upbringing may encourage views that result in high SDO and RWA so that people may, through the use of them, defend and uphold their place in their society (McAdams et al., 2008). In a similar way they also assert that people holding to the nurturant parent upbringing, in believing that empathy and openness can make the world an ideal place to live, will discourage attitudes conducive to SDO and RWA. Such attitudes, based on upbringing, are purported to affect candidate choice in voting behavior (McAdams et al., 2008).

The Five Moral Foundations

The strict father or nurturing parent upbringing dispositions that people learn in childhood have been shown to help form adult moral worldviews (Haidt & Graham, 2007). In their theory, Haidt and Graham (2007) introduced the idea that five moral foundations order an individual's life. These five basic moral foundations (harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, in group/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity) are classified either as individualizing foundations or binding foundations (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007). Two of them (harm/care and fairness/reciprocity) are considered individualizing foundations and involve the concepts of individual rights, dignity, and safety. The other three (in-group/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity) are considered binding foundations and involve individual responsibilities

to the group they belong to and to its authorities (Graham et al., 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007). This theory about moral foundations has proven useful as a way to demonstrate how social development using the strict father or nurturant parent model may express itself in an adult individual since the strict father variables and the binding foundations have been shown to be associated with conservatism (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008) and the nurturing parent variables and the individualizing foundations have been found to be related with liberalism (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

The Importance of Candidate Choice

The above described social upbringing, group loyalty, and group dominance factors are expressed throughout the diverse pool of demographic groups, cultures, variations in moral philosophy, and interests, of the society in general. The individual groups usually do not live in harmony and mutual acceptance of one another's morality and agendas. Instead, each usually sees its own way of life as being superior to the others and it wishes to impose it on the society in general (Skocpol, 1999). However, even when groups do not seek dominance, they compete with one another for scarce resources: food, water, jobs, ability to live in prestigious neighborhoods, and, ultimately, for survival (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999: Skocpol, 1999). In addition, when one group wins rights or status in the political process, others are usually required to respect and validate these gains (Jost, 2006; O'Neill, 2005). In recent years, this competition, with the rise of such groups as the Evangelical right, the Tea Party, the NAACP, and Occupy Wall Street (Stryker & Wald, 2009), has become intensified. People involved with such groups looking to use government to advance their interests have found that the office most

capable of advancing their goals is that of the U.S. Presidency when the presidency is

occupied by a sympathetic person (Malahy, Rubinlicht, & Kaiser, 2009; Stryker & Wald,

2009; Weisberg, 2011).

The president is the only national political figure elected by all of the nation's

voters. Consequently, he (or she) as an individual has a mandate to wield sweeping power

over national affairs. (Executive Branch, 2011). This mandate is seen by most people in

America and around the world as defining the United States; when people think of the

nation as a whole, they think of this one individual as personifying it (Gathje, 2007). In

addition, he or she also sets the moral tone for the nation (Gathje, 2007). Consequently, if

the president advocates a strict father worldview in governing, the government is

recognized by this philosophy and the policies coming from it. In the case of the strict

father model, this may include providing tax cuts for society's most successful, reduction

or elimination of social spending programs and tough national defense and homeland

security policies (Haidt, 2012; McAdams et al., 2008). Such policies are expressed

through particular government laws and programs introduced by presidents and which

affect millions of people. In contrast, a president advocating a nurturing parent worldview

would govern very differently and in most instances would encourage the opposite

policies and programs (Haidt, 2012; McAdams et al., 2008). Thus, for most social

groups, winning the presidency is a prized goal and they devote much time to endorsing

and campaigning for the candidate they choose.

Candidate Choice Research

Much research has been conducted to determine how people choose among presidential candidates (Kinder, 1978; Lazarus & Reilly, 2010; Leventhal, Jacobs, & Kudirka, 1964; Milton, 1952; Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Metzler & Trent, 2005; Winter, 1987). Most of this research has focused on how political candidates' personal characteristics impact voters' willingness to like and support them (Kinder, 1978; Winter, 1987). Other topics of study have included the relationship between the candidate and voters' political orientation and how voters feel they relate to a particular candidate (Kinder, 1978; Riggio, 2007, Trent et al., 2005; Winter, 1987). Results obtained show that people will vote for the candidate who upholds their ideological (conservative vs. liberal, authoritarian vs. non authoritarian, ideology) point of view. If they lack information on a candidate's ideology they will vote for the one who represents their political party (Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004; Leventhal et al., 1964). Voters will also be more willing to accept derogatorily stereotyping information about the candidate who they oppose as opposed to the one who they support (Courser, 2010; Kosloff et al., 2010; Leventhal et al., 1964). Another factor that has been investigated is voter demographics. This line of research however has produced no relevant insight into candidate choice (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). No research has yet examined how parental upbringing and developing worldview are related to candidate selection.

Statement of the Problem

There has not been any research that has directly linked a person's family upbringing and social influences to that person's presidential candidate choice. Social

dominance, right-wing authoritarianism, subjective socio economic status, and the strict father/nurturing parent variables have, however, been found to determine much of how people view their world, interpret the events and people to whom they are exposed, and set their own agenda and tactics in shaping that world (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Jost, 2006; Jost, et al., 2003; McAdams et al., 2008). On the basis of factors such as these, people are known to make friends and enemies, join social organizations and political parties, form attachment and loyalty towards powerful people who exemplify their belief structure, and otherwise attempt to shape their world in accordance to their vision of how families, schools, businesses, and governments ought to work (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008). A major part of how they make these choices is how they judge the moral character of the people they meet (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

The ways in which they develop their preferences may be correlated to their family and social upbringing (Lakoff, 2002). However, this connection has not been verified by research (Lakoff, 2002). Consequently, research about the influence of the above described factors into candidate selection, especially that involving the presidency, could provide information within a practical context in which people exercise their choices in making the above described decisions (Jost et al., 2003). It could also serve to extend the research about the topics of SDO, RWA, subjective socioeconomic status (SES), the five foundations theory, and the strict father/nurturing parent theories (Graham et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008).

Theoretical Basis for This Study

Factors generally involved in people's social behavior that have shown to be fruitful for investigation about candidate choice include SDO, RWA, SES, parental discipline style, the philosophy of social institution representatives, the voter's perception of his or her socioeconomic subjective SES, and the five moral foundations (Altemeyer, 1996; McAdams et al., 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Based on these factors, a model of how a person develops political attitudes that explain voter behavior is proposed to be tested herein involving parental upbringing (strict father and nurturing parent variables) and worldview that guides behavior in moral decision-making (Creswell, 2003; McAdams et al., 2008). According to the strict father philosophy, individuals develop high group loyalty and a high tendency to exhibit social dominance over out-group members, thus encouraging competition and resulting in unequal statuses between people based on merit (McAdams et al., 2008). In contrast, those raised with a nurturing parent approach to life develop a low need to protect one's in-group, a low desire to dominate outsiders and thus encourage cooperation between individuals that enables groups to help one another to reach their goals and foster a benevolent, compassionate society (McAdams et al., 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In the first case, the obligation to in-group authority and values and the pressure to compete with outsiders helps prevent cooperative arrangements between groups in society. In the second, a desire to seek social diversity by associating with out-group members in a spirit of cooperation helps members of all groups involved to pool their efforts to help build a better world for all of them (McAdams et al., 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Once this basis is established, as people grow into adulthood, they rely on these differing philosophies to anchor their moral ideologies and their interests and derive issues positions based on them. It is theorized that they may choose the political candidates who represent their developed opinions and reject those who oppose their beliefs, worldview, and agenda (McAdams et al., 2008; O'Neill, 2005).

Likely to be involved in this choice are people's levels of SDO and RWA, both of which are related to worldview and related to opinions about the social and moral issues involved in a presidential election (McAdams et al., 2008). People's level of RWA has been shown to be related to their levels of fear of out-groups and the extent that they fear that the influences from these out-groups threaten their way of life and their safety (Altemeyer, 1996). People's level of SDO also suggests the extent that they will seek to dominate others both within and outside of their group (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Subjective SES level has also been proposed as a moderator of the effect of SDO on behaviors since people who are more secure in their position in life might be more likely to protect their interests and to exhibit SDO (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Similarly, the five moral foundations of Graham et al. (2009) define the moral reality in which people operate (Graham et al., 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007). These five foundations consisting of two individualizing foundations (harm/care and fairness/reciprocity) and three obligatory foundations (in-group loyalty, submission to authority, and moral purity) are hypothesized in this model as serving the endpoint for the expression of the other factors in determining a person's outlook on world events (Graham et al., 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007). Since the moral agenda emphasized by the

strict father model and the behaviors of people rated high in SDO and RWA can be expressed well within the socially obligatory code of conduct mandated by the binding foundations, it is proposed that these factors are related. These five foundations have been found to express themselves in research participants according to four different configurations: people who rate high in the individualizing foundations but low in the binding foundations, people who rate high in the binding foundations but low in the individualizing foundations, people who rate low in all five foundations and people who rate high in all five foundations (Haidt, Graham, & Joseph, 2009). These configurations may interact with the variables of the strict father/nurturing parent model, SDO, RWA, subjective SES, to produce four striking political personalities: the Democratic Liberal, the Libertarian, the morally principled Liberal, and the Republican Conservative (Haidt et al., 2009). The interaction between these different aspects of personality is believed to have helped shape America's national political scene, according to the formulators of this model (Haidt et al., 2009).

Finally, the levels found of social dominance and right-wing authoritarianism have been found to influence real world contexts involving peoples' beliefs about such issues as affirmative action, welfare spending, and the war on terror (Eibach & Keegan, 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). People who rated highly in SDO, RWA, the three binding foundations and who believe society's established norms and values determining who deserves economic and social success are fair tend to endorse social inequality and to denigrate the unfortunate (Graham et al., 2009; Hafer, 2000).

Purpose for This Study

The purpose of the mixed methods study was to examine how SDO, RWA, Subjective SES, and the strict father/nurturing parent variables are related to the five moral foundations which have been shown to be related to voter behavior (Graham et al., 2009; Lakoff, 2002). Additionally, how individuals explain their attitudes towards a presidential candidate and the five moral foundations was explored.

The quantitative assessment proposed to test whether the nature of parental upbringing is related to the resultant worldview and moral philosophy and attitudes (Jost et al., 2003; Lakoff, 2002). The dependent variable, the five moral foundations described above, was assessed by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) (Graham et al., 2009) that rates participant levels on five moral foundations of life. This study helps to further our understanding of the established association between the moral foundations and voter behavior by examining how parental upbringing and SDO and RWA are related to these moral foundations. The primary questions being assessed are whether and to what extent the strict father variables, with help from SDO and RWA levels, help form participant adult morality as represented by the binding moral foundations and whether the nurturing parent variables help form an alternative form of that adult morality as expressed by the individualizing foundations (McAdams et al., 2008; Graham et al., 2009).

The qualitative assessment of candidate choice was conducted using a candidate choice questionnaire in which participants, in response to a series of open-ended questions, describe the characteristics of their ideal United States presidential candidate.

The research questionnaire asked participants which of the characteristics of the five moral foundations defined and studied by Haidt and Graham (2007) they prefer to be represented in their ideal president. They also were asked to rate which of these five foundations they prefer and why. In addition, they were also asked to state their preferences for other characteristics related to the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, and RWA, (Haidt et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008). The purpose of the qualitative portion of the study is to more fully understand how individuals make voter decisions based on their moral worldview.

To test the proposed model that describes the variable interactions, confirmatory factor analysis was employed. The results of this analysis were represented in a figure that depicted the strength of the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable and the strength of the relationship of the independent variables with one another. These results indicated to what degree the hypothesized relationships between parental upbringing, SDO and RWA, subjective SES, and a person's moral foundations exist in this study's participants (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

In addition, qualitative analysis of the open ended questionnaire responses revealed information about why participants favor certain candidate characteristics over others and how these preferences reflect their quantitatively assessed attitudes towards the five foundations, the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, and RWA. If their attitudes towards candidates' moral characteristics can be divided into the four different patterns (which in this study they did not, but into five), it would suggest that four (or

five) prototypical presidential candidates may be possible, one prototypical candidate representing each attitude type. This could lead to the development of a candidate choice scale that, based on the above described moral characteristics, may provide research participants with the possibility of rating these candidates and choosing among them. (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).

Since it was theorized that people's parental upbringing will affect their worldview (as expressed through SDO and RWA) and that this will affect their ratings of the five moral foundations, the ratings of these moral foundations were manifested in their choice of presidential candidate characteristics and of the candidates themselves (Erzberger & Kelle, 2003). Therefore, results from these two parts of the study were analyzed as a whole to determine how the quantitative variables just mentioned may be expressed through a participant's preference for a presidential candidate. In addition, I attempted to generate new theories about the presidential election context that could be tested further in future studies (Erzberger & Kelle, 2003).

Based on a statistical power analysis of the independent variables that was tested in this study, a total of at least 153 participants from the Walden University Sona online system were sought for this study (Creswell, 2003). With this system, it is impossible to control for demographic factors such as age, gender, and education and to obtain a wide distribution in ratings of the independent variables. However, whatever demographic distribution was obtained is described along with its ramifications for result interpretation (Haidt & Graham, 2007; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; McAdams et al., 2008). To help validate the results obtained, an attempt was made to recruit an additional

90 participants were recruited via the Old Brooklyn Community Development Corporation, Grace Church in Cleveland Ohio, The Knights of Columbus in Cleveland Ohio, and The Lee Road Branch of the Cleveland Heights/University Heights Library System. They filled out the study's surveys at Grace Church, a neighborhood church in that city and at the Lee Road Library (Creswell, 2003). To aid in data validation and to insure that I obtained enough participants for the study, additional participants were recruited via advertisements in city wide newspapers in representative areas across the United States and in advertisements on Facebook and in various internet blog formats (Creswell, 2003).

Qualitative Research Questions

The qualitative inquiry provided information that could increase understanding of how the five moral foundations may affect candidate choice. Since participants' levels of the five foundations were assessed quantitatively in terms of the strict father/nurturing parent variables, RWA, SDO, and subjective SES, an attempt was made to assess how participant candidate choice would be affected by these findings. Finally, the mediating roles of stereotyping, belief in justice as it concerns the individual's own group, and their interaction with voter personal interests was also explored. Other specific topics of exploration included the following:

- Would participants' responses when they are asked to rate the moral characteristics of their exemplar presidential candidates, analyzed in aggregate, reveal four distinct patterns of responding as was previously found by Haidt et al. (2009)? Would these patterns coincide with participants'

ratings on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire? If they did not, what

possible reasons exist for this discrepancy?

- How do participants' rated SDO levels find emotional expression in a

  presidential candidate choice? How do their levels of RWA find such

  expression?

- How do participant levels of the strict father/nurturing parent variables emerge

  in their sentiments towards their invented candidates? How would the

  characteristics of the five moral foundations, as rated by participants' scores

  on the moral foundations questionnaires, emerge in these sentiments?

Quantitative Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1: Are levels of social dominance orientation, as rated by the SDO Scale,

related to the levels of the characteristics of the three binding foundations as

represented by responses on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire?

$H_0$1: Scores on social dominance orientation are unrelated to scores on each of

the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations

Questionnaire.

H_a1: Scores on social dominance orientation are positively related to each of

the scores on the three obligatory foundations measured by the Moral

Foundations Questionnaire.

RQ2: Are levels of right-wing authoritarianism, as rated by the Altemeyer (2006)

RWA Scale, related to the characteristics of the three binding foundations as

represented by responses to the Moral Foundations Questionnaire?

$H_0 2$: Scores on right-wing authoritarianism are unrelated to each of scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

$H_a 2$: Scores on right-wing authoritarianism are positively related to scores on each of the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

RQ3: Is subjective SES, as measured by the subjective SES 10 point scale (Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000), related to scores on SDO as measured by the SDO Scale?

$H_0 3$: Scores on subjective SES and social dominance orientation are unrelated to each other.

$H_a 3$: Scores on subjective SES and social dominance orientation are positively related.

RQ4: Is subjective SES, as measured by the Subjective SES 10 point scale, related to scores on the five moral foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire?

$H_0 4$: Scores on subjective SES are unrelated to scores on all five moral foundations.

$H_a 4$: Scores on subjective SES are related to scores on all five moral foundations.

RQ5: Are the strict father variable and its subscales, as rated by the McAdams et al. (2008) scale, related to the levels of the characteristics of the three obligatory foundations as represented by responses to the Moral Foundations Questionnaire?

$H_0$5a: Scores on the strict father variables are unrelated to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H_a5a: Scores on the strict father variables are positively related to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

$H_0$5b: Scores on the strict father variables are unrelated to scores on the two individualizing foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H_a5b: Scores on the strict father variables are positively related to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

RQ6: Are scores on the nurturing parent variable and its subscales, as rated by the McAdams et al. (2008) scale, positively related to the levels of the characteristics of the two individualizing foundations as represented by responses to the Moral Foundations Questionnaire?

$H_0$6a: Scores on the nurturing parent variables are unrelated to scores on the two individualizing foundations.

H_a6a: Scores on the nurturing parent variables are positively related to scores on the two individualizing foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

$H_0$6b: Scores on the nurturing parent variable are unrelated to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H_a6b: Scores on the nurturing parent variable are negatively related to scores on the three obligatory foundations.as measured by Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

Strict father/nurturing parent model: This model developed by Lakoff (2002) describes how parental upbringing helps contribute to a person's social and political worldview. This model consists of two parts: the strict father morality and the nurturing parent morality. The first type of morality is believed to be instituted by politically conservative parents. The second is believed to be instituted by politically liberal parents (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008).

Strict father morality: Lakoff (2002) asserts that conservative parents instill this morality into their children. Conservatives who follow this model insist that people need to follow the example set by a strict father in order to succeed in life and to exemplify ideal values. To them, competition, not cooperation, is the basis for success, both for the individual and for the society as a whole (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008).

Nurturing parent morality: Lakoff (2002) asserts that liberal parents instill this morality into their children. Liberals who follow this model insist that people should set up their social relationships and their society to match a nurturing parent model so that people work to encourage one another to achieve great things and to express compassion and support when they experience difficulty. Cooperation, not competition, is the path for both individual and social success (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008).

Rules-reinforcement: This is one of the strict father aspects proposed by McAdams and associates (2008) to operationalize the model developed by Lakoff (2002). Measures of this aspect assess the extent to which people believe that following society's rules is morally just and is paramount for one to achieve success (McAdams et al., 2008).

Self-discipline: One of the two strict father variables proposed by McAdams and associates (2008) to operationalize the model developed by Lakoff (2002). This variable represents the belief that only through self-discipline can someone survive in a world based on competition (McAdams et al., 2008).

Empathy–openness: One of the two nurturing parent variables proposed by McAdams et al., (2008) to operationalize the model developed by Lakoff (2002). Measures of this aspect assess the extent of the belief instilled by parents that perspective taking and honesty are essential in encouraging cooperation between people to make the world a better place (McAdams et al., 2008).

Nurturant caregiving: One of the two nurturing parent aspects proposed by McAdams et al. (2008) to operationalize the model developed by Lakoff (2002). Measures of this aspect assess the extent of the belief instilled by parents that by showing

compassion and helping others in need people can maximize their own happiness and society's prosperity (McAdams et al., 2008).

Social dominance theory: This theory that is the basis for the social dominance orientation asserts that between groups in a society one group will assume dominant status and the other will assume subordinate status (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). According to this theory, the dominant group will possess more of what that society regards as positive social value (such as living in high quality neighborhoods, attending the best schools and universities, and enjoying the best health care) than subordinate groups. In contrast, subordinate groups will be consigned to endure hardships that represent negative social value (living in crime infested neighborhoods, attending poor schools, experiencing little or no health care, and experiencing discrimination at school and the workplace) that underscores their denial of privilege in that society (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Social dominance orientation: Proposed by Sidanius and Pratto (1999) based on social identity theory, measurement of this aspect reflects the tendency of people to hold to a competitive worldview and consequently to seek dominance for the social group they belong to over other groups of lower status. People rated highly in this aspect tend to hold to a Machiavellian worldview and to seek victory and domination over others at all costs (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Social dominance orientation scale: This is a scale developed by Sidanius and Pratto in the 1990s in order to measure their concept of social dominance orientation. The scale has been revised five times. The first five versions of the scale rated

participants' attitudes towards egalitarianism (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The sixth version rates their attitudes towards issues of group dominance and the derogation of out-group members. The present scale consists of 16 questions with eight being straightforward questions and eight counterintuitive questions (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Right-wing authoritarianism: This reflects the tendency of people to hold to traditional beliefs and values of their society. People who are high in this value tend to maintain loyalty towards members of their in-groups and to fear anyone who appears to threaten that group or its way of life. Specifically this conception encompasses three concepts: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1996).

Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale: The first version of this scale was developed by Robert Altemeyer to rate the three concepts of right-wing authoritarianism: authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1996). The latest version of his scale consists of 22 items, 11 of which are straightforward questions and the others are 11 counterintuitive questions to which a no answer means an affirmation of the concept being rated (Altemeyer, 1996). Ingrid Zakrisson, in 2006, developed a revised shorter version of the scale using language spoken by contemporary college students and with questions designed to avoid the confounding effects of controversial social issues that Altemeyer's scale incurred (Zakrisson, 2005). Her version is the oe being used in this study.

Socioeconomic status (SES): Socioeconomic status is the result of determining a person's status in society based on his or her income level, job title and prestige, and

education level. Other factors that can be considered in its assessment are the quality of a one's housing and of the schools at which a person's children attend (Gallo, Bogart, Vranceanu, & Matthews, 2005).

Subjective SES: Subjective SES is a person's informal subjective appraisal of his or her SES level. This rating is informal and does not require actual knowledge of his or her actual SES level (Kluegel, Singleton, & Starnes, 1977).

Subjective SES Scale: This scale rates people's subjective assessment of their socio-economic standing in relation to others in their society (Adler et al., 2000). While the MacArthur Scale employs the picture of an actual ladder on whose rungs participants place their ratings the version used in this study simply asks them to imagine their place on such a ladder (Adler et al., 2000; The MacArthur Research Network on Socioeconomic Status and Health, 2008).

Moral foundations theory: This theory first proposed by Haidt and Graham (2007), based on the work of Haidt and Joseph (2004), postulates that basis of all human morality can be reduced to the acceptance of five foundations (two individualizing foundations and three obligatory or binding foundations; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Haidt & Joseph, 2004).

The two individualizing foundations: These two of the five moral foundations are harm–care, fairness–reciprocity. They refer to those aspects of morality that involve justice and safety for the individual and are concerned with individual rights and safety (Haidt & Graham, 2007).

The three binding foundations: These three of the five moral foundations, in-group-loyalty, authority–respect, and purity–sanctity are binding foundations in that they refer to obligations that people have for their social group, their society, and their commonly held values (Haidt & Graham, 2007).

Moral Foundations Questionnaire: This scale was developed by Graham and associates (2011) to rate people's attitudes about each of the five basic moral foundations. The scale is divided into two parts; the first consists of 16 questions that rate moral relevancy items and the second part consists of 16 additional items that rate people's moral judgment (Graham et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2011).

Stereotype: A stereotype is a preconceived belief about the characteristics or qualities of classes of people or of specific social groups. The extent to which it exists helps to mediate the impact of SDO and RWA (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Prejudice: Prejudice is the expression of stereotypes in discriminatory actions against specific groups or individuals. Such actions are based on prejudgments about personal or group characteristics and not on direct observations of those discriminated against (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Belief in a just world: This is people's tendency to believe that the world's institutions, authorities, and values are just (Hafer, 2000). Those who hold strongly to this belief will tend to blame victimized people for their own sufferings as opposed to questioning society, but they will also be more likely to volunteer for assist others in

community service projects and to cooperate with authority figures who ask for their assistance (Correia, Vala, & Aguiar, 2001).

Social Change Implications

The understanding of how people's values and worldviews impact their voting behavior can aid us all in making intelligent voting choices (Kosloff, Greenberg, Schmader, Dechesne, & Weise, 2010; O'Neill, 2005). Being aware that the upbringing of a strict father or of a nurturing parent, loyalty towards authority and to in-group norms, and our loyalty towards our families and groups can mandate what our worldview will be will enable us to understand how to make more objective social and political judgments. With such knowledge, we can better compare our expectations about the way the world ought to be with the way it is and then try to correct our misconceptions about ourselves, others, and society. If people are not aware of how their basic moral beliefs and values are developed, shaped, and encouraged, they can more easily be manipulated by social and political interest groups into believing that by following such groups agenda will advance their own beliefs. (O'Neill, 2005; Rove, 2010). In order to get elected to the office of President, presidential candidates, as well as those running for other offices, collect a massive amount of polling information and have it analyzed in every imaginable way so that they can get an idea how to make themselves attractive to the greatest number of voters (Rove, 2010). They manage their image to different groups of voters differentially so that each group perceives from the candidate what it wants to (Rove, 2010). Most important in insuring the candidate's election is not only how he tailors his

message to specific audiences, but also how that message emotionally matches his audiences' state of mind (Rove, 2010).

Information about the bases of candidate selection could be incorporated into political science courses about the factors involved in voter behaviors and into courses focused upon presidential elections (Skocpol, 1999). In addition, the information gleaned from this study could be disseminated to educate new voters about how to make the voting decisions that best serve their interests and not those of various interest groups.(Skocpol, 1999).

The Political Context and Practical Issues

Do people's personal moral upbringings or personal circumstances reflect their worldview in candidate choice? As will be discussed later in the review of the presidential candidate choice literature, we have accumulated evidence that people tend to vote for the political candidates they feel comfortable with and who reflects their own ideological beliefs (Prasad et al., 2009). Voters may assess their place in their society, decide what their interests, and assess which candidates uphold their values. However the determination of these factors is not always rational. For instance, Mid-Western working voters have been found to support politicians who advocate economic and legal policies that do not benefit them (Prasad et al., 2009). Understanding this reality has enabled a variety of political interest organizations, politicians, and business groups to devise social campaigns designed not just to inform the public of issues, or to motivate interested people to get involved in the political process, but to directly change public opinion (Malahy, Rubinlicht, & Kaiser, 2009; Shoon, Melzer, & Reese, 2006; Stryker & Wald,

2007). Such appeals have involved invoking themes related to the strict father or nurturing parent models described above (Shoon et al., 2006; Stryker & Wald, 2009.

In recent years the partisan interests have had considerable success in this endeavor. Specifically, Republican presidential candidates such as Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush who favored eliminating social programs won a huge majority of such voters (Prasad et al., 2009). They also relied on polling information to help guide their efforts. Ronald Reagan used such information with considerable effectiveness in identifying the voters who would best respond to his message, tailoring that message to appeal to this group, and adjusting his narrative style to best resonate with their worldview (Hall, 2002).

The political organization of President Barack Obama has also found considerable success in these same endeavors (Scherer, 2012). An enormous amount of information from social networking sites concerning people's political opinions, their buying habits, and their expressed economic interests was collected. Then they used this information to generate television, radio, and internet ads aimed at specific groups and they sent out activists to knock on doors in specific neighborhoods to urge people to vote. Thus not only did they make their message appealing to their target audience, but they also paid personal attention to individuals within that group and were able to get their family and friends to encourage them to vote (Scherer, 2012).

The Tea Party movement was initiated by careful and alert opportunism by corporate interests and right wing think tanks with a very specific agenda and with political experts in positions of influence ready to act on the political process (Courser,

2010; Prasad et al., 2009). They galvanized working class voters to support the issue

positions that served both this population's values and their (the right wing political

entities and corporate) purposes. To do so, the corporate and political leaders of this

movement championed conservative social issue positions that these voters held. Such

positions included opposition to abortion and gay marriage, encouraging religion to be

taught in the schools, and emphasizing family values. All of these positions fit under the

rubric of a traditional right wing Christian world outlook (Courser, 2010; Prasad et al.,

2009; Stryker & Wald, 2007).

House Speaker Newt Gingrich also relied on demographic information to rally

public support for his welfare retrenchment program. He proclaimed that true compassion

should involve enabling these groups to be self-sufficient, to overcome adversity by their

own efforts, and to allow them the freedom to fail. He boasted to aides and colleagues

that this framing of the debate would invoke different thought patterns in the electorate

that would eliminate long held beliefs that had been in effect since the time of President

Franklin D. Roosevelt (Stryker & Wald, 2007).

Democrats and labor unions, for their part, have also shaped issues to fit their

agenda. The recent effort by conservatives in Wisconsin, Ohio, and elsewhere to reign in

public union power and leverage was met by a concerted campaign by labor union

organizers and the state Democratic Parties in which these union members were defined

as the caretaking (and even nurturant) public servants of American society (McDermott,

2011; Moody, 2011). Consequently, acting against them would, they asserted, be acting

against the well-being of the society itself (Moody, 2011).

researcher and a trained graduate student assistant) produced a valid and reliable instrument. This process which works toward the establishment of inter-rater validity and reliability should help reduce researcher bias in interpreting the participant responses obtained from the life Experiences questionnaire (McAdams et al., 2008).

A delimitation of this study is that the participants' political orientation is not rated directly. The use of the university Sona Experiment Management System website eliminates experimenter bias in participant selection. However, it does not guarantee a random selection since the participants are self-selected from a university population. For this reason, care must be taken in interpreting these results (Creswell, 2003). In addition, individual groups within the general population may differ from one another considerably on the variables in question. For example, men rate much higher on SDO than women (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). In addition, law students and corporate executives generally rate higher in SDO than women, psychology students, and nonprofit managers (Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003; Passini, 2008). Evangelical Christians also generally rate higher in RWA than psychology students (Roccato, 2008). In addition, men also tend to higher on the strict father morality variables as well (McAdams et al., 2008). Occupation is also a factor: attorneys and politicians, on average, rate higher on SDO than psychologists and social workers (Guimond et al., 2003). Although no research has rated these occupations for their average levels of either the strict father or the nurturing parent conception of events, it is likely that psychologists and social workers would rate lower than attorneys and politicians on these variables. The inverse relationship is probable for the nurturing parent variables (McAdams et al.,

2008). Hence, this study, while providing a generalized picture of how the independent variables affect the five foundations and through them (in the qualitative exploration) candidate choice, will need to be followed up with other efforts to determine how these relationships hold for other specific groups (Creswell, 2003).

Summary

The agenda that people follow in dealing with the world around them is believed to be determined by a variety of factors including the worldview they are socialized into, their group's place in the social order, and their resultant interests and attitudes towards other groups. These personal and group interests are mediated by the extent they believe in a just world and the stereotypes they hold about outside non group members (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

McAdams et al., 2008 found that parental upbringing lays the foundation of this worldview. It has been found to produce two types of worldviews: those of a strict father and those of a nurturing parent. The strict father worldview emphasizes respect for top down authority, competition, and a zero sum mentality. The nurturing parent worldview espouses nurturing relationships within a group and cooperation between groups to bring personal happiness and fulfillment and a peaceful and prosperous world. The strict father worldview has been found to be related to high scores on Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) (McAdams et al., 2008). RWA is a phenomenon that involves in-group-loyalty and a protection of that group from outside threats. SDO is a phenomenon that involves seeking dominance for one's own group over the members of outside groups. Subjective Socio-Economic Status (SES), a person's

subjective appraisal of his, or her, standing among others in society, has been found to be related to SDO (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Together these phenomena help determine people's identity and behavior in society's social and political systems (McAdams et al., 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). However little work has been done to determine how these factors and how their resultant possible agendas affect political candidate choice.

In order to expand on previous research and to apply the variables mentioned above to candidate choice, the researcher recruited 221 participants for this study. One hundred fifty three of them were to come from the Walden University Sona online system. Others who filled out the study's surveys in person at Grace Church in Cleveland, Ohio were recruited through website advertising by the Old Brooklyn Community Development Corporation (CDC). Consenting participants have filled survey forms measuring the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES, and the five moral foundations. Then they were asked to elaborate on what characteristics they want to see embodied in their ideal presidential candidate. The independent variables were the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES. The dependent variable was the five moral foundations.

Presidential candidate choice was explored through a qualitative component.

Research questions addressed here concern the ability of variables known to have an effect in as person's worldview and issue positions to possibly impact participants' candidate choices. The researcher was able to learn how to better predict how people will react to candidate behavior in representative moral dilemmas. This knowledge could be used to help how people will respond to politician's actions in various situations and to

determine when politicians may be exploiting their personal views to carry out an agenda contrary to their interests.

In Chapter Two, the research literature that explains how the variables at hand have been studied will be presented. Additionally, how researchers measure them and how these measurements have been applied by them to gain insight into social issues such as prejudice, affirmative action, income and social inequality, national defense, and terrorism will be explored.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This review draws upon articles obtained from the PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, Academic Search Complete, SocINDEX with Full Text, Political Science Complete, the SAGE databases, and Google Scholar. Additional literature was also drawn from www.moralfoundations.org.

Background

Much research has been conducted about elections and the process of candidate choice (Trent et al., 2005). Such research has not found any particular variables that solely determine candidate choice. Instead a multitude of factors appear to influence people's preference for a political candidate, each one contributing a small but significant proportion to the choice (Trent et al., 2005). Participants tend to support candidates whom they rate as trustworthy, of the highest moral character, experienced in holding political office, and careful and deliberative in making policy decisions (Trent et al., 2005). Research into voter behavior has examined the accuracy of voter perceptions of presidential candidates (Kinder, 1978; Milton, 1952), the process of liking and respecting a candidate (Brent & Granberg, 1982), and the relationship between voters' own tendencies toward authoritarianism and their support for such past presidential candidates as Douglas MacArthur and George Wallace (Kinder, 1978; Milton, 1952). Other studies have attempted to identify the factors that make the ideal presidential candidate (Trent et al., 2005). Finally, work has been done to determine how partisan supporters of Republican and Democratic candidates attend to, cognitively process, and respond to stereotyping concerning their own and the opponents' candidate (Kosloff et al., 2010).

While many studies about voter behavior exist, these efforts have involved only a rudimentary examination of voter values and worldview on their political decision-making. Their investigations were confined to such factors as left/right political orientation, Democratic or Republican Party membership, and their participants' levels of authoritarianism (Leventhal, Jacobs, & Kudirka, 1964; Kinder, 1978; Milton, 1952). Very little research has delved deeply into varying worldviews, the origin of those views, and how they are related to candidate choice. Consequently, additional effort is required to determine how voters' personal worldviews and moral beliefs affect their candidate choices (Altemeyer, 1996; Kinder, 1978; Milton, 1952).

A person's worldview is thought to be greatly determined by that person's upbringing and the examples set by parents, teachers, and others (Jost et al., 2003; Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008). This worldview, once formed, likely becomes the basis for forming beliefs about major issues in a person's life. In addition, it also can become the basis for the relationships a person forms with others and helps to determine who is chosen for those relationships (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008). Among the concepts that have been developed that represent a detailed look at people's worldview are RWA, SDO, subjective SES, the strict father and nurturing parent models developed by George Lakoff, and the five moral foundations developed by Haidt and Graham (2007 (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Right-wing authoritarianism is one possible element of a worldview and is a concept based on the Authoritarianism Scale developed by Adorno in 1950 (Altemeyer, 1996). This construct reflects the tendency of people to hold to traditional beliefs and

values of their society. These who score high tend to maintain loyalty towards members of their in-groups and to fear anyone who appears to threaten that group or its way of life. Specifically, this idea encompasses three concepts: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1996). In his development of the RWA Scale, Altemeyer tested many concepts associated with authoritarianism and found that only three of them were interrelated and had predictive validity (Altemeyer, 1996). Altemeyer then developed and tested questions for this scale based on these questions. This researcher's efforts and those of others (Crowson, 2009; Roccato, 2008) studying RWA involved determining how the possession of high degrees of authoritarianism has assisted people's functioning within the social system into which they were indoctrinated from birth (Altemeyer, 1996). The RWA scale has been tested and found to be valid and reliable across capitalistic nations such as the United States, Canada, and Israel, and in socialist nations such as Italy and the Scandinavian countries (Altemeyer, 1996; Altemeyer, 2006). However, its validity has been questioned in the use of this scale in communist countries such as the Soviet Union wherein authoritarianism is encountered more often in those who hold left-wing political views (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina-Paap, 1992). Chapter 3 contains additional information about the measurement of validity and reliability for this and the other scales used in this study.

In addition to RWA, social dominance orientation has also been proposed as a component of the way that an individual may view the world. Developed by Sidanius and Pratto (1999) and based on social identity theory, this construct reflects the tendency of people to hold to a competitive worldview and consequently to seek dominance for the

social group to which they belong over other groups of lower status. People rated highly in this variable tend to hold to a Machiavellian worldview and to seek victory and domination over others at all costs (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Sidanius and Pratto developed their social dominance orientation scale based on 45 different participant groups involving 11 different nations (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). From the beginning, they set out to assess group dominance attitudes but not the kind of dominance that can occur between individuals. They also attempted to insure that their final scale reflected not just inequality tolerance but social dominance motivation. They assert that such motivation was not borne out of Judeo Christian based respect for authority as is the case for RWA but out of a Machiavellian desire to exalt one's own group and to mercilessly destroy rivals (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Subjective SES is also found to affect worldview and is a concept developed by a variety of researchers over time (Adler, et al., 2000; Gallo et al., 2005; Kluegel, Singleton, & Starnes, 1977). It has been found that objectively derived socioeconomic status ratings based on economic data have little predictive validity in assessing present or future well-being and social success of the people rated. However subjective ratings of their own well-being by the participants themselves do (Adler, et al., 2000; Gallo et al., 2005; Kluegel, Singleton, & Starnes, 1977). Consequently, study of the consequences of social and economic class status have focused increasingly on its subjective elements (Adler et al., 2000; Gallo et al., 2005; Kluegel et al., 1977). Subjective SES is rated on a ten point scale along which people are asked to estimate their overall level of social and

economic functioning and success (Adler et al., 2000; Gallo et al., 2005; Kluegel et al., 1977).

When examining how one's worldview develops, several models have been proposed. Lakoff (2002) developed the strict father and nurturing parent models to help explain not only how political liberals and conservatives order their lives and think about issues but also how their beliefs originate in the first place (Lakoff, 2002). McAdams and associates (2008) tested the validity of these models by operationalizing each of them into two variables and then testing them (McAdams, et al., 2008). They did this by asking their research participants to write about various turning points in their lives that represented the development of particular concepts of importance to them. Their efforts have been augmented by those of Graham et al., (2009) who simultaneously with McAdams and colleagues developed and tested the assertion that the entire moral reality in which people live can be boiled down to five foundations. They analyzed people's statements for specific words or phrases indicating which of the foundations had their focus.

<div align="center">**The F Scale Usage**</div>

Presidential Candidate Preferences and Authoritarianism

The first attempts to discern the relationship between a people's worldviews and moral dispositions and their candidate choice began with what has come to be known as The F scale (Altemeyer, 1996). This scale, which was designed to rate the characteristics of Fascists (which is what the F stands for), is the forerunner of the RWA and SDO

scales; it contains subscales that measure authoritarian aggression, power and toughness, conventionalism, submission, superstition and stereotyping (Altemeyer, 1996).

Studies using this scale have rated candidate choice in relationship to the authoritarian tendencies of the participants. Among these was Milton's (1952) rating of 390 University of Tennessee students' presidential candidate choices among the following candidates: MacArthur, Eisenhower, Stevenson, Russell, Kefauver, and Taft in relation to their F Scale Score (Milton, 1952). Milton found that 74 % of those students favoring candidates MacArthur and Taft had F scores in the top 25% while 62% of those students favoring Stevenson and Eisenhower scored in the bottom 25 % (Milton, 1952).

Given that MacArthur and Taft had aggressive tendencies in foreign affairs and criminal justice matters (Milton, 1952), these results upheld the contention that authoritarian oriented voters would choose authoritarian candidates (Milton, 1952).

Leventhal, Jacobs, and Kudirka (1964) also studied authoritarianism and its relationship to people's political affiliation in the Nixon-Kennedy presidential election of 1960. When they asked Yale University undergraduate psychology students to fill out F scale rating forms (along with political party membership, and their inclination on an 11 point scale to vote either for Nixon or Kennedy, ranging from -5 for Nixon to +5 for Kennedy) they found that students scoring high on the F scale were more likely to vote for Nixon (the conservative candidate) than for Kennedy (the liberal candidate), and those scoring low on that scale displayed the opposite tendency and supported Kennedy over Nixon. High F scoring was also related to Republican Party membership with 76%

of high scorers indicating that they held Republican affiliations. Those supporting the

Democratic Party exhibited low F scores 65% of the time (Leventhal et al., 1964).

The authors validated their results using student reactions to the 1962 midterm

congressional elections when they presented three different pairs of congressional

candidates to participants (Leventhal et al., 1964). Here, the researchers attributed typical

liberal (nonauthoritarian) statements to Republican candidates and typically conservative

statements to Democratic candidates. Once again, high F scale scorers chose the

authoritarian and conservative Democratic candidate even when party affiliation was

reversed (Leventhal et al., 1964).

Expanding upon these results, Rasinski (1987) found a division between liberal

and conservative presidential candidate supporters in their definition of fair distributive

justice. Liberals favored a nonauthoritarian equitable distributive system while

conservatives favored a hierarchical merit-based one (Rasinski, 1987). Specifically,

supporters of Walter Mondale (the liberal candidate) were found to favor distribution of

societal resources to the poor to encourage egalitarianism. Supporters of Ronald Reagan,

on the other hand, favored equity justice that created equal opportunity for all to obtain

their own necessities of life. Reagan supporters favored a merit-based hierarchical system

while Mondale supporters were more interested in equality for all in material possessions

and resources (Rasinski, 1987).

Development of the RWA Scale

In 1981, Altemeyer, drawing on experience with the F Scale, developed the RWA

scale. Altmeyer found that of all the factors that social psychologists and others had

speculated to be a part of RWA, only three of them—authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, and conventionalism—were related with one another and could be measured (Altemeyer, 1996). Since it was released in 1973, the RWA scale has undergone multiple revisions almost every year (Altemeyer, 2006). The first version of the scale was released in 1973 and had 24 items. The next major version was released in 1979 and had 30 items. During the period of 1970 to 1973, Altemyer tested 300 items for potential inclusion into the study in eight research projects (Altemeyer, 1996). The researcher also added counterintuitive items, those for which a participant's positive response indicated the opposite view of the attitude (or concept) being rated in the questionnaire. The current version of the scale has an equal number of intuitive (straightforward) and counterintuitive items (Altemeyer, 2006) Chapter three contains more information about validation studies for this scale.

The RWA construct developed from Altemeyer's efforts consists of three factors: authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, and conventionalism. Authoritarian aggression involves the desire of authoritarians to control others' behavior through fear and punishment. This control (and the fear that it imposes) is believed to reflect the power their own parents wielded over their behavior when they were children. Consequently, they advocate punishment in childrearing and harsh sentences in criminal court cases. Socially unconventional people, including racial minorities, foreigners with strange social customs, political liberals and homosexuals are usually the targets of the wrath generated in support of this view (Altemeyer, 1996).

The term authoritarian submission refers to the tendency to submit to respected authorities and to trust in their statements and mandates without question. People rated high in this aspect of RWA believe that people should submit to authorities as children submit to their parents and that dissent against them should be limited. In addition, they tend to believe that established authorities have an inherent right not only to make society's rules and also to break those rules themselves even while they demand obedience from others. People who, to them, qualify as legitimate authorities include parents, teachers, police and military officers, judges, and political leaders (Altemeyer, 1996).

Finally, conventionalism refers to the reverence toward and adoption of the predominant norms of society by the high RWA person. This reverence is thought to be often based on the traditional religious teachings of a society that mandate moral beliefs and the rules that they involve. Consequently, individuals scoring high in RWA tend to reject an individual's right to decide moral issues for him or herself and tend to feel that people who do so are a threat to society's social fabric (Altemeyer, 1996).

RWA Formation in Childhood

Altemeyer (1988) found, based on a survey of 557 college age students attending the University of Manitoba and 521 of their parents using the RWA scale, that the RWA of a parent was related to that of his or her child (Pearson $r = .42$). Peterson, Smirles, and Wentworth (1997) found a similar result of $r = .48, p < .001$ when they compared the RWA scores of 200 University of New Hampshire University students and one hundred

fifty-nine of their parents using the 30 item RWA scale (Peterson, Smirles, & Wentworth, 1997).

Altemeyer speculated that RWA was developed through parental teaching. Indeed, he used correlation evidence from the same study that found that parental RWA and the RWA they expect from their children were related by $r = .88$. Such parental influence that encourages intra-family, intra-neighborhood, and intra-national loyalty and the suspicion of outsiders seems to be internalized by the time the child reaches adolescence (Altemeyer, 1988). Altemeyer also surveyed 206 of these students' best friends and found that peers have some effect on children's RWA scores rating ($r =.31$) (Altemeyer, 1988). These results strongly suggest that RWA development probably originates from relationships with the different important people in childhood whose influences have worked together on the child. The effects seem to involve social learning following Bandura's model (Altemeyer, 1988), direct teachings, and imitation. Among the direct teachings Altemeyer mentioned was that of obedience (Altemeyer, 1988); he found that many households prioritize obedience above all other values, especially for small children. Consequently, children thus exposed learn that obedience would keep them secure and that the consequences for straying from the norms could be deadly (Altemeyer, 1996).

While Altemeyer offered no direct evidence about how RWA developed in childhood, only having provided theory, later work involving the Lakoff and McAdams and associates variables (these will be discussed later) provide supportive evidence for his hypothesis (Lakoff, 2002).

RWA and Childhood Activities

Roccato (2008) elaborated further on RWA's role in childhood development and functionality when she assessed how RWA and attachment styles contributed to an adult person's worldview formation (Roccato, 2008). She surveyed353 Italians Using Italian adaptions of the RWA and SDO, scales and Carver's Measure of Attachment Qualities (which rates interpersonal attachment styles). Her results upheld the idea that RWA involves the internalization of an authoritarian worldview. This internalization in turn seems to have been fostered by certain experiences individuals reported; Among those mentioned was playing on a sports team in which the child learned solidarity towards an in-group which discouraged contact with outside influences and loyalty towards its leader and his or her agenda. RWA levels seem to have been reduced by other experiences that encourage the acceptance of multiple viewpoints such as engaging in creative endeavors as joining a music group (Roccato, 2008).

RWA and Religious Experience

Religious experience was also found to be related to RWA scores. Roccato found that engaging in such religious activities as attending worship services and bible studies groups can predict RWA, but that RWA levels did not lead to religious organization involvement (Roccato, 2008). She asserted that the doctrines of most organized religions mandate a fellowship and community among their followers that encourages a sense of family within the divine family of God and devoted worshippers. This appears, she asserted, to result in higher RWA levels. Once created, RWA in turn seems to spur further religious involvement. Indeed, in religious services, the faithful tend to express

their religious beliefs through the adoption of religious doctrine that (in the case of Judeo

Christian belief) tends to emphasize top down authority and reverence for traditional

beliefs (Roccato, 2008). In contrast to religious practice, studying psychology and

sociology seems to lower RWA and the importance a person places on religion (Roccato,

2008).

Living in an Authoritarian Home

One may expect to find that living in an authoritarian home would decrease a

child's ability to form egalitarian and secure relationships with others. While Rocatto

found this to be true, she also found that RWA was surprisingly positively related to

secure attachment through a relationship with religion. In her work, she found that it was

religion that seemed to lead to secure style attachments through the loyalty of its

members fellowship. This fellowship encourages both secure attachment and higher

levels of RWA in families that are involved in organized religion (Roccato, 2008).

Conversely, for people who rate low in RWA, their formative relationships may not

encourage a top down authority value system and fear of outsiders; therefore, they are

free to explore their environment and to define their relationships and their life priorities

as they choose (Altemeyer, 1996). Such exploratory activities as performing in a musical

group represent such freedom and enables musical band members to foster relationships

that diverge from the RWA pattern (Crouse & Stalker, 2007; Roccato, 2008).

Parent and Child RWA Similarity

However, when parent and child RWA levels differ, parents may not only have

failed to transmit their authoritarian outlook to their children, but may also find

themselves cut off from communication with their children if they should choose not only a different political world outlook but also different positions on a variety of political issues (Peterson & Duncan, 1999). Peterson and Duncan (1999) explored how parent child RWA similarity or difference affects their level of agreement on social and political issues. They used an RWA scale, a measure rating the subjective importance of 18 20th Century social movements and a self-report that measured the extent that young adults learn political activities either from parental example or from their consumption of popular culture such as the movies they watched, the books and newspaper articles they read and the extent that they and they join their parents in their chosen activities (Peterson & Duncan, 1999).

The researchers found that a high correlation between the student's RWA and that of his or her parents was related to their holding similar political beliefs. This relationship was strongest for those students and parents who rated low on RWA. Students and parents with closely matching RWA scores also demonstrated closer agreement on specific political issues than those with dissimilar scores. In addition, they also spent more time discussing their attitudes and beliefs with one another and spent more time engaging in similar politically related activities. They exhibited more similar tastes in popular culture items. However, the opposite was also true: Parents and children with dissimilar RWA scores spent less time engaging in joint activities and exhibited greater difference in their preference for popular culture items. They also disagreed more about major political issues (Peterson & Duncan, 1999). The researchers concluded that similarity between parents and children in their levels of authoritarianism facilitated the

intergenerational transfer of values and encouraged engagement in the activities that edify these values by both parents and children. However, dissimilarity in authoritarianism was seen as leading children to a break from their parents' ways to forge their own direction in life (Peterson & Duncan, 1999).

Institutional Authoritarianism Socialization

Social institutions can also play a role in socializing RWA. Gatto and Dambrum's (2012) surveyed 301 French academy police cadets for their levels of SDO, RWA, and answers to selected SDO and RWA question items relevant to police activities as they underwent training. They found that the cadets chosen had a high level of police relevant RWA as well as SDO and that these levels increased dramatically as the cadets were indoctrinated into the law enforcement culture. The authors speculated that this could result in extreme conformity to traditional police norms that in turn could lead to possible abuses of police power in spite of strict procedures designed to prevent such abuses (Gatto & Dambrum, 2012).

Rubinstein (2006) obtained similar results when he surveyed 160 Israelis who were border police, students working as airport security, career soldiers, and students temporarily employed at other jobs using the Israeli version of the RWA scale and a demographic questionnaire which rated among other things their political affiliation. He found that border police exhibited the highest levels of RWA followed by both the student airport security guards and the career soldiers, and then followed by the students employed in other jobs (Rubinstein, 2006). Since the border patrol officers dealt with the Palestinians, regarded by many Israelis as their national enemies, they had plenty of

opportunity to be indoctrinated into fearful attitudes concerning the potential threat from the Palestinians and what must be done to keep them in line (Rubinstein, 2006). Both the career soldiers and the student airport security screeners were young and had little opportunity for RWA indoctrination; the same was true for the other students (Rubinstein, 2006).

RWA functions. RWA appears to serve a function of providing security and belongingness in politically conservative homes. People raised in such a setting learn that they can remain in a secure environment in which they have an accepted worldview and are accepted and encouraged in their pursuit of socially acceptable goals (Crouse & Stalker, 2007). In addition, the cohesion of their relationships is encouraged when they face outsiders who threaten their instilled way of life. In addition, high RWA people may align with a powerful leader who grants them a sense of purpose, imposes a delegation of duties on them, and provides them with a sense of security, since like God, authorities often wield power (Heaven, Organ, Supavadeeprasit, & Leeson, 2005; Roccato, 2008). Crouse and Stalker (2007) assert that this sense of security protects the high RWA person from the realization this human life is insignificant, frail, and short lived (Crouse & Stalker, 2007). Consequently, they feel it necessary to defend their leader against all offenses and assaults, real or imagined, and by doing so, they defend their worldview from being corrupted and in the process defend their family and friends from harm whether physically or morally. Such defense of the social hierarchy may also include the determination that women should remain in strict submission to their husbands and children remain obedient to all adults and silent unless spoken to. For all of the above

reasons, such a person will also support conventionally accepted norms, values, customs, and relationships. Such perceptions should also lead to a perception that the world is a dangerous place to live and that only a strong national defense and a thorough homeland security policy can protect society from attack. Such a person also would not tolerate dissension against official policy or tolerate originality in the development of social and political beliefs (Crouse & Stalker, 2007).

Consequently, people rating high in RWA are often found to have joined conservative religious organizations, to support conservative issue positions on abortion, gay rights, immigration and about cultural and religious diversity. They also might oppose social programs and cash benefit programs assisting the poor. Such programs might not threaten their members physically, as would an enemy army or a terrorist bomb, but they may be seen as weakening the high RWA person's in-group discipline, hard work, and reliance on top down authority for functioning and sense of identity (Altemeyer, 1996). Therefore, such programs may be seen as tools of an outside enemy (Altemeyer, 1996). However, this opinion, as will be mentioned later, is often influenced by other factors such as SDO as well (Crouse & Stalker, 2007; Roccato, 2008).

Real life Consequences of Authoritarianism

Right-wing authoritarianism through its effect on how people view their social world and others in it has been found to impact people's attitudes and behaviors on both domestic and foreign policy issues from such areas as government social programs and welfare reform and affirmative action to terrorism and the use of police authority (Altemeyer, 1996).

Attitudes Towards Welfare Recipients

American college students high in RWA, who have less information from which to draw inferences about the outside world, can only assume that those outside their group have the same social advantages that they do tend to believe that poverty is caused by personal as opposed to situational events and to believe that the poor receive the fate that they earn (Altemeyer, 1996; Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001; Lupfer, Hopkinson, & Kelley, 1988). Cozzarelli and associates (2001) found, after surveying 209 undergraduates from an American Midwestern college, that such individuals also exhibit loyalty towards the middle class. They tended to strongly accept that all of the positive stereotypes about the middle class are correct while all of the negative stereotypes about the poor are true (Cozzarelli et al., 2001). They also tended to cite poor parenting, weak policing, and a lack of self-discipline and welfare dependence that encourages laziness as causal factors for poverty. Consequently, they might deem as a threat any politician or activist who seeks to procure positive action in support of the poor (Altemeyer, 1996). Other groups that they often feared included gang members, drunk drivers, violent criminals, and people who behave in what they deem to be immoral ways (Asbrock, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2010). They also expressed apprehension for the following disenfranchised groups: protestors, atheists, gay rights activists, feminists, and prostitutes (Asbrock et al., 2010). However, they did not express fear of or hate for the poor or deviant groups themselves but only for the social disorder that these groups represent and might encourage (Altemeyer, 1996; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Cross, Cross, & Finch, 2010). Indeed, they also were not categorically opposed to government social spending, but

might actually support that which helps advance their own group's interests: High RWA rated students have been found to support government financing for education programs for gifted students that encourage group learning and shared values while opposing programs that involve providing individualized attention for each student (Cross et al., 2010).

Addressing Crime and the War on Terror

High levels of RWA correlated in a powerful way with people's criminal justice and terrorism attitudes. Feather (1998), when surveying Australian residents, found that people rated highly in RWA were more likely than those rated low to blame criminal suspects for their illegal activities either in a political protest or a high speed chase and to hold police officers involved in the same incidents less responsible when they behaved inappropriately (Feather, 1998). This tendency was also inversely related to universalistic values that reflect acceptance for differing perspectives and cultures as well as tolerance for others. Consequently, as has been found in other studies (Altemeyer, 1988; 1996; Feather, 1998) reverence for authorities seemed to block the ability to understand the perspective of others outside their own group (Feather, 1998).

RWA has been shown to relate similarly to attitudes related to terrorism (Crowson, 2009; Heaven et al., 2005). Both Crowson (2009). surveying American college students, and Heaven et al. (2005), surveying Australian college students found that, within both national groups, those who are rated highly in RWA were likely to approve crackdowns on deviant groups and individuals in the War on Terror waged by the United States and its international allies against any group, nation, or person, who

might be affiliated with terror activity. These results were interpreted by the researchers as a response to the attacks on the Twin Towers in New York and the Pentagon in Washington September 11, 2001 (Crowson, 2009; Heaven et al., 2005). The authors found that students having high levels of RWA tended to hold themselves as belonging to the legitimate hegemonical group. As such, they believed that they would not suffer as a result of such anti-terror policies (Crowson, 2009; Heaven et al., 2005).

Kossowska et al., (2011) expanded on these results when they surveyed people in four European countries using an RWA survey and the Civil Libertarianism Scale (CLS) (which rates participants' approval of government restrictions on civil liberties) in reference to two different factors: whether their country was attacked by al-Qaeda and whether public opinion in a particular country favored or opposed government enhanced terror surveillance policies (Kossowska et al., 2011). These countries were Poland (which was not attacked by al-Qaeda but whose people favored government surveillance policies), Belgium (which was not attacked by al-Qaeda and whose people opposed government surveillance policies), Spain (which was attacked by al-Qaeda but whose people opposed government surveillance policies), and England (which was attacked by al-Qaeda and whose people favored government surveillance policies) (Kossowska et al., 2011).

The researchers found that RWA was related to the acceptance of civil liberty restrictions in all four nations. While being hit by a terrorist act and favoring government surveillance was most related to RWA for the British participants, it was least related for the Spanish sample. Indeed, the Spanish participants, when compared to the other

nations' respondents, resisted government anti-terror policies regardless of their RWA levels (Kossowska et al., 2011). Hence, it appeared that even when hit by a terrorist attack, the Spanish people regarded government actions as an affront to their civil rights. This appeared to indicate that while high RWA British participants were willing to identify with their government, the high RWA Spanish participants were not. The reason for such differences between people's identification with their nation's government will be elaborated on in the next section that discusses the social dominance orientation (Kossowska et al., 2011).

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) is another worldview perspective that can impact voting behavior. As a concept and a phenomenon, it was first described by Sidanius and Pratto (1999) as the tendency of groups of authoritarian people to favor inequality and non-egalitarian relationships among different groups of people. Such groups have been defined in a variety of ways; it may be by race, religion, creed, gender, or any distinction in which hierarchical non-egalitarian relationships are possible (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The concept of SDO was based on the Social Identity Theory (SIT) postulated by Henri Tajfel and his associates in the 1970s (Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979; Vaughan, Tajfel, & Williams, 1981). They found that people who were divided into two arbitrary groups spontaneously favored the interests of their assigned group and developed stereotypes about their opponents (Turner et al., 1979). They also found that the group members allocated community resources in a way that favored their

group over the opponent group even when that strategy harmed their group's interests (Vaughan et al., 1981).

Social Dominance Theory

Sidanius and Pratto (1999) developed social dominance theory (SDT) which adds power as an additional variable to SIT (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). SDT posits that once individuals join groups, these groups exist in hierarchical fashion with some groups holding authority and power over others (Pratto et al., 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The groups at the apex of this social structure enjoy all the things that are desirable in society: good housing, the best schools, the best salaries paid at the highest jobs, along with social status, authority and power. Lower status groups endure the opposite fate and find life in society to be difficult and brutal. A high status person with ambition, determination, and ability will be more likely to succeed in life than a comparable person from a lower status group (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). These individuals also are willing to defend their achieved social position and feel threatened by anyone who questions its legitimacy. Indeed, Pratto and Shih (2000) found that Stanford students rated highly in SDO felt threatened when an editorial questioned their status as elite students. They deflected such criticism as applying to other students and expressed favorable sentiments about themselves (Pratto & Shih, 2000). This finding has been upheld even when all other factors such as age, gender, race, and culture had been controlled for (Sidanius, Pratto, & Mithchell, 2001).

How SDO Functions

Sidanius and Pratto assert that social status differences can be mediated by three processes: aggregated institutional discrimination aggregated individual discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Aggregated institutional discrimination refers to the discrimination that is initiated against an out-group individual by societal institutions on behalf of the dominant group. Aggregated individual discrimination refers to the discrimination that individuals of the dominant group exert on minority group members. Behavioral asymmetry refers to the tendency of dominant group members to behave in ways that advance their goals and their social image while minority group members behave in self destructive ways based on the negative stereotypes that fit their group (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The authors assert that the differential treatment of these dominant and minority groups provides dominant society members with the relationships, opportunities, and skills to be successful. At the same time, it shuts the door to these resources against minority groups spurring members of these groups to antisocial and dysfunctional behaviors (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

This discrimination is in turn mediated by legitimizing myths. These myths consist of two types: those that encourage or enhance unequal status and those that attenuate it (Pratto et al., 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The extent to which a person advocates the stereotype enhancing myths represents his or her level of SDO. SDO does not occur in a vacuum but is mediated by stereotyping (Heaven et al., 2005; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Yee and Brown (1992) found that children, when divided into groups, based their identity upon their group membership. They also accepted arbitrarily designated status differences between them when the experimenter, judging their performance on a running task, praised the performance of one group and criticized that of the other (Yee & Brown, 1992). Mullen, Brown & Smith (1992) conducted a meta-analysis of studies concerning dominant/submissive group relations and found that in every case the dominant group displayed greater social cohesion that the submissive one. Both groups accepted hierarchy enhancing stereotypes (perceptions that highlighted the morality and functionality of the higher status group but highlighted the dysfunction and immorality of the lower status group) and acted upon them (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992).

Characteristics of SDO

Passini (2008) found that Italian college students rating high in SDO tended to actively seek power and authority not just for their in-group but also in their interpersonal relationships. They were ambitious, goal driven, and willing to use other people to obtain their objectives (Passini, 2008). In addition, they were not inclined to be empathetic or to accommodate others, and acted in tough-minded, manipulative, and callous ways (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). Bäckström and Björklund (2007), surveying Swedish high school students, found that two of the four sub factors of empathy (perspective taking, and empathetic concern) were repressed when SDO was expressed (Bäckström & Björklund, 2007). Consequently, those high in SDO also tended to place little priority on such concerns as social and economic fairness and equality but instead adopted an all's

fair attitude concerning the tactics used to attain success in such matters (Heaven et al., 2005).

The members of dominant groups who were high in SDO also tended to morally exclude anyone who either is an out-group member or who is opposed to their agenda. They also were materialistic and expressed a determination to protect what they feel is theirs. Hence they usually held to a conservative political affiliation (Passini, 2008). In contrast to people rated high in RWA, people high in SDO were not afraid of new ideas; however, they intentionally rejected them if they posed a threat to their plans (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). Finally, evidence has surfaced that a person rated highly in SDO may hold to an opinion very strongly even in the face of disconfirming information. Tausch and Hewstone, (2010) found this when they rated British college student responses to stereotype confirming information or stereotype disconfirming information about the characteristics of representative elderly people. Students rated highly in SDO who expressed negative stereotypes about such people held to these stereotypes even when they were presented with descriptions of specific elderly persons that directly contradicted such beliefs. The students, the researchers asserted, might have been trying to impose their will on the stereotyping situation and to discredit disconfirming information (Tausch & Hewstone, 2010).

Social Dominance, Social Relationships, and Consequences

Differential Treatment of Outside Groups and Prejudice

Once people decide who is an in-group and who is an out-group member, they may behave differently towards members of each group. In a study of 3,667 secondary

school students from 33 high schools in England, Belgium, and Germany, Binder et al.

(2009) found that threat to the dominance of one's group mediated their behavior towards

outsiders (Binder et al., 2009). Furthermore, they found that reactions to the perceived

threat involved reducing both the quality and quantity of their interactions with lower

status group members in order to insure that these groups remain disadvantaged. In the

process, they also reduced the extent of cooperation between the groups. When the

researchers assessed three positive and three negative emotions, they found that these

individuals who possessed the greater level of negative emotions in combination with

increased social distance created the most avoidance of the minority group: the greater

the negative emotions and the social distance between the two groups the worse the

quality of the interaction and the lower the contact levels between the groups (Binder et

al., 2009). Anxiety was the behavior through which these negative emotions showed in

reducing both the quality and quantity of interactions. For majority group members it led

to an increase in discriminatory behavior, however, for minority group members it did

not (Binder et al., 2009).

Finally, when majority members did form friendships with minority members,

this did not diminish their stereotyping or prejudice for the minority group itself (Binder

et al., 2009). The anxiety reaction is what one would expect from people acting because

of RWA (Binder et al., 2009). Finally, friendships with particular group members did not

reduce stereotyping. Dominant group members did not identify their minority group

member friends as members of these groups but as individuals. Minority group

stereotypes did not apply to these friends, but did apply for their group as a whole.

Indeed, even with minority group friends, the behaviors of the dominant group members explicitly perpetuated the status difference (Binder et al., 2009).

Confirmation Bias in Stereotyping

People who employ stereotyping and prejudice actively looked for clues in their environment that uphold their beliefs and ignore disconfirming evidence (Sherman, Stroessner, Conrey, & Azam, 2005). This result was previously mentioned as occurring with high SDO persons (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Sherman and associates (2005) tested the way people use stereotypical and counter-stereotypical information in the formation of impressions about others; they utilized Northwestern University undergraduates who were asked to form an opinion about a prototypical gay man named Robert from a story that included homosexually stereotypical items and homosexual counter-stereotypical items (Sherman et al., 2005).

The results indicated that, while participants who rated low in prejudice successfully identified stereotypical items from Robert's description, those who were moderate and high in prejudice were more scrupulous in finding all such relevant items whether they fit the person's description or not. Indeed, people high in prejudice were better at encoding stereotypically inconsistent information than those who were low or medium in prejudice (Sherman et al., 2005). They seemed to be sensitized to counter stereotypical information so that they could explain it away. Doing so enabled them to uphold the validity of their stereotyped beliefs (Sherman et al., 2005). Indeed, they paid more attention to stereotyped inconsistent behaviors than stereotyped consistent ones. In doing this they regarded Robert's stereotype inconsistent behaviors as being due to

chance and his stereotype consistent behaviors as reflecting internal dispositions

(Sherman et al., 2005). These results suggest that people moderate and high in prejudice

are eager to find fault with others: They have a purpose for holding to a prejudicial

outlook and adeptly use it to achieve their goals (Sherman et al., 2005; Sidanius & Pratto,

1999).

Stereotyping and Voter Behavior

Party affiliation in and of itself has not been found to inspire voters to select a

particular candidate. However, motivated social cognition can (Skitka, Mullen, &

Griffin, 2002). Voters (both liberal and conservative) tended to support the candidate who

upheld negative stereotypes concerning marginalized groups and proposed acts against

them (e.g., to cut welfare benefits or to increase criminal penalties for norm violators)

(Skitka et al., 2002). However, liberals, when confronted with evidence that their

stereotyped responses were wrong, reevaluated the information upon which they based

their judgment and reversed their previous decision. This was especially true when they

received accurate stereotype disconfirming information about particular individuals

(Skitka et al., 2002).

Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotyping

Descriptive stereotyping involves lumping people together into one cognitive

category and judging members of that category only according to the group construct.

Prescriptive stereotyping involves the imposition of the stereotyped belief on the person

being stereotyped and might involve the use of coercion to make labeled people conform

to the social expectations that the dominant person or group holds (Fiske, 1993).

Fiske (1993), after testing college students, confirmed that powerful people use stereotyping more than those under their authority. This occurred, she concluded, because the powerful need not fear those lower in social status and do not depend on them to fulfill any basic needs. Instead they use such underlings to help them achieve specific goals. To that end they use prescriptive stereotyping to cast them into expected roles, attitudes, and behaviors. Once this occurs they may enforce these expectations by singling out non-conformers for punishment (Fiske, 1993). Hence, she asserted that stereotyping here is completely at the service of social dominance. When dominance motivation and authoritarianism are both high, not only will the powerful label their subordinates and use them ruthlessly, but they will also sincerely fear and despise them, leading to a great potential for abuse and harm as will be found in the research about the SDO RWA interaction to be mentioned later (Fiske, 1993).

Stereotyping for Social Control

Stereotyping may not just be a result of a person's social perceptions but also may be used to serve their political agendas and used intentionally for that purpose. As Fiske (1993) asserted, people can wield their prejudices to control and constrain the rights, power, behaviors and dignity of others they deem to be of lowers status or to be threatening. Hence stereotyping is not just descriptive but can also be prescriptive (Fiske, 1993). It can also be a means through which authoritarianism and social dominance are expressed by people seeking to order their social environment (Sidanius & Pratt 1999).

Social Dominance in Real World Contexts

Like RWA, SDO, when expressed, can also affect how people see their world and how they react with both their own group members and those people from outside groups. Examples of how this dominance can be expressed has been shown in people's responses to affirmative action (Eibach and Keegan, 2006), a group member's level of patriotism towards the country he or she lives in, and the Bush Administration's War on Terror (after the 911 Trade Center bombing) (Crowson, 2009). These results will be discussed below.

Perspective and Dominance

People's perspectives as dominant group members seemingly can influence their assessment of fairness between groups. Eibach and Keegan (2006) found that White undergraduate college students saw racial progress in the United States differently than did their black peers. While Blacks saw it in terms of an absolute standard of fairness, Whites saw it in terms of how much racial progress was made from the time the Civil Rights Movement began (Eibach and Keegan, 2006; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996). Consequently, while Blacks sought further progress, Whites believed that equality had already been achieved: While Blacks expressed enthusiasm over the prospect of status and opportunity gains, Whites were fearful of possible losses to status and resources they could suffer (Eibach and Keegan, 2006).

Principled Conservative Resistance to Affirmative Action

Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo (1996) found that people at the top of a social hierarchy may also become accustomed to power and will likely fight to retain it. Sidanius et al

asserted that. as a part of this fight, such people might argue that since their society is just and everyone has an equal chance at success, there should not be special assistance for lower status individuals or groups. Consequently, such people, they said, often use the principled conservative arguments of individual merit, self-sufficiency, and the Protestant work ethic to justify their opposition to social equalizing programs (Sidanius et al., 1996). However, Sidanius and Pratto (1996) concluded that their underlying reason might instead be based in SDO (Sidanius et al., 1996).

In order to assess the reasons behind principled conservative resistance to affirmative action, these researchers surveyed students from the University of Texas at Austin randomly and found that, while classical (overt) racism and a conservative political orientation were inversely related with educational level, the amount of variance in students' political conservatism due to prejudice (through which SDO is expressed) increased dramatically as they advanced from their freshman to senior years (from 10% to 34%). In addition, they found that the relationship between the students increasing education and classical racism increased with each grade level from the freshman year through graduate school. These results have also been replicated with UCLA undergraduate students (Federico & Sidanius, 2002). These results suggest that people who are inclined towards high levels of SDO will use education to confirm and to justify their beliefs (Federico & Sidanius, 2002; Sidanius et al., 1996). Such increases in knowledge and prestige as might come from an advanced education can be used to rationalize already existing beliefs by providing them with apparent empirical support (Federico & Sidanius, 2002).

In addition, Federico & Sidanius, (2002) found that Los Angeles area residents who opposed affirmative action for principled reasons also rationalized opposition to it for a variety of other reasons as well. Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo (1996), when using other participants from Los Angeles, found that when SDO was removed from statistical analysis, the relationship between principled conservatism and prejudice disappeared. Hence dominance based in-group loyalty and out-group status threat seemed to explain racism rather than adherence to free market economic principles (Sidanius et al., 1996). Finally, the researchers also found that SDO predicted some of the variance in levels of political conservatism and some of the variance of classical racism levels independent of one another (Sidanius et al., 1996).

Consequently, social elites (whether they be principled conservatives as in this example or Whites as in the previous one) assessment of affirmative action appears to be derived from their position in society and their unwillingness to lose the privileges that this position entails (Eibach & Keegan, 2006).

SDO and Patriotism

Another aspect of SDO and its relationship to in-group vs. out-group identity that has been explored is loyalty towards one's country. Pena and Sidanius (2002) surveyed White and Latino residents of Los Angeles using an SDO Scale and a scale measuring patriotism. Patriotism was defined as being love of and pride in one's country and was rated by a likert scale consisting of three questions. They found that as White Americans' SDO level increased, their sense of patriotism also increased. However, the opposite was true with Latinos. As Latinos' SDO levels increased, their patriotism decreased. These

results are consistent with past research showing that patriotism by any group in the United States was associated with the dominant society (Pena & Sidanius, 2002). As a result, a racial hierarchy is theorized to exist in the United States in which Whites enjoyed the most prestigious status and racial minorities were ranked under them (Pena & Sidanius, 2002). Heaven et al. (2005) also found that Australians who were rated high in SDO and thus placed very little value in social equality and harmony had no problem with cooperating with George Bush's Coalition of the Willing that invaded Iraq (Heaven et al., 2005). The authors asserted that because such people regarded foreigners as members of out-groups, they had no qualms about invading their country.

The same pattern of results occurred when Crowson (2009) found that American college students who rated high on SDO favored a crackdown on racial, ethnic, and religious minorities to foster the war on terror. They did not advocate these policies because they feared harm either physically or morally from these groups but because they saw an opportunity to establish a public mindset and policies that would insure dominance over these groups. They also favored restrictions on civil liberties because they saw an opportunity to increase their dominance within their society. In both cases, since they saw themselves as being members of the law abiding majority group in society, they did not see themselves as being threatened by these policies. This was especially true for those with high social status (Crowson, 2009).

Socializing SDO

SDO, similarly to RWA, appears to be learned through socialization. However, in SDO, parents do not instill fear as seems to be the case in the socialization of RWA

(Durieza, Soenensh, & Vansteenkisteb, 2008). Durieza, Soenensh, & Vansteenkisteb, (2008) found (when they surveyed American parents and their adolescent children) that the parents instilled their drive to achieve instrumental extrinsic goals and their desire to use their environment to achieve them (Durieza et al., 2008). Hence children of high SDO parents seem to learn ambition instead of caution and a need to threaten others as opposed to reacting fearfully or angrily because of a threat (Durieza et al., 2008).

The academic environment also is seen as being able to help to instill SDO (Guimond et al., 2003; Passini, 2008). Guimond et al. (2003) found that French law and psychology students began their careers with relatively equal levels of SDO but diverged dramatically over their four year graduate school careers. The law students SDO ratings increased incrementally for each of the four years while, over the same time periods, the psychology students' SDO levels decreased. Interestingly over the same time periods, both men and women law students' levels of prejudice towards women also increased (Guimond et al., 2003). It has been suggested that law school teachings embody a worldview as seen through the legal system which embodies a hierarchical top down authority structure which imposes its own values and excludes all other knowledge as irrelevant (Guimond et al., 2003). In contrast, some fields, such as psychology have been found to encourage the opposite and encourage students to think in new ways and to consider the perspectives of others (Guimond. et al., 2003; Roccato, 2008).

Reducing SDO

Dambrun, Kamiejski, Haddadi, and Duarte (2009) attempted to find an explanation for the observed differences between the law and psychology students

(Dambrun, Kamiejski, Haddadi, & Duarte, 2009). They rated 439 undergraduate psychology and biology majors at Blaise Pascal University who ranged from being freshmen to seniors students levels of SDO with the SDO scale and their belief people's personality and behavior as being based on internal (as opposed to social and environmental forces) with the use of the belief in genetic determinism scale. They found that for psychology students SDO declined as they proceeded from their freshman to senior years. This decline was found to be associated with a decline in their belief that determinism (internal factors) was responsible for personality and behavior. For biology students no such decline in SDO or determinism was observed (Dambrum et al., 2009). Hence, they concluded that determinism was a possible cause of SDO and that psychology students' exposure to information suggesting environmental causes for personality and behavior reduced their belief that success and failure in life is determined by internal dispositions (Dambrum et al., 2009).

SDO and RWA Interactions

As will be described below, SDO has been found to interact with RWA in a unique fashion. These interactions can have a variety of outcomes with ethical ramifications depending upon the involved people's level of SDO, RWA, and their interests in dealing with the other people or groups in their environment and upon the fears they might entertain concerning these entities (Son Hing, Bobocel, Zanna, & McBride, 2007).

SDO and RWA Interplay

People rated high in SDO and RWA have often been found to form a cohesive social unit that has specific properties. When high SDO and tough-minded leaders interact with followers high in RWA, the high SDO leaders might use the followers ruthlessly while ignoring all of their needs and concerns (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Son Hing et al., 2007). In the process, they may stir them up against outsiders to be used as objects of denigration in the name of maintaining their high status within the group and in maintaining the group's focus on their agenda (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Son Hing et al., 2007). Thus high SDO and High RWA people seem to complement each other well. This occurs because, as mentioned before, SDO people tend to seek power and authority in relationships, are ambitious, goal driven, and willing to use other people to obtain their objectives while people high in RWA tend to make good followers, respect top down authority and the group organizational structure that high SDO people create (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Son Hing et al., 2007). Consequently, high SDO and high RWA people have often been found to form symbiotic relationships in which they each edify and compliment the social role played by the other (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Son Hing et al., 2007).

SDO RWA Interaction and Ethical Consequences

Son Hing et al., (2007) validated the relationship between persons high in RWA and those high in SDO in a carefully designed four study effort in which they paired women with varying levels of SDO and RWA and observed their interactions in a mock corporate context in which one served as general manager (leader) and the other as

operations officer (follower). Four possible pair combinations were tested: high SDO and high RWA, high SDO and low RWA, low SDO and high RWA, and low SDO and low RWA (Son Hing et al., 2007).

The authors found that those who rated higher in SDO were more likely to assume leadership roles than those who scored lower. RWA rating was not related to position seeking. When personal and corporate interests were pitted directly against ethics in either an environmental pollution (in a foreign country) or a sexual harassment dilemma, participants rating high in SDO were more likely to make unethical decisions in the environmental dilemma but not when sexual harassment was the issue. In addition, when confederates mimicked high SDO supervisors, they also gave them higher ratings than participants lower in RWA did. They were also more willing to exploit the indigenous workers in that foreign country than those who rated lower in RWA (Son Hing et al., 2007). Finally in dyads consisting of partnerships of leader high in SDO and a follower high in RWA, the members were more likely to make unethical decisions than those comprised of people in duets of the other possible combinations (Son Hing et al., 2007).

The effect of the SDO/RWA relationship was strongest when people high in both phenomena were paired together. SDO was also best expressed when the out-group person or group in the study's dilemmas subject to exploitation was a stranger and unfamiliar, hence the lesser impact of SDO on gender discrimination since the women involved are often those that the high SDO people know personally (Son Hing et al., 2007).

Differing Processes for RWA and SDO

Finally, SDO and RWA are thought to operate through different processes that result in differing attitudes and behaviors. Sibley, Wilson, and Duckitt (2007) surveyed 331 college undergraduates over a five-month period using SDO and RWA, belief in a dangerous world, and belief in a competitive-jungle world scales. They found that SDO seems to express itself by enhancing an in-group's social status by causing group members to see themselves in competition with outsiders (Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007). RWA, on the other hand, seems to express itself through enforcing in-group conformity and protecting that group from harm by outsiders. The researchers found that high SDO people see the world as a competitive place and high RWA people see it as dangerous (Sibley et al., 2007). However, the two, when acting in conjunction, may enhance one another (Crowson, 2009). A dominant group that labels a rival as threatening to its status and way of life often invokes an atmosphere of fear against that group as well. High RWA people who fear religious extremists will not only condemn that group's religious teachings but also denigrate their social status and rights to function within society (Duckitt, Wagner, & Birum, 2002; Pratto et al., 2000).

RWA, SDO, and Simulated World Leaders

People rated highly in both RWA and SDO may also be motivated to use the fear of authoritarians in their own group to help advance their own interests and to protect their control over the group. This was found by Altemeyer (2003) when he recruited University of Manitoba college students to play the Global Change Game. This game is a three hour role playing simulation that tests how people behave when they are placed into

the make believe roles of leaders of selected nations interacting with leaders of other nations in dealing with 21st century global issues (overpopulation, global warming, economic downturns, shortages of food and pollution) over a 40 year period (Altemeyer, 2003). The game was played three different times with one group in 1994 and two others in 1998. For each simulation group, membership was varied according to participants' level of authoritarianism (as rated by the RWA scale) and social dominance (as rated by the SDO scale). In the first simulation, participants rated low on both measures while in the second simulation, participants rated high on RWA but not high on SDO. In the third simulation, participants rated high on both measures. Performances in this game were assessed by trained observers or facilitators who acted as referees for the participant interactions with one another (Altemeyer, 2003).

Acting national leaders in the first simulation (low on RWA and SDO) interacted with their counterparts from nations all over the world and confronted international problems in a constructive fashion, ultimately solving a number of them. The leaders in the second group (who were rated high in RWA but not in SDO) segregated themselves into cliques consisting of people within their own nations, of people from adjacent nations, and of people from nations with similar cultural values. They failed to interact significantly outside of those groups. As the century progressed, when other nations' people began to suffer from famine and disease they ignored them and paid no attention to their leaders' requests for assistance. However,when these pestilences began affecting their own people, they finally worked with the entire world to alleviate these global problems. They even provided low interest loans to nations in need. However, by that

time, 1.9 billion people had died from famine and the world economic system ultimately collapsed into chaos.

Leaders of the third group (who were rated highly in both SDO and RWA) upon obtaining power sought out their fellow international leaders from other nations and formed cliques with them (Altemeyer, 2003). None of these leaders had much contact with their own people but instead became obsessed with competing with their peers (on behalf of their own nations) for status, wealth, and prosperity. Because of their determination not to be outdone by their rivals, their nation's people on the average fared better than those in the simulation involving the high RWA only leaders. However, their beneficial actions were performed exclusively for profit. They negotiated with one another, bullied one another, but rejected all pleas for help from those in need and acted in strict self-interest. They were also belligerent and started wars with one another. The 40 year time period expired as two of these nations were about to engage in a nuclear war that would have ended life on the earth (Altemeyer, 2003).

Thus, people rated high in RWA who shunned others outside of their own group failed to recognize the world's problems as being their own until it was too late. The world for those rated high in both SDO and RWA consisted of only themselves and their world leader peers. Their in-group consisted of their peers while they used the people under their authority as objects for intra group competition. While the ensuing competition brought about better international prosperity, the leaders' motivation was bereft of social concern and their people benefitted only when it served their leaders' own purposes. Hence, those under weak leaders as well as the disadvantaged and

impoverished suffered without mercy while the leaders, caught up in their rivalries, eventually led the world to the brink of nuclear destruction (Altemeyer, 2003).

SDO and RWA in Context

Roccato and Ricolfi (2005) found that RWA and SDO levels are the most related in societies in which social and political caste groups are most well defined such as Italy and New Zealand (Roccato & Ricolfi, 2005). These scores tended to be less related in more egalitarian societies such as France and the United States. In addition, such relationships also tended to disintegrate when the order within a group was unstable and fragmented (Roccato & Ricolfi, 2005). Consequently, as will be mentioned later, the values encouraged in these caste systems could have their basis in strict father type of teachings accepted by some people in childhood that discourage egalitarianism and encourage rules reinforcement. The values these teachings impart can impact group cohesion that in turn can impact SDO-RWA relationships (McAdams et al., 2008).

<div align="center">Subjective SES and Worldview</div>

Social Status: High and Low

Another variable that has been shown to be important in the development of worldview is subjective socioeconomic status. As will be discussed, high SES, particularly high subjective SES, can encourage the development of SDO and once SDO is formed, high subjective SES provides a person rated high in SDO a strong incentive to act against out-group members who pose a threat to his or he social standing (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Defining Subjective SES

Objective SES is based on such demographic considerations as income level, job title and prestige, education level, the quality of one's housing, and the quality of the schools which a person's children attend (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). However such demographic statistics do not reveal a great deal of information about how people interact with each other and how that interaction affects their quality of life (Gallo et al., 2005). For example, a high status person is thought to be better able to accept tough personal circumstances better than a person not well to do because the former person knows that he or she has a safety net to fall on and that the suffering is temporary. A low status person probably has no such knowledge and can face a more merciless outcome of suffering (Kluegel, Singleton, & Starnes, 1977). High status people also have been found to be more resistant to the common cold and to other illnesses and to have better overall social functioning and physical health (Adler et al., 2000; Cohen, Alper, Doyle, Adler, Treanor, & Turner, 2008). Consequently, the cognitive component of status may be more important than the objective reality, even if it simply reflects that reality (Gallo et al., 2005; Kluegel, Singleton, & Starnes, 1977).

SDO and Subjective SES

This cognitive component helps mediate the effect of social dominance orientation: As mentioned before people rating high in SDO are more likely than others to see themselves and their contemporaries in terms of their social and economic status, their educational and occupational achievements as well as to seek the highest possible status for themselves. Hence their sense of wellbeing in any context may be determined,

at least in part, by comparing themselves to their peers and their perceived skill in out-accomplishing them, whatever it takes (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In addition, as will be demonstrated, people's level of subjective SES helps determine these peoples' worldview and how they relate to others. Hence, it also is relevant in political candidate choice (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

What Exactly Is Subjective SES?

In order to determine what subjective SES is and what it consists of, Kluegel et al. (1977) designed a structural equation model that identified the relevant traits and the specific factors that represented them (Kluegel et al., 1977). Relying on data obtained from 800 residents of Gary Indiana, they mapped out causal relationships. The constructs evaluated were the participant's self assessed subjective educational level, subjective occupational level, subjective income, subjective class identification, and subjective political alienation. There were contrasted with 12 measurable variables. Among these were: observed education, observed occupational status, observed income, a subjective class-occupation indicator/question, a subjective class income question, a subjective class life style question, a subjective class influence question, a subjective class general question, and four political alienation indicators (Kluegel et al., 1977).

Making the Model Fit

Kluegel et al. (1977) in assessing the results of the many factors relevant to subjective SES modeled into a structural equation model with arrows pointing between causative factors as exhibited by 800 Gary Indiana adults, was a single construct which was measurable by a single Likert based survey instrument. This result was the only one

that fit all of the data provided by the participants and the only one that could be adequately explained by a model. This concept is determined by how politically alienated people feel towards society's establishment and which level of social class they place themselves in (Kluegel et al., 1977). Adler et al. (2000) and Ostrove, Adler, Kuppermann, and Washington, (2000) designed and used an instrument that captures this subjective evaluation of social wellbeing and status. While each researcher used a somewhat different version of this scale, all variations use either a physically depicted or verbally described ladder upon which the research participants rate their place in respect to others in their society on a scale of 1-10 (Adler et al., 2000; Ostrove et al., 2000).

The Relationship of Subjective SES to Personal Resources and Coping Ability Quality of Life Experiences and Subjective SES.

Operario, Adler, and Williams, (2004) using the MacArthur subjective SES measure surveyed 1290 adults from across the United States and found that, while people rating high in subjective SES tend to enjoy good health, high income levels, and advanced education, this enjoyment of success might be at least in part mediated by their emotional reaction to this success. They found that those rating low in subjective SES may be prone to depression (Operario et al., 2004). Such depression can occur even when these just mentioned objective factors are equivalent to those rating highly in subjective SES. This can occur, for example, because people understand that not all four year college degrees are equivalent and that their bachelor degree from a low prestige college (as opposed to an Ivy League university) might potentially limit their job and income prospects. Such a realization might lead to depression which in turn can lead to less than

optimal use of the resources at their disposal and a poor ability to cope with stressors in their environment (Operario et al., 2004).

Subjective SES, Happiness, and Misfortune's Vicious Cycle

One factor that can drive poor coping is poor interactions with others. Cundiff, Smith, Uchino & Berg (2011) found after studying 300 older and middle-aged married couples that those couples in which both partners had had higher subjective SES ratings were happier with their lives, with their marriages and were more adept at inspiring confidence and support from others. The researchers found that support from others also provided them with a higher level of experienced competence that those couples with lower levels of subjective SES. Men who behaved with confidence and warmth inspired submission and trust from others. Women who behaved the same way (but with less warmth) elicited the same responses. In contrast those people with low subjective SES in this study were more likely to be seen by others as being less competent, dependent and were more likely to have antagonistic interactions with them (Cundiff et al., 2011).

Strain and Perceived Control of Life Events

However, Gallo et al., (2005) found that positive emotions were an even more powerful indicator of subjective SES than negative ones were. Their participants were 114 women who were employed a minimum of 35 hours per week. Over a two day period, these women were subjected to physiological monitoring of their vital responses as well as a variety of other measures: blood pressure measurement while being asked to write a diary rating their social interactions, socio-economic status (SES), perceived

personal control, level of optimism or pessimism in life, self-esteem, level of perceived

social support, and level of social conflict with others (Gallo et al., 2005).

The authors found that SES level predicted resource levels, social strain (positive

more than negative) and physical resources contributed to stress levels and to subjective

SES: Specifically they found a relationship between overall positive affect, as measured

by a combination of all the above factors (which can represent subjective SES) and

perceived self-control. Of three SES level groups assessed, people rated lowest in SES

were also found to have the least control over their environment and to experience the

most stress (Gallo et al., 2005). They also found that people with the highest SES rating

(of the three SES groups assessed) were found to be the happiest, followed by those of

moderate SES who exhibited a moderate level of happiness. Those lowest in SES were

far and away the least happy of those rated. However, no difference was found between

the groups for negative effect. Even so, as mentioned before, the levels of physical

resources (money and education) and social resources (the support of family and friends)

in and of themselves did not contribute anything to the variance (Gallo et al., 2005). From

these findings, it can be asserted that SES associations with positive affect and perceived

control were mediated through a perception that stressors are challenges to be met and

were not obstacles that cause frustration.

Subjective SES, Health and Well-Being, and the Common Cold

A part of a general cycle of events that can lead to either prosperity or to failure in

one's life endeavors may be the ability to enjoy good health (Christie & Barling, 2009;

Cohen et al., 2008). Hence, if subjective SES is found to be related to a person's health,

this relationship can be factored into theories concerning how subjective SES, and the other factors mentioned above personal control over one's environment, interpersonal relationship skills, and one's image in the eyes of others are related (Christie & Barling, 2009; Cohen et al., 2008).

Cohen et al. (2008) analyzed the 2000-2004 data of about 203 people (98 women and 95 men between the ages of 21 and 55; M = 37.3 years, SD = 8.8 years) who were intentionally infected with the common cold. They found that only subjective SES was significantly associated with developing a clinical illness. Specifically, lower levels of this variable were related to full blown illness. While all three subjective SES levels rated were associated with some incidence of illness, this incidence increased from the highest to the middle level, and then dramatically, from the middle to the lowest level. (Cohen et al., 2008). Finally, objective SES accounted for only 2.7% of the total variance in cold length and duration (Cohen et al., 2008). This result supports the contention that lower subjective SES leads to illness that can lead to poor social functioning and a poor sense of personal control over one's life (hristie & Barling, 2009; Cundiff et al., 2011; Gallo et al., 2005).

Personal Control

Christie and Barling (2009) in assessing 3,419 employed Canadians elaborated on the relationship between subjective SES and personal control. After administering a national probability survey that probed topics related to health behaviors, predictors and outcomes, they found that, for individuals' subjective sense of personal control and for their observed number of health problems, SES level differences were related to

significant differences that increased over time. In addition, the participants' sense of personal control went down as work stress increased, especially if that stress was high initially (Christie & Barling, 2009). This relationship also occurred in the other direction: A high sense of personal control led to lower levels of perceived stress (Christie & Barling, 2009). Hence a cyclical relationship was found to occur in which health problems and SES caused people to feel stress and a lack of control over their lives and in turn the presence of these factors affected their objective wellbeing (Christie & Barling, 2009).

Social dominance, Subjective SES, and Behavioral Asymmetry

The above findings taken together, illustrate a process mentioned previously, that Sidanius and Pratto (1999) asserted happened when social dominance functions in a society: It is the presence of behavioral asymmetry (Christie & Barling, 2009; Cohen et al., 2008; Cundiff et al., 2011; Operario et al., 2004; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). People with high subjective SES who feel good about their lot in life and exude self-confidence are often assisted by beneficial relationships with others that buffer them from life's difficulties (Cundiff et al., 2011). They tend to be in good physical health (Cohen, et al., 2008) and they tend to have an easier time seeing stressful situations as challenges to be mastered instead of problems to be coped with and they tend to make constructive life choices (Christie & Barling, 2009; Cundiff et al., 2011). The opposite is true for those people with low subjective SES. Starting from a position of weakness (being dissatisfied with life, involved in poor relationships, suffering from poor physical health, etc.), they tend to have less ability to cope with stressors (Christie & Barling, 2009; Cundiff et al.,

2011). Consequently, their personal fortunes spiral downward and they are thought to make self-destructive life choices (Cundiff et al., 2011). People rated high in subjective SES tend to be seen by others as successful and competent while those low in this aspect tend to be regarded as the opposite (Cundiff et al., 2011).

Family Upbringing and Worldviews

How family upbringing influences the development of one's worldview has been studied by several researchers. One theory is Lakoff's Strict Father/Nurturing parent model that explains how family upbringing predicts how people judge the moral beliefs and behaviors of others. Additionally, the five foundations theory of Graham et al. has been presented to classify foundational views that can emerge from upbringing (Graham et al., 2009). Both will be explored in the following sections.

The Lakoff Theory.

A dominant theory explaining how political conservatives and liberals develop their personal worldviews and beliefs is Lakoff's (2002) model. In it, he asserts that liberals and conservatives are indoctrinated from childhood by different experiences (Lakoff, 2002). The conservative indoctrination which he refers to as the strict father model involves instilling into children a worldview in which people are dangerous, competition is fierce, and the learning of self-discipline is essential for people to survive and prosper (Lakoff, 2002).

According to this model, this worldview can only be taught by a strict father who places maintaining his authority above all other considerations (Lakoff, 2002). In contrast, the liberal model called the nurturing parent model concerns the instilling of the

opposite worldview, one that emphasizes the child's self-actualization into an adult who is capable of empathy, creativity, and expanding the boundaries of his or her understanding of the world. Essential to the child's development are parents who encourage exploration and the development of a positive self-concept (Lakoff, 2002).

Conservatives who hold to the strict father morality are thought to see the world as an arena in which zero sum contests are staged. Only those who are self-disciplined, who work hard, and who respect proper authority will win. Others, by nature, will fall by the wayside and cease to make significant impact on the world. As a result they see people who succeed in this environment as meeting their moral standards. Consequently, those who fail to measure up are failures; they do not meet society's standards and are worthy of punishment (Lakoff, 2002).

Their idealized conception of family embodies these beliefs. The father is the chief authority figure who rules over his wife and children with a firm but constructive hand. Children, especially boys, are taught to be competitive, to fight others for scarce resources and to take what they need and want from the weak. In order to succeed at this effort, they need self-discipline and reverence for authority. This reality is the natural order of things and these virtues constitute the best moral code to succeed in this environment. Hence, these virtues not only are conducive to success, they also are validated by this context (Lakoff, 2002). If left to themselves, these persons think children will develop faulty moral beliefs that place personal well-being and enjoyment above principle. Further, they tend to exhibit behaviors representative of this attitude such as a refusal to work, a reliance on welfare programs, drug usage, premarital sex and

the bearing of children outside of wedlock, and criminal activities, especially those activities that are intended to victimize the most successful and morally upright members of society (Lakoff, 2002).

Consequently, for strict father moralists, it is thought that their parental love and acceptance are not provided unconditionally; instead, they are granted or withheld based upon the child's compliance with paternal mandates. Such treatment insures that children understand that everything in life must be earned and achieved. It also forces children to attain the skills necessary in life to succeed. Success leads to reinforcement to keep up the good work; failure leads to disgrace and abandonment. This result is thought to confer social stability, insure that fundamental social values are upheld and a continuing supply of young people ready to continue the good fight for another generation are produced (Lakoff, 2002).

Hence, such people are thought to regard themselves as servants of this morality and favor laws and government interventions that enhance its hegemony. They also are thought to regard as hostile enemies any person or institution that fights against them. Such enemies could include those people who advocate social welfare programs that help the poor, particularly cash benefit programs, the mainstream news media (that introduces ideas that encourage people to question the status quo), scientists, psychologists, and college professors (for much the same reason) and endowments for the arts. From the perspective of such moralists, the social programs provide their recipients with an easy way to avoid solving their problems, discourage self-discipline, and convey to the recipients the idea that violating society's rules (as evidenced by their need for such

assistance) will not have consequences. Funding the endowments for the arts, from their perspective, would enable the propagation of possibly new unknown ideas that could distract people from the strict father morality goals (Lakoff, 2002).

In contrast to the strict father upbringing, those who hold to the nurturant parent philosophy espouse a worldview that is opposite of that expressed above. They are thought to favor authority based on individual wellbeing and cooperation between individuals and groups. For them, as with the strict father moralists, the family is the basis for national policy and actions. However, they do not see parents as disciplinarians but rather as facilitators of childhood development who encourages mutually beneficial relationships with others. Their view is that such relationships build society through cooperation that encourages prosperity through the accomplishment of mutual goals that edify all who partake in this philosophy (Lakoff, 2002).

According to this worldview, competition breeds antagonism and the selfish accumulation of material goods. They believe that top down insensitive authority encourages abusive parental behavior which potentially cripples the child's emotional development by making him or her become fearful of authority and resentful of others. As they see if, the children involved then would learn abusive behaviors and treat others as they were treated. In aggregate, when all children in a society grow up and express such attitudes and behaviors, this would result in an abusive society in both its public and private institutions and policies. Officials in such a society, like police officers, would also abuse citizens and deny them basic rights. Hence, they see this morality as a viewpoint to be shunned (Lakoff, 2002). The process of shunning it involves encouraging

diversity of opinion and of artistic expression. Such diversity would encourage\ people to listen to one another, understand their varying points of view and helps them develop a sense of self-worth. Once this was accomplished, people then could not only eliminate abuse but also encourage healthy functioning that causes creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship (Lakoff, 2002).

To this end, parents subscribing to this worldview are thought to try to show their children unconditional acceptance and love and encourage them to grow beyond the confines of a strict family authority and value structure. As a result, they think that children could grow and enjoy fulfilling lifestyles that help them reach their potential and not just uphold society's integrity (as is done in the strict father model) but expand upon it (Lakoff, 2002).

In favoring this philosophy over that of the strict father model, Lakoff referred to the work of Baumrind (1971) who, when assessing the interactions between Berkeley California preschool children, their parents, and their caretakers, found four different parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and rejecting-neglecting). Baumrind used two of these, the authoritarian style and the authoritative style, in his theory (Baumrind, 1971; Lakoff, 2002). The first is associated with the values of the strict father model and the second with the values of the nurturing parent model. In comparing the research on each, he found that children raised according to the authoritarian (strict father) model were more likely to develop insecure attachments to others resulting in superficial relationships, displayed less social competence in interacting with peers and adults, and were subject to aggressive and anti-social behavior.

Children raised according to the authoritative model were not subject to any of these difficulties but developed the competencies in dealing with others and negotiating the world that the proponents of the other model touted for their childrearing method (Baumrind, 1971; Lakoff, 2002).

Finally, according to Lakoff, those who hold to the strict father morality regard the alternative agenda as pure evil; it contradicts all of the basic values upon which this morality is based. Since this alternative moral foundation is the opposite of that of the strict father model, its' mandated worldview and actions to uphold it are seen as directly attacking and working to overthrow the strict father model. It is not surprising, therefore, that people holding to these opposing worldviews should be social and political opponents (Lakoff, 2002).

Operationalizing the Strict Father and Nurturing Parent Model

McAdams and associates (2008) operationalized the strict father and nurturing parent concepts by dividing each of them into two variables. For the strict father model, these were rules reinforcement and self-discipline; for the nurturing parent model, they were nurturing caregiving and empathy–openness. They used their variables to test the validity of Lakoff's model (McAdams et al., 2008).

Their effort which involved compiling case profiles of 128 midlife adults between the ages of 35 and 65 years found that people with experiences matching the strict father model grew up to espouse conservative political beliefs and to rate highly in SDO and RWA (McAdams et al., 2008). The relationship to RWA was very strong while the relationship with SDO was moderate. The two strict father variables of rules

reinforcement and self-discipline were highly related to one another while two nurturing parent variables were also related to one another albeit at a somewhat lower level. In addition, both strict parent variables were inversely related with the empathy–openness aspect of the nurturing parent model. However, neither variable was related with nurturing caregiving. Finally, gender differences were found. While men much more than women valued self-discipline, no gender differences were found for the empathy-openness variable. Gender differences were found for the nurturant caregiving theme, with women rating higher than men, but this result this result fell slightly short of significance having an alpha level of $p = .06$ (McAdams et al., 2008).

These researchers also found that only one of the nurturing parent variables was related to political liberalism: empathy-openness. The other, nurturant caregiving, was not. This result, they speculated, may have occurred because strict father adherents also embrace nurturance of their children but carry this out in a spirit of "tough love" (McAdams et al., 2008; Tetlock, Bernzweig, & Gallant, 1985). Along these lines, they also speculated that social norms in American society perpetuating masculine values and behavior in boys may encourage the strict father orientation to be instilled in boys and less so in girls (McAdams et al., 2008).

Humanistic Versus Normative Perspectives

The work of both Lakoff and McAdams and associates provided an explanation for previous results obtained by de St. Aubin, Wandrei, Skerven, & Coppolillo (2006) who found that people from liberal and conservative backgrounds see the world from either a humanistic frame of reference or from a norm based perspective respectively (de

St. Aubin, 1996; de St. Aubin et al., 2006). The humanistic perspective asserts that human nature is independent, complex, altruistic and trustworthy. The normative perspective asserts that human nature is simple, selfish, untrustworthy, likely to conform to group pressures (de St. Aubin, 1996; de St. Aubin et al., 2006).

They found when surveying 64 adults with the Life Story Interview (McAdams et al., 2001) that the humanistic worldviews of liberals involved a cluster of beliefs including open-mindedness, equality for all, and forgiveness of transgressions. Their religious views consisted of a search for spiritual enlightenment and a desire to better themselves.

In contrast, the norm based views of conservatives exhibited the opposite configuration. Their religious beliefs centered on the belief in an authoritative God who mandated submission to his authority, obedience to his commands, and lack of tolerance for self-initiated searches for enlightenment. In addition, they also displayed a preference for politeness, cleanliness, and social conformity. They accepted top down authority, and placed themselves at the service of God, country, traditional values, and demanded that they and the people they knew showed proper reverence for the natural order of things as they viewed this. They also conducted themselves accordingly by showing proper manners, a clean cut appearance, and an eagerness to please those in power. Liberals on the other hand tolerated and possibly encouraged irreverence towards traditional values that they deemed to stymie the search for individual truth (de St. Aubin, 1996). Since long hair and irreverence towards important people are often part and parcel of following one's own path, liberals often encouraged those things. In addition, the search for truth

often did not include scrupulous grooming habits; Hence liberals tended not to place as much importance on cleanliness as being next to godliness as conservatives do (de St. Aubin, 1996).

These results help explain the attitudinal and behavioral outcome of indoctrination into each of the two Lakoff models. People's upbringing in accordance to the strict father model naturally conditions them to revere the above normative orientation of conservatism while an upbringing according to the nurturing parent model instills in them the humanistic belief system found operating in liberals (de St. Aubin, 1996).

de St. Aubin and associates (2006) also found that, for normative oriented people, respect for the mandates of God, church officials, and fellow parishioners emboldened them with psychological security (de St. Aubin, et al., 2006). In contrast to this, people from the humanist perspective saw religion as an opportunity to improve themselves, to expand their awareness of the universe, and increase their understanding of life (de St. Aubin et al., 2006).

Such ways of organizing one's beliefs provide the foundation for organizing other areas of life as well. Normative people ordered their lives very carefully. They prized rationality, reason, and the intellectual ordering of their view of life. They have a need for control over their lives. Imagination and emotionality were deemed by them to be reckless. Instead they often felt a need for an externally determined (from the church or political institutions etc.). Humanistic people on the other hand prized emotional exploration and were not constrained by an externally determined moral code of conduct.

Instead they allowed their moral beliefs and their definition of self to drift and be redefined from time to time as their exploration merited (de St. Aubin et al., 2006).

Interpersonal conduct follows suit from these other tendencies. Those who were normative oriented were most likely to order their relationships with mandates from the outside world. They tended to follow gender, occupational and class appropriate norms in their behavior. They also tended to rank their interactions with others according to the norms they value. People who followed these norms were highly rated while those who did not were not only lowly rated but also vilified as being antagonistic or threatening. In contrast, those with the humanist perspective tended to have egalitarian attitudes towards others. They regarded their relationships as open and fluid and governed by their internal inclinations rather than by social norms (de St. Aubin et al., 2006).

Consequently, it can be inferred that two different ways of looking at the world leading to two different behavioral paths may well be based on two different parental upbringing styles (de St. Aubin et al., 2006). The humanistic perspective seems to be developed from the first two individualizing foundations and the normative perspective is analogous to the final three obligatory foundations (de St. Aubin et al., 2006; Haidt, & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

Bryan et al., (2009) followed these above efforts with an exploration of how these two differing perspectives affect beliefs on a variety of issues. Issues included whether more prisons should be built, whether universal health care should be guaranteed, whether there should be a flat tax rate for all people, and answers to various vignettes concerning whether single mothers should be cut off from welfare benefits after two

years, whether a man who in panic killed a police officer during a robbery attempt should be put to death, and whether resources for a school should be diverted from assisting challenged students to fund a gifted program. They found that there were perspective based differences between conservatives and liberals on the social issues rated (with conservatives favoring cutting off welfare benefits, putting the man shooting the police officer to death and that the funds should be diverted to the gifted program) (Bryan et al., 2009).

The Five Moral Foundations

As stated previously, Haidt and Graham (2007) proposed that five basic moral foundations underlie the entire moral reality that define people's lives (Haidt & Graham, 2007) These foundations are harm–care, fairness–reciprocity, in-group-loyalty, authority–respect, and purity–sanctity. The first two (harm–care, fairness–reciprocity). Haidt and Graham called the individualizing foundations and the other three (in-group-loyalty, authority–respect, and purity–sanctity), they called the binding (or obligatory) foundations.

Introducing the Five Foundations

Using the same pool of subjects as did Haidt and Graham (2007), McAdams and associates (2008) tested Haidt and Graham's (2007) theory by asking the participants to describe their moral and religious beliefs and relate what impact they have on the participants' daily lives. They also asked them to relate how these values and beliefs changed over time (Haidt, & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

Participant responses for the first two moral foundations (harm-care, fairness-reciprocity) were inversely associated with their responses on the other three foundations (in-group-loyalty, authority–respect, and purity–sanctity) and were related to participant income. Scores on the first two foundations were positively related with one another as were the last three. Conservatives placed a greater priority than liberals did on the three foundations of, authority–respect, in-group-loyalty, and purity–sanctity, with the most powerful correlation for conservatives occurring for authority-respect with a remarkable $r = .51$. Liberals displayed a stronger emphasis for the harm–care and fairness–reciprocity dimensions (McAdams et al., 2008). Finally, family income and education were both inversely related with the last three foundations, but positively related to the first two (McAdams et al., 2008). This was especially true with the purity–sanctity and the authority/respect foundations. In addition, women also were found to rate higher than men in the priority they placed on the harm-care foundation (McAdams et al., 2008).

When these authors performed multiple regressive analysis on the basis of gender, age, family income, and the particular self-report of participant political attitudes concerning RWA, liberal and conservative political orientation, the premises of moral foundations theory were convincingly upheld. However, when SDO was added to the equation, the results were less dramatic. This is consistent with RWA and SDO studies which have found that SDO was less involved in authoritarian reverence and submission than in a desire for social domination (McAdams et al., 2008).

More Work about the Five Foundations.

Rating Morally Relevant Items

Additional work involving the five Foundations theory was conducted by Graham, Haidt, and Joseph, (2009). In their research work that resulted in four studies, they tested various aspects of this theory (Graham et al., 2009).

Participants who rated 15 social issue terms presented to them in terms of their moral content and their relevance to each of the five foundations accepted the individualizing foundation terms as valid. However, conservatives tended to favor the binding obligatory foundation terms as well. This result was found to be consistent across participant samples from different nations (Graham et al., 2009).

Explicit Moral Dilemmas

These results were upheld when they included foundations relevant moral dilemmas (as opposed to simply rating morally relevant items) and asked the participants to rate them as themselves, as a prototypical liberal and as a prototypical conservative: Liberal or conservative identification, once again predicted a participant's moral outlook preference (Graham et al., 2009).

However, participants rating the items as referring to themselves did not validate the results for in-group loyalty: They saw themselves as existing apart from a liberal or conservative political identity and were able to express judgments that were not indicative of the liberal and conservative identities (Graham et al., 2009). <Finally, the authors found that universal acceptance of the first two foundations was due to what many believe to be their relatively non-controversial nature. Deciding about items

relating to the other three foundations seemed to require much more careful consideration and involved deeper mental processes: Few people have condemned the virtue of protecting children from harm or that of insuring fairness in consumer transactions, however enforcing obedience to an obscure law or imprisoning someone for burning the national flag are controversial actions that usually cause debate. (Graham et al., 2009).

Value Trade-Offs

Graham et al. (2009) explored people's reactions to value trade-offs and evaluated the impact on a person who is made to trade away a sacred value for the benefit of a profane one (as may occur when a hospital administrator sacrifices lives for the sake of institutional profits). They found that, while conservatives displayed an unwillingness to accept money to perform any morally profane act, liberals were willing to do so, more for the binding foundations more than for the individualizing ones (Graham et al., 2009). Overall, both liberals and conservatives valued the individual foundations more than the binding ones. This meant that, while neither conservatives or liberals were willing to defraud an innocent person of his land to plant a vegetable garden, liberals were more willing to burn an American flag if it meant saving lives. Conservatives, on the other hand, valued the flag sufficiently so that they might be willing to sacrifice lives to protect its dignity (Graham et al., 2009). Deciding about items relating to the other three foundations seemed to require much more careful consideration and involved deeper mental processes (Graham et al., 2009).

Analyzing Church Sermons

The researchers also found that church sermons delivered by Unitarian-liberal-pastors, and by Southern Baptist-conservative-preachers differed in content related to the five moral foundations. While sermons delivered by Unitarian pastors contained words associated with the first two foundations, sermons delivered by the Southern Baptists contained words indicative of the other three: Unitarians expounded on such issues as justice for the poor, equal opportunity in hiring, and fairness in dealings with one another, while Baptists preached about reverence towards God, the obligation to work hard for one's employer, and patriotism towards the armed forces during times of war. (Graham et al., 2009).

Follow up Efforts

Graham and associates (2011), in order to replicate their findings, surveyed an international sample of 34,476 adults. They confirmed the existence of the moral foundations and their division into five individual parts and that political liberals favored the individualizing foundations while political conservatives favored the three binding ones (Graham et al., 2011). They also found that these foundation preferences varied depending upon the social group being studied. For people of Eastern countries (e.g., East Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia) a strong preference was expressed for the binding foundations. The authors also found that women favored foundations that were not consistent with the liberal conservative divide; they favored the harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, and the purity foundations over the others. (Graham et al., 2011).

In another survey involving 20,962 American respondents who filled out a questionnaire on the internet, Haidt, Graham, and Joseph (2009) conducted a factor analysis that revealed four basic personality types from the patterns of participant response (Haidt et al., 2009).

The first type was what they referred to as the secular liberal personality, the second they called the libertarian personality, the third was what they called the liberal religious person, and the fourth was the social conservative. The first type, the secular liberal, scored highly on the two individualizing foundations but low on the other three.

Such a person they believed was a politically liberal activist who is a member of the Democratic Party. In defending the individualizing foundations and scorning the three binding foundations, such a person will uphold social spending programs for the poor and will demonstrate concern and care for such things as the environment. He or she would also despise such conservative causes as banning flag burning and defining marriage as being a relationship between a single man and a single woman as being silly (Haidt et al., 2009).

The second type, the libertarian, scored low on all five foundations. This type of person should, the authors asserted, despise the idea of social responsibility in a society. Being a true libertarian, such a person will disdain liberal calls for the wealthy to share their prosperity as citizens responsible to their fellow man. They should deny the obligation to pay taxes as well as to serve in a military draft. They should also despise politically conservative demands that anti-terrorism officials and police be given special powers to follow, arrest, detain, and try society's worst offenders without due process and

their determination to legislate such issues as abortion, gay marriage, and they should also oppose laws banning social discrimination and that enforce health and safety in the work place. In summary, such people want government out of their lives so that they can have the maximum freedom to do what they want to do when they want to do it (Haidt et al., 2009).

The third type the religious liberal, scored high on all five foundations. The researchers believed this type of person should revere traditional authority, should adhere to established religious doctrine and should see people as being part of their society with obligations to serve and contribute to others in that society. However, such people should also believe that society can be very oppressive towards those of lowly status and that inequality in status, opportunities, resources, and outcomes is a serious problem. They would also likely express the desire to assist the needy by working in soup kitchens and integrated assistance programs which combine cash assistance with job training and time management skills. This type of person is the opposite of the libertarian (Haidt et al., 2009).

The fourth type, the social conservative, scored high on the three binding foundations, but low on the other two individualizing ones. Such a person should in typical conservative fashion uphold traditional values, religious doctrine, and show loyalty towards the military and police authority in his society. He or she will seek bans on abortion and gay marriage. They may seek reductions in social spending for the poor so that conservative institutions will have more leverage in dealing with people. This would enable such institutions (as the church) to mandate behavioral change in people

who they believe to be irreverent towards their values in order to receive assistance. Otherwise such people could escape their normative pressure by turning to government assistance instead (Haidt et al., 2009).

Past Candidate Choice Research

Much research has been conducted to determine how people choose among presidential candidates (Kinder, 1978; Lazarus & Reilly, 2010; Leventhal, Jacobs, & Kudirka, 1964; Milton, 1952; Trent et al., 2005; Winter, 1987). Most of this research has focused on how political candidates' personal characteristics impact voters' willingness to like and support them (Kinder, 1978; Winter, 1987). Topics of study have included candidate leadership, the relationship between candidate and voter political orientation, how voters feel they relate to a particular candidate, and the relationship between candidate's chances of victory and voters' choice (Kinder, 1978; Riggio, 2007, Trent et al., 2005; Winter, 1987). Another factor that has been investigated is voter demographics. This line of research however has produced little insight into candidate choice (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). No research was found in the literature that has examined how parental upbringing and developing worldview are related to candidate selection.

Research has shown that voters, lacking all other information, will attribute positive characteristics to candidates representing their chosen political party and will support them (Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004; Leventhal et al., 1964). However, this loyalty will disappear if the candidate espouses values and issues they do not agree with. (Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004; Leventhal et al., 1964). Consequently, authoritarian conservatives will not support or vote for a member of their own party who disagrees

with their party's moral and social philosophy. Instead such a candidate, if he or she faces a primary challenge will lose the support of the party faithful (Courser, 2010; Leventhal et al., 1964).

Partisan voters have been found to elicit strong prejudices against the candidate of the opposing party (Kosloff et al., 2010). Kosloff and associates (2010) attempted to determine how followers of both Barack Obama and John McCain (candidates in the U. S. presidential election of 2008) reacted to slanderous accusations against their own and the opposition candidate (Kosloff et al., 2010). They presented University of Arizona students with a visual priming instrument through which they were presented either the name Obama or McCain for 300 milliseconds and then presented another word, either a neutral one or a slanderous term for 4000 milliseconds such as Muslim (for Obama) and Senile (for McCain). Then the students were asked to make a judgment concerning the word that was presented (Kosloff et al., 2010).

Results indicated that Obama's followers identified the slanderous term used against McCain when his name was presented first, but not when Obama's name was presented. McCain supporters reacted the same way when Obama's name was presented and then followed by the slanderous term. These results upheld the hypothesis that the supporters of each candidate had stereotyped and habituated perceptions about his opponent. They however did not have such perceptions about their own candidate (Kosloff et al., 2010). Undecided voters also exhibited prejudice for each candidate but only when receiving the appropriate prime (Kosloff et al., 2010).

McCain supporters needed no priming to identify Obama as a Muslim and Obama needed no priming to accept the story that McCain was senile. Undecided voters also showed prejudice against Obama and McCain, but only in response after being primed (Kosloff et al., 2010).

Another factor affecting candidate choice is educational level. Abrajano (2005) used data from the Knight Ridder's 2000 Latino Voter Survey and found that, for Hispanic voters, increasing education caused them to consider non-issue related information. This trend however did not occur in older voters. Consequently, while younger educated voters were attuned to ethnic, candidate related demographical information about their candidates and their relation to voter interest, older candidates tended to focus directly on issues. Abrajano speculated that less educated voters, when casting their votes based on candidate demographics. may have had access only to basic issue information preventing them from making a more informed candidate decision (Abrajano, 2005).

Thus, it seems that voters' presidential candidate choices are not only mediated by stereotyping and group loyalty factors but also by the voter's partisan loyalties and by his or her education and interest in ethnic and cultural factors (Krosnick, 1988; Riggio, 2007). Even so, the impact of voters' moral worldview on their presidential candidate choice has remained largely unexplored (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Summary and Conclusions

The RWA scale and the hypothesized facets of authoritarianism it assessed were developed by Altemeyer (Altemeyer, 1988; 1996) based on the work of Adorno who

studied Fascism and developed the first scale rating of authoritarianism. Altemeyer's scale rated three facets of authoritarianism: aggression, submission, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1988; 1996). People rated highly in RWA have been found to cling strongly to the members of their ingroups and fear anyone or thing that threatens them. They will also condemn anyone who threatens their worldview (Altemeyer, 1988; 1996).

Based on social dominance theory, Sidanius and Pratto developed the SDO Scale to test people's tendency to defend the interests of their own group and to dominate others from out-groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). People rated high in SDO have been found to differ from those high in RWA in that they act out of dominance motivation instead of fear. They are also proactive and actively seek out their opponents and destroy them. Instead of judging them with biased standards they impose derogatory characteristics instead. Once this is done they can discredit them and insure that they never gain the social or political status to challenge them (Sidanius, & Pratto, 1999).

Subjective SES is another variable that has been found to affect people's candidate choice. People who feel satisfied with their lot in life, enjoy the respect of their family, friends, and their social group will be happier with their lot in life, feel more accomplished, and be physically more healthy than those who rate low in this variable (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). People who are rated high in both subjective SES and SDO are especially prone to not only dominate others but to use them ruthlessly and to disregard their perspectives, needs, and rights (Sidanius, & Pratto, 1999).

The strict father/nurturing parent model has been proposed as a way to explain how one's worldview is developed (Lakoff, 2002; McAdams et al., 2008). It also helps

define why political confrontation between conservatives and liberals takes place. These factors exert their influence on the person's environment through stereotyping. According to the results of many studies, stereotyping is the primary method by which people judge whether those who are outside of their social group are keeping the norms of their in-group or violating them (McAdams et al., 2008). Such stereotyping also is related to SDO and RWA. In contrast to this, people who rate low on SDO and RWA will likely hold to the nurturing parent model of morality. These two models lead to different values and positions on political issues. Because strict father morality adherents fear and are provoked by anything that threatens their worldview they tend to oppose funding for social programs, for the arts and humanities, and they tend to show distrust for academia and the mainstream news media. Nurturant parent adherents favor such programs because they believe that they help people improve themselves and help society grow (McAdams et al., 2008).

Stereotyping of the exemplars of outgroups and the idolizing of ingroup leaders will affect people's political judgment. In addition, all interests that people have such as social values, religious customs, and personal outlook are seen by them through the lens of stereotyping and prejudices which are motivated by SDO, RWA, subjective SES, and the strict father/nurturing parent variables (Sidaniua & Pratto, 1999; Sidanius et al., 1996; Sidanius et al., 2001).

In addition, research suggests that once views shaped by the strict father/nurturing parent model variables are formed, they may help develop the five moral foundations as hypothesized by Haidt and Graham, which in turn may directly mediate political

candidate choice (Haidt & Graham, 2007). Different combinations of the four variables just mentioned can lead to different motivations for candidate choice (Haidt et al., 2009). While RWA, SDO, and the five moral foundations have been individually discussed as related to candidate choice, they have not been examined concurrently before. Additionally, examining the strict-father and nurturing parent model in conjunction with these constructs has not been performed.

In Chapter Three, the author will describe the study that was conducted here, the participants used and their selection, and the instruments used to assess them. In addition, how the collected data was analyzed and how it relates to the social issues related to presidential candidate choice will also be presented.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

The study conducted in this dissertation is a mixed methods effort (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). It involved testing whether the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES, are related to the development or lack of development of the five moral foundations described in the previous chapters. In addition, it also tested the extent to which this development is expressed in presidential election candidate choice.

In this chapter, the methods used in this study are described. This includes information about participant demographics and the research tools used for information collecting. When applicable, information concerning the validity and reliability of these instruments is presented. Finally, in an effort to facilitate replication of this study, the steps used for data collection (when applicable) and the procedures used for analyzing it are described.

Participant Selection

Determination of Sample Size: Power Analysis

In order to determine the minimum number of participants needed to achieve a power of $\beta = .80$ and probability $p < .05$ for seven independent variables and an assumed (average effect size of .15), G Power software was utilized and returned a minimum sample size of 153 participants for multiple linear regression analysis. (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). Since participants are those who engage in the Walden University research website and since involvement in this system is voluntary, participant selection is not random but is subject to self-selection effects. With the actual effect size

for the variables averaging about .27, the G Power analysis revealed a sample size of 89 was necessary for the above statistical method to be used. Hence, a sampling of 90 participants from Grace Church, The Knights of Columbus Hall, and the Lee Road Library, which are in-person venues, was all that was needed to validate the results obtained from the Walden University Participant Pool. (Adler, et al., 2000; Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1996; Crowson, 2009; Faul, et al., 2009; Gallo et al., 2005; McAdams et al., 2008; Peterson, B. E., & Duncan. L. E. 1999; Roccato, 2008; Roccato M., & Ricolfi, 2005; Sidanius &, Pratto, 1999; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996; Sidanius, Pratto, & Mithchell, 2001).

Participation in the study was open to all who had access to the Walden University Sona Experiment Management System website. This included faculty, staff, and students of Walden University of all ages who access this research website. Since this participant pool was used, no information concerning participant demographics was available until data collection was complete and the data was analyzed. However, I included a demographics questionnaire which asked them for their age, gender, occupation, income, education, and ethnicity. In addition, the online version of the study offered to Walden University participants was also offered to all those recruited outside of the university setting. Both groups of people had access to the same surveys which were placed on Survey Monkey.

Procedure

All forms that participants filled out were presented to them on computer screen via SurveyMonkey on the internet and the Walden University Sona Experiment

Management System. Participants needed the use of a computer that met the minimum standards for processor speed, memory, video capability, and had a mouse and a keyboard for participation in the Walden University academic environment and classrooms. When they accessed the internet study, potential participants were first presented with a consent form. The consent form described the nature of the study, what they were being asked to do, risks that may be associated with participation in this study, and that they can withdraw their consent at any time. This form contained boxes they could check signifying their granting or denying consent to participate. They were then presented with internet versions of the instruments mentioned in the following order: The Life Experiences Questionnaire, The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale, The Social Dominance Orientation Scale, The Subjective SES Scale, The Moral Foundations Questionnaire, and the Ideal Presidential Candidate Characteristics Scale.

The Life Experiences and the Ideal Presidential Characteristics Questionnaires contain open ended questions to which participants typed their answers onto the screen in the spaces provided. If participants needed more space for their answers, the form expanded in length automatically to accommodate them. The other questionnaires presented boxes for each question in which participants can indicate their answer. These questionnaires took no longer than 60 minutes to complete. However, participants were allowed to save their answers and log into the study multiple times until they are finished.

Instruments

Strict Father/Nurturing Parent

Life Experiences Questionnaire consists of 12 open-ended questions in which participants are asked to describe 12 important scenes in their lives. These include the participants' high point in life, low point in life, turning point in life, positive and negative childhood scenes, vivid adolescent and adult scenes, high and low points of faith, childhood scene of faith, and political scene (McAdams et al., 2008). To code responses to these scenes, the procedures outlined by McAdams and associates (2008) was followed. For each scene, words or phrases indicating the presence of each of the four desired concepts, the strict father/nurturing parent variables, rules reinforcement, self-discipline, empathy–openness, and nurturant–cargiving, were coded using the number 1. The absence of the concept was indicated with the number 0 (McAdams et al., 2008). To assess inter-rater reliability, one of the authors and a graduate student separately coded the participant responses according to the following formula: 2 x the number of instances of agreement on the presence of a theme divided by the number of presence ratings by the author plus the number of presence ratings by the graduate assistant. Their level of inter-rater agreement was 79% for self-discipline, 88% for rules reinforcement, 80% for empathy–openness, and 85% for nurturant–caregiving. However, two of these results (for empathy–openness and self-discipline) fell short of the criterion (85%) normally accepted in scoring TAT style questionnaires (McAdams et al., 2008).

Procedure Followed in this Study.

Since this study builds upon McAdams et al (2008), I relied on their study for precedence in use and interpretation. A graduate assistant trained in these procedures and I rated the responses of the first 50 participants to questions on the McAdams instrument. These ratings were compared with one another in order to determine the level of agreement in identifying relevant items according to the formula used above. This formula yielded the percentage of inter-rater agreement between the author and the assistant. Such words or phrases that are agreed as fitting this criterion were then used as the standard for evaluating positive instances of the variables for the rest of the participant responses to be evaluated (McAdams et al., 2008; Woike, 2007). To help insure reliability for this coding process, a correlation between the two raters' total scores for each of the four variables (which were rated on a scale from 1-12 for number of appearances) was obtained (McAdams et al., 2008; Woike, 2007). The average number of words the participants used for each of the questions were recorded and compared with the number obtained for each of the other questions as a measure of the amount of effort the participants used to answer each of them. Finally, collaboration between the assistant and myself resulted in a codebook being written by me that acted as a guide for response interpretation. (McAdams et al., 2008; Woike, 2007).

Social Dominance Orientation

The SDO scale contains 16 items; it contains both intuitive and counterintuitive items. Each tests a person's tolerance for unequal social structures based upon hierarchical arrangements and that person's desire to achieve power, status, and prestige

within that hierarchy. Participants are to rate all statements based on a seven point Likert scales ranging from 1, strong disapproval, to 7, strong approval (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

The SDO scale used in this study (the sixth version of this instrument) was standardized on 14 participant samples from around the world including American college students from UCLA and Stanford, Israeli college students, Palestinian Israeli college students, Palestinian college students, Chinese college students (in Shanghai), New Zealand college students, British Columbia (Canadian) college students, San Francisco Bay area voters, and American Los Angeles area adults. The alpha numbers for 11 of these standardization samples ranged from .82 to .92. The alpha numbers for the other three samples, the Palestinian students, the Chinese students, and Bay Area voters, were .66, .66, and .72, respectively (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

The final two versions (five and six) exhibited the following reliability numbers: for the fifth version, $r = .81$, $p < .01$ with an American college student sampling that was retested after a three month period (for version five). It was $r = .84$, $p < .001$ over several months with American college students in a different sample. Test-retest measures obtained with the sixth version were very close to each other-with one student sample used. $r = .86$, $p < .001$. Other results were similar. The correlation between the two scales was $r = .75$, $p < .001$ (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Finally, Sidanius & Pratto sampling UCLA and Stanford students over three months found the test-retest reliability of the fifth version of the test to be $r = .81$, $p < .01$. The reliability over seven months was $r = .84$, p

< .01. For the sixth (and final) version the reliability over a month period (using UCLA students) was $r = .86, p < .01$.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism

The RWA Scale assesses people's inclination to follow top down authority, fear those who are different from them, and it also is constructed with both intuitive and counterintuitive items (Altemeyer, 1996; Zakrisson, 2005). The version used here constructed by Zakrisson (2005) consists of 15 items, 11 each in the intuitive and counterintuitive form respectively Participants answer the questions presented on a nine point Likert scale with answers ranging from -4 to +4 for each statement rated (Zakrisson, 2005).

Zakrisson developed this scale using three different samples. The first involved 226 undergraduate college students drawn from four different psychology courses, the second 63 university students taking night courses and the third 179 high school and college students recruited from various areas of Sweden. Starting with Altemeyer's original 30 item RWA Scale which exhibited a Cronbach_s alpha rating of .86, she removed, one by one, items from the scale that rated the lowest internal reliability. This eliminated most of the counterintuitive items so she wrote new questions to replace them. She also removed items that highly correlated with social dominance orientation (SDO). Then she eliminated from the questions all references to controversial social issues and rewrote the questions in the plain contemporary language of college students. The internal reliability of the scale after the extra questions were removed was as rated at, 0.80. After questions were rewritten and new questions added this number remained

about the same with an alpha rating of .78. The final scale had 15 items nine of which were straightforward and the other six counterbalanced (Zakrisson, 2005). Participants who took the new scale achieved similar scores to tose who took the old scale on measures of racism (as rated with a nine item scale developed by Akrami, Ekehammar, and Araya (2000), and by questions taken from a study of European values) and sexism (as rated by questions from the modern sexism scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, and Hunter, 1995).

Subjective SES.

Subjective SES is rated by asking a study participant to rate his or her overall feeling about his or her socio-economic status on a 10 point scale from 1 – 10. Specifically, it asks the participant to imagine themselves on a rung of a 10 rung ladder representing their perception of their level of education level, the prestige of their job title and rank, and their level of financial prosperity (Adler et al., 2000; Ostrove, Adler, Kuppermann & Washington, 2000).

Subjective SES has fairly good test-retest reliability with a longitudinal study of 191 American adults averaging 45.5 years of age yielding a Spearman rank order correlation of $r = .62$ ($p < 0.01$) between the baseline and a follow-up study assessment six months later (Ostrove et al., 2000).

<div align="center">Dependent Variable</div>

The Five Foundations

Participant levels of the five moral foundations were rated using the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ). This instrument consists of a total of 32 questions: 16

brief statements relevant to moral concepts corresponding to each of the five foundations and 16 additional items representing moral dilemmas corresponding each foundation. The participants then rated each on a five point scale from least favorable (1) to most favorable (5) (Graham et al., 2011).

For this scale the internal reliability is good with Cronbach's alpha for each of the five foundations with alpha ranging from .46 to .70 for the subscales. Cronbach alpha for the total scale is .85 (Graham et al., 2011). The authors confirmed the survey's reliability of this measure by administering it to 123 University of Southern California students over an average period of 37.4 days. The test-retest correlations obtained for each foundation ranged from .68 to .82 (with all ps < .001).

Qualitative Exploration

Presidential Candidate Choice

In order to more fully understand the factors involved in presidential candidate choice, participants also completed an open-ended qualitative questionnaire written by the researcher. On this questionnaire, they were asked to describe the characteristics they believe should go into making their ideal presidential candidate. One question asked them to rate which of the five moral foundations developed and tested by Graham et al.2009, they prefer to be embodied in their ideal candidate. Then they were asked to rate each of these foundations (as portrayed in a candidate) on a scale from 1-10 (Graham et al., 2009). In a third question the defining characteristics of the strict father and nurturing parent worldviews, as explored by McAdams and associates (2008), are briefly described and participants were asked to express a preference for one or the other of these

worldviews. They were then asked to explain their reasons for this preference (McAdams et al., 2008). In a fourth question in which a president's attitudes towards international and intergroup relationships and their consequences for national safety, stability and prosperity at abroad and insuring intragroup social and philosophical stability participants were asked to indicate their preferences for a president who exhibits either a high level or a low level of right wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer; Feather, 1998; Crowson, 2009; Heaven et al., 2005). Finally, in a fifth question (involving presidential attitudes towards group equality/inequality in terms of socio-economic related issues) the same procedure is followed as in the third except the concept being rated is social dominance orientation (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Passini, 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Son Hing et al., 2007). Basing the content of the question items (when applicable) on past findings from the literature and on questions asked from previously used scales (the SDO and RWA scales) helps demonstrate theoretical trustworthiness of the resulting scale (Bryman, 2006; Onwiegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003). The purpose of the qualitative portion of the study is to gain additional information regarding the way that presidential candidates are chosen and to see how these orientations emerge in open-ended responding. The scale for rating participant preferences in candidate characteristics and issue positions has been placed in Appendix G.

Data Collection Procedures.

Sampling Technique

Participant recruitment. For the data collected through the internet the survey instruments to be used in the study were uploaded to Walden university's Sona

Experiment Management System website and was available to the university's participant

pool. Those choosing to participate in this study did so via a presentation over their

computer screens. Before any information was collected participants read a statement

explaining to them that the researcher is a Walden University graduate student working

on a dissertation and is interested in gauging how their moral worldview impacts their

choice of presidential candidate. They provided their consent by clicking on the

appropriate check box located after the statement. Participants were asked to fill out the

independent and dependent variable measures (surveys and open ended questionnaires) in

the quantitative study before being asked to view and respond to the ideal candidate

qualities questionnaire used in the qualitative portion of this study (Johnson & Turner,

2003).

  For the data collected in person the participants were recruited via an internet

notice placed on The Facebook Page of the Old Brooklyn Community Development

Corporation (CDC), and by volunteers who distributed flyers, to attend an event at Grace

Church in Cleveland between 5:30 and 7:30PM on November 12th and 14th and between

12 noon and 1 PM on November 14, 21, and 28, 2013 and at the Knights of Columbus

Hall, in Cleveland, on September 24 and October 5, 2014. They were also recruited at the

Lee Road Library in Cleveland Heights via an advertisement placed in the Cleveland

Plain Dealer. They filled out an anonymous consent form and a demographic

questionnaire on which they provided their age, gender, income, occupation, and

ethnicity, but not their names. The forms were collected independently of the

administration of the study's surveys, which when completed were also collected. This

information was used to validate the overall study results in terms of already conducted research by past researchers and to insure the quality of the data collected. As an incentive for participation some people entered a drawing for a Giant Eagle gift card. The surveys themselves could take up to 60 minutes to complete. An employee of the Old Brooklyn CDC assisted in getting the room at Grace Church in order but will not be involved in any data collecting activities. She has signed a confidentiality agreement in case he recognizes any participants at the events.

Protection of participants. Internet participants signed a web based release form that explains their rights in the research process that explains, along with other information, that they can withdraw their consent to participate at any time. See Appendix A for the participant consent form. After they completed the study questionnaires, they will be debriefed via a statement posted on a webpage concerning the purpose of this research effort that asks how the results might benefit them. The webpage will provide them with a phone number to call if they have any questions (Creswell, 2003). See Appendix A.

Information obtained from participants at the in person venue was collected in two stages: the demographic information was collected before the study's surveys are distributed. After participants complete them, they too were collected. These participants, like those filling out the internet surveys, were presented with a release form that explains their rights in the research process that explains, along with other information, that they can withdraw their consent to participate at any time (Creswell, 2003)

Information from the obtained responses was transcribed into a personal computer with the use of the qualitative data manipulation program NVivo 10 (Creswell, 2003). All of the information placed on this computer is protected in McAfee Total Protection password accessed files and the computer itself will be accessed only by password. The researcher is the only person with access to this computer so all of the information will be kept confidential. No personally identifying information from participants' answers was used. For all information used in the results section from the answers to the open ended questions the names of persons and places was changed (Creswell, 2003). The data collected will be stored for five years and then deleted from computer storage (Creswell, 2003).

Role of the researcher. The researcher was involved in every aspect of the research process from gaining approval for conducting the study from the dissertation committee and from the Walden University Institutional Review Board and placing the study on the Sona Experiment Management System, working with Old Brooklyn CDC and with the officials at Grace Church, administering the survey forms to the participants who come there, to analyzing the data, interpreting the results, and preparing the final report (Creswell, 2003). The researcher designed the study, stated its goals and its hypothesis. He also developed the candidate choice questionnaire and with the assistance of a graduate student assistant interpreted participant open ended responses that are deemed to reflect key concepts. These findings were interpreted in order to expand upon the results obtained by the quantitatively obtained data. To help insure objectivity in results coding and interpretation the researcher relied on the theoretical considerations

emphasized by relevant previous researchers. The inter-rater validity provided by the use of a graduate student coder should help assist in this goal.

Analyzing the Data

Linear Regression and Path Analysis

Revealing variable relationships. Using Statistical Pack for the Social Sciences (SPSS 21) a software package commonly used for quantitative data analysis, linear regression was performed to predict how the five moral foundations will interact with the following independent variables: the strict father and nurturing parent variables SDO, RWA, and subjective SES. Once the results were obtained, they were interpreted in terms of the precedents established in past research concerning interpretation of each of the variables. This analysis helped reveal how changes in the independent variables affect changes in the dependent variables (Erzberger & Kelle, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

The hypothesized interactions between the variables in this study were analyzed by the statistical technique of confirmatory path analysis. In confirmatory path analysis, all of the factors in a study are depicted in a path diagram and the expected relationships between them are compared with the actual outcomes obtained. This depiction shows which variables are independent, which variables are dependent, and which variables are in between the extremes. In this study, the strict father/nurturing parent variables are the independent, or exogenous, variables, the five foundations variables (broken up into two parts: the individualizing and the binding factors) are the dependent or endogenous, variables, and SDO, RWA, and subjective SES, are the intermediary variables. These

intermediary variables are also called endogenous since they act as dependent variables

for the strict father/nurturing parent factors (Mertler & Vanatta, 2005). The significant

possible cause and effect relationships between all of the variables (not just between

independent and dependent variables) were analyzed by the use of multiple regression

and correlational analysis and shown in this diagram. To accomplish this, regression

analysis was performed on the main dependent variable (the individualizing and the

binding foundations) and on each intermediate variable (SDO, RWA, and subjective

SES) in various combinations for the variables predicting them. Following this, different

routes from the independent variables to the main dependent variable were mapped and

tested according to the following procedure: Correlational values for the relationship

between all variables in the study, both exogenous and endogenous were obtained. Then

the hypothesized relationships between the variables (as demonstrated by a path drawing

to be included as a figure) were compared with the actual correlational relationships

obtained. Those hypothesized relationships found to have actual correlational values

with an alpha significance value of under .05 were retained. Those with a significance

rating above .05 were not retained. (Mertler & Vanatta, 2005; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003).

The model featuring the surviving relationships was retained. It was compared with the

original model and explained in light of the previous research. Possible alternate

relationships between variables whose relationship path(s) did not survive analysis were

to be proposed (if applicable) and shown with a reproduced correlation representing the

new hypothesized relationship. This is done by multiplying the correlations between the

variables involved in the new relationship by one another. For example, if the

relationship between SDO and the binding foundations variable is found to be non

significant but the same relationship when mediated by RWA is significant, then the

correlation between SDO and RWA would be multiplied by the correlation between

RWA and the binding foundations. This would provide the relationship value of the new

mediated SDO-binding foundations path. An explanation of how the models differ will

be offered if applicable (Creswell, 2003; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie,

2003).

Qualitative Results and Mixed Methods Analysis

The participants' responses on the candidate choice questionnaire were rated in

terms of the number rating they assign to their ideal candidate's characteristics (in terms

of the five foundations), their strict father/nurturing parent worldview candidate

preferences, and their candidates' group loyalties preferences. The responses were

analyzed to find patterns in the responses that shed light on the presidential candidate

selection process In addition, as will be explained below, when these ratings were

analyzed in comparison with the results obtained in the quantitative portion of the study

they can help shed light on how people's social worldview and morality as rated

quantitatively by those variables affect their perceptions of presidential candidates

(Bryman, 2006; Lecompte & Schhensul, 1999). Specifically, these results were then

analyzed as to how they relate to participant levels of the two individualizing and three

binding moral foundations as rated by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire. This

analysis helped the researcher describe how the participants' ratings on these foundations

reflects their choice of (and emotional feelings for) the ideal candidates they describe and how they rate them (Bryman, 2006; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003).

Occurring along with this qualitative methodology, a quantitative analysis using principal component analysis was conducted to determine if the participant responses for the most preferred candidate moral characteristics produce the four differing types of responses found in previous research by Haidt et al. (2009). These four patterns, if found, would exhibit the following characteristics: the first pattern would consist of high ratings on the two individualizing foundations and low ratings on the three binding foundations. The second pattern would exhibit low ratings on all five foundations, the third pattern would exhibit high ratings on all five foundations, and the final pattern would exhibit high ratings on the three binding foundations and low ratings on the two individualizing foundations. These results or any other pattern of responding would be acknowledged as being valid if the PCA analysis displays the differing types of response with a total variance of $r = .70$ or above, a screen plot that includes all of the response patterns before leveling off, and average communality among the factors above $r = .60$ (Bryman, 2006; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003).

Since the individual and binding foundations acted as dependent variables for the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES, analysis across quantitative and qualitative methods concerning how these independent variables affect candidate choice can also occur and an explanation derived for how these variables may possibly impact participant attitudes in the candidate choice context. The researcher explored if, and how, participants' rated RWA, SDO, and subjective SES, and the strict

father/nurturing parent variables levels find emotional expression through the candidate selection process. (Bryman, 2006; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003). To this end he identified and sorted from the pool of completed participant questionnaires those indicating considerable emotional expression and compared such responses with these participants' ratings on the quantitative measures. He then analyzed accordingly (Bryman, 2006; Erzberger & Kelle, 2003).

Consequently, hypotheses and theories may be developed from this analysis that can be validated through additional research as occurred with that for the five moral foundations (Bryman, 2006).

Hypotheses

Hypothesized Variable Relationships

The hypothesized relationships between the variables are as follows: SDO and RWA with their connotations concerning in-group loyalty fear of outside group influences and, with their resultant desire (at least with SDO) to dominate outside groups should be positively related with the three obligatory foundations-as expressed through the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007). Since these three also have to do with maintenance of group integrity these variables should go together well. For much the same reasons the two strict father variables of rules reinforcement and self-discipline should also compliment the three obligatory foundations of in-group loyalty, submission to authority, and moral purity. These three serve to reinforce the group structure and the two strict father variables help to build that structure in the first place. It also follows that the two individualizing

foundations will also be related to the two nurturing parent variables since empathy-openness and nurturant caregiving help build the worldview by which people with a concern for harm/care and fairness exist and thrive. Since the nurturing caregiving foundation is related to both political conservatism and political liberalism, it should also be related to both the individualizing and the binding moral foundations. However the nurturing parent factor of empathy openness should be negatively related with the three binding foundations (Graham et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008).

SDO is associated with a desire for power. Therefore since people who achieve a high level of subjective SES are dismissive of those lower in status, it should be associated with subjective SES (Kraus & Keltner, 2009). However, since this relationship is correlational, there is room for other causes of high subjective SES and people high in this variable need not also rate high in SDO. RWA and subjective SES should be unrelated to one another since they have no concepts in common: RWA has to do with respect for authority and fear of outside influences and subjective SES has to do with a person's perceived sense of well-being (Altemeyer, 1996; Kraus & Keltner, 2009).

The following multivariate changes in variable relationships should occur: As the level of subjective SES increases, the level of SDO, of the strict father morality variables, and of the three obligatory foundations should increase. This multivariate increase will occur not because of a direct cause and effect relationship but because of meditational factors involving one or more of the variables acting as an intermediary (McAdams et al., 2008). The path of this causation, however at present is not clear and it could conceivably go both ways. Hence a path analysis graphic depicting possible cause and effect

relationships, mediating variables, and the direction of hypothesized relationships will be useful (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

The following hypotheses have been tested in this study:

H01: Scores on social dominance orientation are unrelated to scores on each of the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Ha1: Scores on social dominance orientation are positively related to each of the scores on the three obligatory foundations measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H02: Scores on right-wing authoritarianism are unrelated to each of scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Ha2: Scores on right-wing authoritarianism are positively related to scores on each of the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H03: Scores on subjective SES and social dominance orientation are unrelated to each other.

Ha3: Scores on subjective SES and social dominance orientation are positively related.

H04: Scores on subjective SES are unrelated to scores on all five moral foundations.

Ha4: Scores on subjective SES are related to scores on all five moral foundations.

H05a: Scores on the strict father variables are unrelated to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Ha5a: Scores on the strict father variables are positively related to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H05b: Scores on the strict father variables are unrelated to scores on the two individualizing foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Ha5b: Scores on the strict father variables are inversely related to scores on the two individualizing foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H06a: Scores on the nurturing parent variables are unrelated to scores on the two individualizing foundations.

Ha6a: Scores on the nurturing parent variables are positively related to scores on the two individualizing foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

H06b: Scores on the nurturing parent variable are unrelated to scores on the three obligatory foundations as measured by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Ha6b: Scores on the nurturing parent variable are negatively related to scores on the three obligatory foundations.as measured by Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

Extension of Results Obtained to Real Life Candidate Choice Issues.

Finally, the researcherl also attempted to generalize the results obtained from the mixed methods analysis to real life political dilemmas taking place in the present society. Since the candidates being chosen here hold issue positions that reflect the present political debate in American society, participants' endorsement or rejection of their issue positions, their moral philosophy, and their group membership should also reflect participants attitudes about real life events (Altemeyer, 1996; Kosloff et al., 2010; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Consequently, since present real life candidates may act as instruments of the participants will in representing their group membership in the government they will then in turn act on behalf of their in-group, the strict father or nurturing parent values that their group holds to, and the level of SDO, RWA, and subjective SES that this group has to decide what laws and policies the present nation should enact. To the extent that these inferences are borne out, conclusions about the functioning of the socio-political system can be made. As a result theories can be generated about how the participants would utilize their elected members to help decide such issues as affirmative action, social and welfare spending, national debt issues, and the national response to terrorism (Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanuis & Pratto, 1999; Feather, 1998; Lupfer et al., 1988)**.**

Summary

In this study the researcher investigated the five moral foundations that are asserted by Graham and associates (2009) to underlie all human morality in two stages: one a quantitative assessment and the other a qualitative one. The quantitative assessment

rated these five foundations as two dependent variables (dividing them into the two individualizing and the three binding foundations) in terms of participant ratings on the strict father/nurturing parent variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES. In the qualitative portion of this study the researcher used the five foundations to explore presidential candidate choice. A presidential choice questionnaire was used to assess study participants' candidate choice in terms of the four patterns of responding to the moral foundations questionnaire that have been reported by Haidt et al. (2009).

The participants were to be 153 members of the Walden University community who choose to participate in its Sona Online research system. Another 90 participants were to be recruited by Old Brooklyn CDC and were to fill out this study's forms in Grace Church in Cleveland, Ohio. They read a statement explaining the study to them and soliciting their consent for participation. Once this is obtained they filled out the survey materials the responses obtained will be transcribed into a computer for analysis. This computer was protected from unauthorized usage by McAfee Total Protection Software and Windows security password protection. The data will be stored for a period of five years and then will be deleted from the computer's hard drive. The researcher insured that participants understand their rights and that they can refuse any participation without penalty.

Multiple linear regression was used to track how changes in the independent variables influence the five foundations, and how these variable affect another. Understanding such changes can shed light on how each variable interacts with the others and in the process changes how these different factors jointly help shape a person's

political personality and how this personality is expressed in a presidential election candidate choice. The researcher assessed presidential candidate choice qualitatively through a questionnaire in which participants' words or phrases that indicate which of the moral five foundations they prefer exhibited in their ideal presidential candidate and whether and to what extent they prefer either the strict father or the nurturing parent social worldview. Their response to political beliefs that are indicative of their ideal candidate's SDO and RWA levels were also explored.

Chapter 4: Results

Data was gathered between November 2013 and March 2015 with the administration of the Life Experiences Questionnaire, Right Wing Authoritarian Scale, Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Subjective SES questionnaire, Moral Foundations Questionnaire, and The Presidential Candidate Choice Questionnaire. A total of 221 participant responses were obtained. They were analyzed with SPSS 17 using multiple regression analysis and principal component analysis (Erzberger & Kelle, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

Demographic Breakdown

Tables 1 and 2 represent the online participant breakdown in terms of their age and educational level. Tables 3 and 4 represent their ethnic breakdown and occupation.

Table 1

```
        ```___
```

Participants Age

```
_____
```

Age	
21-30	19%
31- 40	24%,
41-50	25%,
51-60	24%,
61-70	7%,
71-80	1%

In Table 1 participant age distribution is nearly even over the firsr four age categories, falling off in the last two.

Table 2

Educational Level

Less than a bachelor's degree   14%

Bachelor degree   43%

master's degree   36%

PhD degree or beyond   6%

In Table 2 most participants fell on the middle of the education distribution with either a bachelor's or a master's degree.

Table 3

Ethnic Breakdown

White   71%

Black   16%,

Hispanic   5%

Irish   3%

Asian   1%

As depicted in Table 3 concerning the study's ethnic breakdown most participants were white with a sizable minority being either black or Hispanic

Table 4

Occupation

Health Care Professionals	25%
Managers	21%
Educators	20%
Students,	12%
Managers,	11%
Retired	7%
Consultants	4%
The Legal Profession	4%
Librarians	2%
Engineers	2%
Data Processors	2%
Homemakers	2%
Writers	1%
In the Military	1%
Tax Preparers	1%
Typists	1%
Election officials	1%
Bicycle Sales	1%
IT professional	1%
Singers	1%
Clerk Typists	1%
Student Cashiers	1%

Many of the in-person respondents were health care professionals, managers, educators, or students. The remainder came from a variety of occupations.

The in-person respondents' average age was 46.79. Their average income was $21,476, their ethnicity was 38% White and 62% Black, and 21% had a master's degree, 26% a bachelor's degree, and 53 % an associate's degree or less. Their occupational breakdown was as follows: 17% were retired, 13% were self-employed, 13% were in sales, 8% were artists, and 4% were each plumbers, accountants, dog walkers, <pcna's

tow meter drivers, social workers, movers, cooks, caddies, ushers, electrical/technical persons, veteran's administration, retired navy persons. Seventy four percent of the study's respondents were male, and 26% were female.

Most of the online participants were White while most of the in person respondents were Black.

Before the data could be analyzed, results from each variable were assessed for skewness, kurtosis, homosedacity, linear relationships between the variables, and for multivariate outliers. Two of the variables, SDO and empathy–openness, were found to have positive skewness and kurtosis values above 1.0 and required a mathematical transformation. SDO values were changed with an SDO manipulation while empathy–openness values were transformed using a Log 10 manipulation. Mahabolis distance analysis resulted in two cases being deleted when all the study's variables were included and two other cases being deleted when only the strict father/nurturing parent independent variables were included (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). An error in the SurveyMonkey system caused three questions of the 32 question Moral Foundations Questionnaire (each one measuring a different moral foundation) to be deleted. This affected 37 participant responses. The three missing question answers were replaced with the mean for a particular participant's scores on the questions on the concept being assessed as described in the author's scoring booklet (Graham et al., 2011). In part, because a large number of people preferred taking the online version of the survey as opposed to the in-person version, the number of in-person responses fell short of the 90 specified in Chapter 3. Below is a table summarizing the descriptive characteristics of the

variables in this study including the minimum and maximum participant scores on the

study's surveys, the mean of these scores, standard error of the mean, standard deviation,

skewness, and kurtosis.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistical Results for Study Variables

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Error-M	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
RWA	148	.00	104.00	48.145	1.55	18.90	.19	-.40
SDO	149	4.00	10.58	5.95	.14	1.65	.88	.20
SubSES	140	1.00	10.00	5.70	.18	2.12	-.14	-.54
NurturantCaregiving	122	.00	8.00	2.97	.16	1.84	.39	-.55
EmpathyOpenness	120	.00	.78	.15	.02	.20	1.00	.02
RulesReinforcement	122	.00	9.00	2.83	.19	2.05	.63	-.20
SelfDiscipline	122	.00	8.00	2.22	.15	1.69	.64	.14
IndMorFound	126	25.00	76.00	47.51	.72	8.05	-.25	.71
BindMorFound	125	9.00	89.00	52.34	1.71	19.17	.19	-.92

Below is an explanation of how the study's hypothesized relationships fared, the relationships that were found, and a summary and brief explanation of the study's results.

Research Questions, Hypothesis Testing, and Relationship Summary

Research Questions

Social dominance and the binding foundations. The first research question was whether social dominance was related to the three binding foundations. The alternate hypothesis in the study was that it was. The research hypothesis was not upheld: social dominance was unrelated to the binding foundations but was inversely (and insignificantly) related to the individualizing foundations, $\beta = -.003$, $p = .971$.

Right-wing authoritarianism and the binding foundations. The second research question was whether right-wing authoritarianism was related to the three binding foundations. The alternate hypothesis in the study was that it was. The null hypothesis was upheld. Right-wing authoritarianism was related to the binding foundations, $\beta = .646$, $p = .000$.

SDO and subjective SES. The third research question was whether SDO and subjective SES were related. The hypothesis was not upheld. SDO and subjective SES were not found to be significantly related with a correlation of $r = .051$, $p = .561$.

Subjective SES and the five foundations. The fourth research question was whether subjective SES was related to any of the five binding foundations. The alternative hypothesis was that it was. The research hypothesis was not upheld: subjective SES was not related to any of the five foundations. However, it did approach significance with the binding foundations, $\beta = .120$, $p = .096$ for the binding foundations and $\beta = .338$, $p = .331$ for the individualizing foundations respectively.

Self-discipline and the binding foundations. The fifth research question was whether the strict father variables were related to the binding foundations. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis was partially upheld: The strict father variable self-discipline was related to the binding foundations; however, rules reinforcement was not, with $\beta = .196$, $p = .016$ for self-discipline and $\beta = -.033$, $p = .662$ for rules reinforcement.

The nurturing parent variables and individualizing foundations. The sixth research question was whether the nurturing parent variable was related to the individualizing foundations. The alternative hypothesis was that it was, but, it was not

upheld: neither nurturing parent variable was related to the individualizing foundations. However, the empathy openness variable approached .05 significance, with $\beta =. -.012, p = .899$, for nurturant caregiving, and $\beta = -191, p = .066$, for empathy openness.

The binding foundations and the nurturing parent variables. In addition, binding foundations were not related to the nurturing parent variables. $\beta = . 050, p = .489$, for nurturant caregiving, and $\beta = -.096, p = .225$, for empathy openness.

Empathy openness and the individualizing foundations. Another hypothesis tested was whether empathy openness was related to the individualizing foundations but not related to the binding foundations. This hypothesis was partially upheld: empathy openness was inversely related to the individualizing foundations but not significantly related to the binding foundations, with $\beta = -191, p = .066$ for the relationship to the individualizing foundations and $\beta = -.230, p =. 026$, when only the strict father and nurturing parent variables were included in the analysis, and with $\beta = -.096, p = .225$ being the relationship to the binding foundations.

Tables 2 and 3 depict the regression analysis, the variables rated in this study, and the statistical significance of each of them. ables 4 and 5 depict the analysis including only the strict father/nurturing caregiving variables as predictors. Tables 6 and 7 depict the results of the principal components analysis.

The relationship between rules reinforcement and the individualizing foundations was not significant when all of the variables were analyzed together but was significant when only the strict father and nurturant caregiving variables were included in the analysis. This indicates that RWA, SDO, and subjective SES when included ate up the

variance that would otherwise be exhibited by rules reinforcement. That is, their

expression took precedence in the reality in which they were included (Erzberger &

Kelle, 2003; Mertler & Vannatta, 2005; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

Table 6

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting the Individualizing Foundations from NurturantCaregiving, EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA, SDO, and SubSES

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	p
NurturantCaregiving	-.052	.412	-.012	.899
EmpathyOpenness	-7.894	4.245	-.191	.066
RulesReinforcement	.382	.374	.101	.309
SelfDiscipline	.376	.381	.099	.327
RWA	-.021	.040	-.049	.607
SDO	-1.920	.500	-.372	.000
SubSES	.338	.346	.091	.331

Note. F (7,97) = 3.559, p < .002 R^2 = .204 (p< .00005); Adjusted R^2 = .147

This table displays the beta, standard error, adjusted beta, and the percentage of significance for each of the variable interactions in the regression of the independent variables on the individualizing foundations. As the table shows only SDO and Empathy openness were significantly (or near significantly) related to the dependent variable, the individualizing foundations in this model. The very large negative beta score for EmpathyOpenness indicates a strong inverse relationship with the dependent variable. However, given the relatively large standard error some caution should be used in interpreting this result.

Table 7

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting the Binding Foundations from NurturantCaregiving, Lg10EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA, SDO, and SubSES

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	p
NurturantCaregiving	.526	.758	.050	.489
EmpathyOpenness	-9.515	7.783	-.096	.225
Rules Reinforcement	-.308	.701	-.033	.662
SelfDiscipline	2.378	.973	.196	.016
RWA	.651	.073	.646	.000
SDO	-.034	.916	-.003	.971
SubSES	1.067	.635	.120	.096

Note. F (7,96) = 16.170, p < .0001 R^2 = .541 (p< .00005); Adjusted R^2 = .508

This table displays the beta, standard error, adjusted beta, and the percentage of significance for each of the variable interactions in the regression of the independent variables on the binding foundations. RWA, self discipline, and subjective SES, are significant or near significantly related to the dependent variable the binding foundations. Note once again, the high negative beta for empathy openness, as in the previous table.

Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting the Individualizing Foundations from NurturantCaregiving, EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA, SDO, and SubSES

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	p
NurturantCaregiving	-.323	.423	-.072	.446
EmpathyOpenness	-9.080	4.027	-.230	.026
Rules Reinforcement	.828	.382	.215	.032
SelfDiscipline	-.710	.536	-.142	.188

Note. $F_{(4,106)} = 2.430$, p = . .052 R^2 = .084 (p< .00005); Adjusted R^2 = .049

In this analysis only the strict father and nurturing parent variables were included. Rules reinforcement and empathy openness were found to be significant predictors of the individualizing foundations, self-discipline and nurturant caregiving were not. Note once again the high negative beta value for empathy openness indicating a strong negative relationship. Note also the relatively high standard error associated with this result.

Table 9

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting The Binding Foundations from
NurturantCaregiving, EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA,
SDO, and SubSES

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	p
NurturantCaregiving	1.040	.991	.097	.296
EmpathyOpenness	-17.532	9.418	-.186	.065
Rules Reinforcement	-.619	.896	-.067	.491
SelfDiscipline	2.915	1.274	239	.024

Note. F (4,105) = 3.756, p < .007 R^2 = .125 (p< .00005); Adjusted R^2 = 092

As Table 5 depicts, once again, only the strict father and nurturing parent variables were included in the analysis. Self-discipline and empathy openness were significant predictors of the dependent variable the binding foundations, nurturant caregiving and rules reinforcement were not. Once again note the high negative beta number for the empathy openness value, double the size of previous analysis and that this time it is associated with a large standard error number also double the size obtained in the other analysis.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Factor analysis yielded significant, or near significant relationships between the following variables: Rules reinforcement and the individual foundation, r =.17, p =.07, self discipline and the binding foundations, r =.29, p =.002, an inverse relationship

between empathy openness and both the individual and binding foundations, $r = -.18$, $p = .06$, $r = -,29$, $p =.02$, between rules reinforcement and self discipline, $r = .35$, $p =.000$, RWA and the binding foundations $r =.68$, $p =.000$, an inverse relationship between empathy openness and self discipline, $r =-.40$, $p = .000$, an inverse relationship between SDO and the individualizing foundations, $r =-.33$, $p =.000$, and RWA and SDO, $r =.21$, $p = .015$. These results upheld the findings of the regression analysis. The relationship between RWA, as rated by the Zakrisson Scale, found by its author, and SDO was replicated and upheld (Zakrisson, 2005). The high correlation between rules reinforcement and self discipline and their inverse relationship with empathy openness points to a philosophical shift in the social and political process, which will be discussed in chapter 5 (Graham et al., 2011; McAdams et al., 2008;). Not enough significant correlations between the variables were found to include a path analysis diagram. Therefore, only the significant relationships were discussed above.

These results also help to show where a person fits in the social and political system. While there were some surprises there were enough established relationships between the variables to provide a good amount of information on specific types of people in the political system and to contrast their position in society, their interests, and their behaviors (Fiske, 1993; Graham et al., 2011; McAdams et al., 2008).

Qualitative Research Questions and Political Personalities

Do participant responses reveal four distinct patterns of responding?
Examination of open ended answers to the Presidential Candidate Choice Questionnaire, while showing the combination of moral foundation variables underlying the existence of

the four personality types found by Haidt and associates in previous studies, also showed a variety of other responses that did not conform to these prototypes (Graham et al., 2011). To clarify these findings a principal components analysis was performed on the study's quantitative results.

A principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the five variables assessed by the Moral Foundations Questionnaire. This was done to validate the results obtained by Graham, Haidt and Novak, (20111). The results obtained explained 88.80% of the total variance and indicated that instead of four differing personality types three were found. These types were the traditional hard-nosed conservative, the classical liberal, and a moderate liberal. That only three types were found could be indicative of a narrowly drawn sample or possibly due to idiosyncratic factors. Two factors were discovered with an Eigenvalue above 1.0. However, the scree plot leveled off at the third factor. So this factor was included as well. Table 6 displays this analysis and includes the values for total variance explained, rotation sum of squares loadings, extraction sums of squared loadings, initial eigenvalues, the percent of eigenvalue each factor contributes, the cumulative total of variance the included factors contribute, and the variance of each factor as it is loaded. The PCA analysis displayed in Table 7 includes all of the study's variables and is described below.

Table 10

Principal Components Analysis Loading Results-Total Variance Explained

	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.46	49.12	49.12	2.46	49.12	49.12	2.42	48.34	48.34
2	1.58	31.56	80.67	1.58	31.55	80.67	1.01	20.29	68.62
3	.41	8.13	88.80	.41	8.13	88.80	1.01	20.18	88.80
4	.32	6.51	95.35						
5	.23	4.65	100.00						

A PCA analysis including all of the study's variables was conducted to shed more light the existence of differing personality types and what factors may contribute to their existence. This analysis included all of the study's variables, not just the moral foundations included in Graham and associates (2011) analysis. Since it added more to the results than was included in their analysis it could reveal political personality types that might not be directly comparable to theirs. However, the present author believed that such an analysis would add more information concerning the political typology including the possible effect on partisan types of RWA, SDO, subjective SES and the strict father and nurturing caregiving variables. It revealed five personality types which explained 78% of the sample's total variance: The tough minded disciplinarian authoritarian conservative, the Ambitious (dominating), but understanding moderate authoritarian

conservatives. The nurturing and empathetic but by the rules self discipline (self improvement) liberal, the socially concerned, status conscious moderate liberal, and the rules oriented establishment loyalist. Varimax Rotation upheld these general results (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Notice that the researcher reduced the eigenvalue criterion for inclusion from 1.0 to .991 to include five factors. This is justified for three reasons: One, principal components analysis on the raw data resulted in all five factors rating above 1.0 with the fourth and fifth factor being reversed and two, these two factors are close in eigenvalue number and in percent of total variance explained, and three, the scree plot for this analysis declines sharply after the fifth component. Hence it is informative to include both in the analysis (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

Table 11

Principal Components Analysis Loading Results For All Variables-Total Variance Explained

_____

Component Initial Eigenvalues Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings

	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	2.10	23.41	23.41	2.11	23.41	23.41	1.76
2	1.67	18.57	41.98	1.67	18.57	41.98	1.48
3	1.24	13.80	55.78	1.24	13.80	55.78	1.45
4	1.03	11.47	67.26	1.03	11.47	67.26	1.22
5	.99	11.01	78.26	.99	11.01	78.26	1.11
6	.75	8.30	86.57				
7	.53	5.89	92.45				
8	.47	5.21	97.67				
9	.21	2.34	100.00				

_____

This table shows the principal components analysis with all of the study's variables included involving a total of nine components five of which met the criteria for inclusion for further analysis and for interpretation.

Table 12

Principal Components Analysis Matrix With Five Components Involving The Individualizing Foundations, The Binding Foundations, NurturantCaregiving, EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA, SDO, and SubSES

Variable	Component Matrix				
RWA	.731	.390	.024	.236	-.207
SDO	.173	.775	-.100	-.086	.256
SubSES	.132	-.027	-.540	.421	.637
IndMorFound	.159	-.715	-.153	.384	-.304
BindMorFound	.857	.112	-.060	.286	-.208
NurturantCaregiving	.069	.228	.728	.245	-.029
EmpathyOpenness	-.576	.263	.281	.487	.060
RulesReinforcement	.227	-.455	.499	.179	.509
SelfDiscipline	.614	-.259	.237	-.484	.278

Table 8 displays the component analysis matrix with the correlation that each variable has to each of the five component factors found. Each of the five components in this table was found to be related differently to each of the variables in this study. Based on these relationships, or correlations, five different political personalities were identified and described below here. These personalities will be discussed in more detail below. Component 1 was highly related with the binding foundations, RWA, and self discipline, and moderately related to rules reinforcement SDO, and subjective SES. It was inversely

related to empathy openness. Component 2 was highly related with SDO, moderately related to RWA, and slightly related tonurturant caregiving, and empathy openness. It was inversely related to rules reinforcement, self discipline, and subjective SES. Component 3 was highly related to nurturant caregiving, moderately related to rules reinforcement, RWA, empathy openness, and nurturant caregiving. It was highly inversely related to subjective SES and also inversely related to the individual foundations. Component 4 was moderately related to empathy openness, subjective SES, and the individual foundations. It was also related to nurturant caregiving, RWA, and rules reinforcement. It was inversely related to self discipline and SDO, Component 5 was highly related to subjective SES, less so to rules reinforcement and SDO.with virtually no relation to empathy openness and nurturant caregiving. It was inversely related to the individual and binding foundations as well as to RWA.

Table 13

Principal Components Analysis Matrix Using Varimax Rotation Involving The Individualizing Foundations, The Binding Foundations, NurturantCaregiving, EmpathyOpenness, RulesReinforcement, SelfDiscipline, RWA, SDO, and SubSES

Variable	Component Matrix				
RWA	.868	.163	.077	.007	-.026
SDO	.271	.776	-.046	-.114	.149
SubSES	.072	.036	-.046	.062	.938
IndMorFound	.150	-.873	.028	.014	.119
BindMorFound	.900	-.100	.216	.047	.082
NurturantCaregiving	.235	.168	-.329	.542	-.402
Lg10EmpathyOpenness	-.194	.115	-.799	.171	-.031
RulesReinforcement	-.050	-.198	.150	.844	.147
SelfDiscipline	.121	.070	.789	.406	-.071

Varimax Rotation which maximizes the relationships between components and variables they are highly related to was performed to help patterns of data that may classify differing types of political personalities. Once again five components were generated and their relationships to the study's variables is as follows: For the first component the binding foundations and RWA loaded very highly. SDO, individual, self discipline, were moderate and lowly loaded. Subjective SES and rules reinforcement

were virtually not related. Results were similar to the PCA analysis without Varimax Rotation for some variables except that factors loaded more powerfully for them with this analysis. They loaded less powerfully for others. While the overall result indicated the same five personality types: it emphasized traditional conservatism, socially dominant conservatism, unempathetic, self discipline-self improvement, oriented moderation, rules oriented, discipline conscious, politically left leaning ideals, and the status conscious, non nurturing ambitious moderation in the five types, respectively.

Open Ended Responses and Qualitative Research Questions.

General Responses.

In general, participants' open ended questionnaire responses were consistent with those they provided on the quantitative surveys, with a number of exceptions with some who answered according to a liberal mindset responded conservatively on the subjective measures. These respondents, while expressing views that protecting people and insuring fairness were of paramount importance, based their views in a belief that such priorities were socially appropriate, were representative of their ingroup n(family and friends) and represented true religious belief. That is, they seemed to subordinate the individualizing (liberal) moral foundations to the binding (conservative) ones.. Many left leaning respondents expressed the view that caring for the poor and downtrodden was an important presidential responsibility. Some believed that providing fairness of opportunity was of the utmost importance. More conservatively minded participants asserted that the president should endeavor to minimize government's role in people's lives and to allow them to follow their own pursuits (Jost, 2006; O'Neill, 2005)..

However, both conservative and liberal responding participants occasionally favored a hawkish foreign policy president apparently because they believe that regardless of their own views, the world is a tough unforgiving place and only a hard nosed disciplinarian and cynical president could adequately keep the nation safe. In general, even when conservatives and liberals expressed the expected opinions for their ideal president many on both sides of the dichotomy expressed the view that the world is a tough place and that the president needed to be ready for its challenge. Participants with international experience asserted that cooperation was the best course of action. However, some claimed that based on such experience, a firm hand was necessary to keep foreign threats at bay.

SDO, RWA, and Candidate Choice Research Question

There was variation in the pattern of responses but some tended to reflect participants' levels of SDO and RWA. This was expressed in terms of a person's place in society and his or her interests. <Based on their open ended question responses minority and white participants were more likely to judge situations and others involved from their demographic perspectives. – Where are the statistical analyses that demonstrate this? Please include them here.> Individual social dominance and authoritarianism tended to be reflected in presidential candidate choice. However, people in general tended to favor a tough minded president over a more benevolent one.

Strict Father, Nurturing Parent Beliefs, and the Five Moral Foundations Research Questions

The strict father/nurturing parent attitudes generally expressed along the left vs. right dichotomy are consistent with the interest of demographic groups. Those participants expressing nurturing parent ideals also wanted a president who would be compassionate for the poor and who would help insure fairness for all groups in society. They also rejected, as callous and short-sighted, a president who would favor corporate and wealthy interests. They asserted that only when society's members worked together could overall national well being and success be achieved. Strict father adherents expressed viewpoints that only through hard work and vigilance could people individually insure national success. They felt that this was the only way that any coherent goals, whether conservative or liberal could be achieved. However, as mentioned before both liberal and conservative participants preferred a tough minded president to protect their worldview and interests.

Interpretation Across Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

While most participants tended to answer along the political left right divide, some of them deviated idiosyncratically. A few expressed the view that purity was important declared that a president should maintain American values and ways of national behavior both at home and abroad. Participants emphasizing authority, as a value also declared that since the president represents American ideals, he should be respected so he can best promulgate them. Those who emphasized in-group loyalty asserted that while America may have altruistic goals abroad but ultimately the president must place

American interests and protecting Americans first. These preferences tended to be expressed in the quantitative RWA questionnaire. However, there were not enough of such responses for a statistical analysis to be conducted. Instead, this triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data points to the need for further research to be conducted.

No relationship between these attitudes and SDO was found. However, that might have been due to participants' tendency across the board to score low in SDO. This tendency, might not reflect low dominance motivation as much as a desire to reflect the socially desirable inclination of opposing dominance. (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008; Rasinski, 1987). These results uphold past research which shows that true empathy is a rare commodity and that altruism is much more often an expression of a desire to confirm ones sense of being a benevolent person instead of truly taking the perspective of others, especially out-group members (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Rasinski, 1987).

In general, conservative participants, in responses to the open-ended questionnaires statements, favored a procedural viewpoint of justice: They asserted that fair procedures would lead to just government as opposed to fairer distribution of societal resources. Only those participants scoring liberally on all of the quantitative measures favored distributive justice. This indicates that at least some people in the political system think in a conservative mindset and supports results obtained from the other measures in this study. Left leaning people in this study opposed the use of arbitrary authority which they termed arrogance, but generally did not have trouble accepting authority per say, especially if that authority was benevolent. (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al.,

2008; Rasinski, 1987). While there were not enough such participants to provide a statistical analysis these results should stimulate further study.

Summary of the Results

Subjective SES was found to be related to the binding foundations at a near significant .10 level. While this finding fails to reach the .05 criteria it does contribute to an overall picture that all the study's findings, when analyzed together, presents. The quantitative regression results present two different major political personality types: one with relationships between RWA, subjective SES, and the strict father variable of self discipline and the binding foundations, the other with a relationship between the strict father variable of rules reinforcement, an inverse relationship with SDO, and the individualizing foundations. The first personality is that of a class conscious person, who idealizes and is driven by self discipline and a determination to demonstrate their competence and social viability in a society in which they value their in-group and respect the authority of its leaders. The second is that of a rules oriented person who dislikes ambition, who may express concern for the poor and downtrodden, but is less concerned with feeling empathy or with perspective taking than with demonstrating that they are concerned and helpful people. They also may feel that personal shortcomings in not following society's mores and values is more likely the cause for misfortune than social injustice.

Results from all sources indicated a positive relationship between self discipline, right wing authoritarianism, subjective SES, and the binding moral foundations. An inverse relationship was also found between rules reinforcement, empathy openness,

SDO, and the individualizing foundations. However, the relationships involving rules reinforcement and empathy openness was found only when the strict father nurturing parent variables were included in the analysis without RWA, SDO in subjective SES. It would seem that these other variables eat up the variance that would otherwise go to the strict father/nurturing care variables in the full analysis. The overall variance explained by all of the variables was over 50% for the analysis involving the binding foundations but dropped to 20% for the individualizing foundations. Hence it appears that more factors may affect the expression of the individualizing foundations (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

Summary

In this study 221 people were surveyed using the RWA, SDO, subjective SES, Life Experiences Questionnaire, The Moral Foundations Questionnaire, and the Presidential Candidate Choice Questionnaire. These surveys were presented in both online and in person formats. Results indicated that the study's hypothesis' were partially upheld. RWA and self discipline were associated with the binding foundations but SDO and rules reinforcement were not. Empathy openness was inversely related to the individualize get foundations when all the variables were analyzed and was inversely related to the binding foundations when only the strict father/nurturing caregiving variables were included in the analysis. Subjective SES was not associated with any of the study's other variables. Principal components analysis revealed five types of personalities in the political system. These types included subgroups for whom the study's hypotheses were upheld. They also showed that nurturant caregiving was

exhibited by politically left wing participants, but it was an expression of rules reinforcement. Participants open ended responses indicated that people on both the political left and right were interested in a president who was tough minded, understood that the world was a dangerous place, and was willing to do what it takes to defend his people. While people on the left were concerned about helping the less fortunate they seemed to do so to support rules they believed should underlie society. Those on the right were interested in policies that facilitated self sufficiency.and upheld the belief that the world was a competitive place and they needed to win battles against antagonistic opponents in a zero sum world.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study was designed to use a variety of measures, the RWA, SDO, subjective SES, the life experiences surveys, and the moral foundations questionnaire to obtain a bird's eye view of participants in the political system and to test and verify the parameters of conservative and liberal ideology as defined by past researchers. The results obtained by previous researchers were for the most part not upheld. In previous studies, the political right was defined by those who score high in the binding moral foundations, high in self-discipline, rules reinforcement, in RWA and SDO, while liberals were rated high in the individualizing foundations, nurturant-caregiving, empathy-openness, with low ratings in RWA and SDO (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Haidt et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008). Instead, in this study, the quantitative regression results present two different major political personality types: one with relationships between RWA, subjective SES, and the strict father variable of self-discipline and the binding foundations, the other with a relationship between the strict father variable of rules reinforcement, an inverse relationship with SDO, and the individualizing foundations. Results indicated a positive relationship between self-discipline, right-wing authoritarianism, subjective SES, and the binding moral foundations. An inverse relationship was also found between rules reinforcement, empathy–openness, SDO, and the individualizing foundations. However, the relationships involving rules reinforcement and empathy–openness was found only when the strict father/nurturing parent variables were included in the analysis without RWA, SDO, and subjective SES. As mentioned before, it would seem that these other variables consume the variance that would

otherwise go to the strict father/nurturing care variables in the full analysis. The overall variance explained by all of the variables was over 50% for the analysis involving the binding foundations but dropped to 20% for the individualizing foundations. Hence, it appears that more factors may affect the expression of the individualizing foundations (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

RWA's relationship with the binding foundations is expected in the literature and authoritarianism is part of the group binding process. Subjective SES relationship with SDO was not realized. Perhaps leadership itself, which often entails maintaining

a person's status and stereotyping others might not entail dominance motivation but instead fear. Its relationship with the binding foundations may indicate the tendency of established people to protect their standing in society which is reflected in the status quo. Self-discipline's relationship with the binding foundations also may reflect a similar idea, that noble people who work hard are successful and are those for whom the status quo exists and whose interest it is to protect the established group values, loyalties, and authority structure. That self-discipline is not asociated with rules reinforcement is surprising and might indicate a shift among conservatives to a libertarian philosophy.

The lack of relationships between nurturant caregiving and the dependent variables departs from previous research results (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008). The inverse relationship of empathy–openness with the individualizing foundations fits no established theory and has no precedent. These results could represent a shift in the result configuration normally associated with left versus right politics and shows that the left might now be defined by rules reinforcement being associated with the

individualizing foundations and the right by self-discipline being associated with the

binding foundations (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

Interpretations of the Principal Component Analysis

The first personality is that of class conscious persons, who idealize and are

driven by self-discipline and a determination to demonstrate their competence and social

viability in a society in which they value their in-group and respect the authority of its

leaders. The second is that of rules-oriented persons who dislike ambition, who may

express concern for the poor and downtrodden but are less concerned with feeling

empathy or with understanding the situational perspective of others than with

demonstrating that they are concerned and helpful people. They also may feel that

personal shortcomings in not following society's mores and values is more likely the

cause for misfortune than social injustice.

If these personalities or prototypes are to be taken as representations of right and

left in the political system, this may indicate a shift from the traditional dichotomy found

in past studies of the authoritarian, rules oriented, socially dominant, and class conscious

conservative and the compassion showing, rules shunning, and anti-authoritarian liberal

to a new social and political dynamic in which both sides of the debate have changed

their moral beliefs and their priorities (Haidt & Graham, 2007; McAdams et al., 2008).

However, the five personality types also indicate that while nurturant caregiving is not

dead, in action it is subordinate to a philosophy involving rules reinforcement.

Instead, liberals and conservatives divided themselves between the binding foundations

with liberals rating high in rules reinforcement and conservatives rating high in self-

discipline. Both liberals and conservatives exhibited an inverse relationship to empathy– openness, with liberals' inverse relationship reaching significance and conservatives' same relationship nearly reaching it. Both liberals and conservatives also exhibited extremely low levels of empathy. This was the most striking result of this study (McAdams et al., 2008). Results involving RWA and SDO, when significant or near significant, upheld those of previous studies concerning the left-right dichotomy with conservatives' ratings reaching significance for RWA and liberals inverse ratings for SDO doing the same.

These results will be explained here and their ramifications for intergroup relations discussed. Finally, their consequences for social change will be expounded upon as well as recommendations for future research.

Loss of Empathy

These results, as extrapolated to the general population, appear to indicate a realignment of social and political identities in which the left, while continuing attitudes that discourage SDO, may actually hold attitudes that encourage authoritarianism and consequently discourage empathy and openness. Since attitudes on the political right also discourage empathy, an overall context in which empathy is discouraged by all people may be fostered. This will likely increase polarization between individuals and groups in society and possibly lead to an increase in conflict over various issues. While the left and the right are not philosophically coming closer to one another, their determination to uphold their established ways means less opportunity for them to find common ground and to work together (Haidt et al., 2009; Haidt, 2012). This is a departure from the work

of Graham et al., 2011, who found that empathy was exhibited by the left but not the right.

The Political Left

The political left, through their emphasis on enforcing rules, may press for discipline within their groups and enforce their priorities. They could believe society can only run properly if institutions and the government are recognized for their efforts to allocate resources and shares of the economic and social pie in accordance to their guidelines, to which they grant credence as being based in truth and objectively determined. Indeed, participant responses to questions in the Presidential Candidate Choice Questionnaire reflected this. Those asserting compassion and understanding for the less fortunate insisted that this was a normative expectation. Even those emphasizing openness to different ideas did so from the same basis. The low scores on empathy–openness exhibited by participants also evidence a lack of acting on the perspective of others by these groups. Instead, they may be more interested in demonstrating their benevolent nature through enforcing their standards. Their efforts appear to benefit infrastructure, the poor, disfranchised artists, professors, and students, and those needing a hand, but might not necessarily do so because their focus may not be on helping these groups per say but in defending their view of their own benevolence and of the correctness of their mission, whatever that mission might be, regardless of its consequences. Therefore, in some cases they may even punish members of these groups they help if they question the philosophy, objectives, goals, or the efficiency by which they act (Haidt, 2012).

Self-Discipline and Conservatism

As already mentioned, the political right has been redefined by these results by its emphasis on self-discipline. This is a shift from their previous alignment of variables with both rules reinforcement and self-discipline representing their worldview (Graham & Haidt, 2011). This could be a result of the rise of libertarianism as a political force in the last few years, or it could be the result of the shift of rules reinforcement from conservatives to liberals.

The idea of self-reliance is based in the Protestant work ethic instilled by religious immigrants to America during the colonial period. As such, it has become a foundation of traditional American culture. Hence political conservatives have sought to uphold it in any way possible through organizational and religious activities, mores, statutes and laws, and so forth. This concept is naturally associated with authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1996; Altemeyer, 2006) Notions of self-discipline are also associated with success in American society. As a result, it is no surprise that it is associated with respectability in established society. Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance, and subjective SES should, under certain circumstances, enhance belief in this strict father idea (Altemeyer, 1996; McAdams et al., 2008). What is surprising is that one of the five political personalities discovered by principal components analysis emphasizes self-discipline without regard to authoritarianism, social dominance, or subjective status, but with regard to nurturing–caregiving (McAdams et al., 2008). This personality type, while not qualifying as conservative, is not clearly defined as liberal, in the traditional sense, but might be seen as a new expression of conservatism. Rules reinforcement when combined with

nurturing-caregiving has been defined by some as a form of "compassionate conservatism" (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Haidt et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008). This definition conforms to traditional notions of conservatism. As a result, it follows that replacing rules reinforcement with self-discipline could yield another form of compassionate conservatism.

Rules Reinforcement and Liberalism

The liberal emphasis on rules reinforcement may indicate a worldview and policy not based on the needs of the people they profess concern for but preformed ideas and values. The lack of empathy found here also may show that differing individuals and groups within the liberal coalition may not be able to join together in common cause for anything beyond major issues and will be more inclined to fight one another than to see that their needs are shared by others allied with them (Haidt, 2012).

A New Strict Father Reality

In this study neither conservatism nor liberalism was found to be positively associated with the nurturing parent variables of nurturing caregiving or empathy openness. Only in the principal components analysis were these two variables significant, and their significance was subordinated to conservative ideals. This would seem to indicate that the morality on both left and right is based on strict father ideals. If nurturing parent values are not central to determining adult morality, they will likely not be the basis of personal moral actions or public policy decisions in society. Subjective SES near significant relationship with the binding foundations could indicate that both left and

right liken holding to established ways to societal success. Consequently, society will function differently than it has in past generations (McAdams et al., 2008).

More Evidence of This Change

The correlation between rules reinforcement and self-discipline found in the factor analysis indicate a similarity of philosophy between the political left and right. That both analyzed together were inversely related to empathy openness indicates a common lack of empathy by left and right (Graham et al., 2011). The strong inverse relationship between empathy openness and self-discipline appears to uphold previous research indicating conservative ideology is inversely related to perspective taking. The failure to find this result in the linear regression an analysis may indicate that other factors such as RWA have taken up the variance that was observed here. This suggests the possibility that RWA might add to empathy by its tendency to encourage cohesion and understanding between in-group members but not between in-group and out-group members (Altemeyer, 1996).

RWA and SDO

That many people expressing left leaning beliefs in their open ended question responses also rated highly in RWA and SDO underlines the decreased proportion of traditional classical liberals in the general population (Haidt, 2012; Sundquist, 1983). It might be the case that the political realignment of the 1960's (which continued through the Reagan Movement of the 1980's) which was due at least in part to adverse reaction to that era's protest movements placed empathic beliefs in a negative light (Sundquist, 1983)

SDO, Subjective SES, and Stereotyping

While the relationship between SDO and subjective SES was not upheld subjective SES was found to be related to the binding foundations. One of the five political prototypes also exhibits high levels of both SDO and subjective SES. This indicates that a subset of conservatives may exhibit the pattern of behavior indicated by Fiske (1993) and stereotype underlings and outsiders to protect their place in society and in their own organizations (Sidanius & Prato, 1999; Fiske, 1993). Conservatives as a whole did not score highly on social dominance, but liberals scored low on this measure. This does not mean that there are no conservatives rating highly on this measure. Indeed, the principal components analysis found such a relationship in one of the two conservative groups identified. This groups consisting of ambitious libertarian conservatives is to be differentiated from the other consisting of traditional authoritarian, ideological, and in-group oriented conservatives.

The Five Personality Types

The five prototypes identified in the principal components analysis tend to defy the traditional right vs. left political dichotomy (Graham et al., 2011; Haidt et al., 2009). While one plainly conservative and one plainly liberal prototype were identified, the other three types were ambiguous in their left vs. right characteristics and defined political activity along new dimensions. The emergence of the three new types which could be described as the ambitious libertarian, the self improvement and socially conscious concerned liberal, and class conscious concerned moderate liberal, may indicate that a new way of classifying political types, their demographics, and their

interests may be necessary. Any new system developed would need to capture the diversity of opinions expressed in society as reflected in participant responses in this study (Graham et al., 2011).

Open Ended Question Responses

Participant open ended responses expanded on the above results. While they divided along the traditional lines of left and right both sides of the political divide saw the world as a competitive and dangerous place and that being tough minded was the only way to prosper, to get ahead, and to protect what you have. This view, which conforms to the strict father worldview, adds evidence that a shift in the underlying political dialogue has occurred. Participants with traveling experience also favored being open to other cultures and other ways of living. Yet they viewed this too as being a normative rule that, if enforced, would improve life for everyone. That those participants leaning to the political left favored distributive justice while those on the right favored procedural justice underscored that they saw the world as optimally functioning in two different ways, conservatives insisting that social processes be objective and consistent and liberals that the end result of the process be equitable and not consistently favor any individual or group. This in turn suggests that liberals in this study may have been sensitized to the consequences of unfair procedural outcomes while conservatives have not (Lucas et al.,2009). That both hold to a strict father worldview means that their contest has shifted to a different battlefield-from a contest between strict father and nurturing parent beliefs to one involving individual self sufficiency as key to a prosperous society vs. one

involving maintaining rule and order to insure fairness and compassion as leading to that

prosperity (McAdams et al., 2008).

Social Change Ramifications

These results indicate that people on the left tend to mimic those on the right by

showing concerned about enforcing in-group ideas and in disciplining members for

disloyalty. They may not be concerned about their groups themselves, but believe that

their way of doing things as expressed through the group is objectively correct and must

be upheld. Such a focus tends to limit their ability to be empathetic to others and to be

open to new ideas and ways of thinking. This raises is the specter of left-wing

authoritarianism-or some variation of it (Altemeyer, 1996). This concept has been raised

by some authors but not thoroughly explored in the literature. The idea behind the

concept is that people on the left can be just as authoritarian as those on the right and that

they can exhibit the same social phenomenon and behaviors as they do. This brings about

a new view of society in general in which no longer is there left versus right political

ideologies and groups but a society in which both left wing and right wing groups act in

an authoritarian manner to uphold their worldviews and ways of life. Hence they act as

different right wing groups that compete with each other and while based on ideologies

normally called left and right and liberalism and conservativism in actuality function as

different types of conservatism (Altemeyer, 1996; McAdams et al., 2008; Graham et al.,

2011). That is not to say that the liberal ideology embodied by the political left with ideas

such as universal healthcare large government and concerns for active care for the poor,

minorities and marginalized groups has passed into history. However, the way that these

ideas are framed in debate and the way that liberal groups enforce adherence to their ideas seems to be a conservative one in that their emphasis on rules is one traditionally used by conservatives (Haidt et al., 2009; McAdams et al., 2008).

This also would indicate a lack of empathy and nurturant do in the social and political system as a whole. Consequently, while people on each side of the political debate might insist that they have the best interests of society at heart this concern is not based on concerns for others but on competing ideologies, values, and group loyalties. If this is the case they may not be open to understanding how their policy views impact society as a whole but only be focused on achieving their agenda and define social well being in terms of that agenda. Such competing worldviews will create conflicts between left and right groups and drain society's overall resources and place America and similarly affected nations at risk of falling behind other nations whose populations have a more unified philosophy and agenda (Haidt, 2012).

It would seem that an increase in empathy and the ability to understand the perspective of others can help bridge such polarizing differences. To this end research on empathy, its impact on interpersonal attitudes, and its effect on helping people from diverse backgrounds work together to solve common problems should be undertaken. Efforts on measuring its effects on the functioning of social and political institutions can also be pursued (Haidt, 2012; McAdams et al., 2008).

Limitations

That many more women than men participated in this study might limit its results. In addition, since sampling from the Walden Participant Pool and from sites in the

Cleveland Area might not necessarily represent the population as a whole caution should be taken in generalizing these results to the population as a whole. Women tend to rate lower than men in social dominance. They also tend to rate lower on the strict father morality variables as well (McAdams et al., 2008). The Walden University Participant Pool while drawing from a diverse sampling of students also represents a more highly educated group than that comprising the general population (Creswell, 2003.

The number of in person participants fell short of the 90 sought and this limits the predictability of results from this source. However, the overall number of participants was well over that needed to attain statistical power for the overall study (Adler, et al., 2000; Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1996; Crowson, 2009; Faul, et al., 2009; Gallo et al., 2005; McAdams et al., 2008; Peterson, B. E., & Duncan. L. E. 1999; Roccato, 2008; Roccato M., & Ricolfi, 2005; Sidanius &, Pratto, 1999; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996; Sidanius, Pratto, & Mithchell, 2001).

Summary

Results of this study indicated a change in reality from the political left holding to nurturing parent principles of nurturant caregiving and empathy openness and the political right holding to rules reinforcement and self discipline to one in which the left emphasized rules reinforcement and the right emphasized self discipline. Nurturant caregiving was not found to be relevant to participants' political behaviors and empathy openness was found to be inversely related to these both on the political left and right. These results indicate that while small groups of people hold to nurturing caregiving beliefs (as exhibited in the principal components analysis) a possible shift in political

beliefs to a system in which both left and right hold to strict father beliefs may have occurred. As in past studies, political left was concerned about distributive justice while the political right held to procedural justice. However, neither side exhibited their tendencies from a perspective taking philosophy. These results may indicate a more ideologically and doctrinally based and system in which the political left and right interest groups fight to achieve their own agendas while regarding outsiders and the general population as pawns in their battle with one another.

References

Abrajano, M. A. (2005). Who evaluates a presidential candidate by using non-policy campaign messages? *Political Research Quarterly, 58*(1), 55-67. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete Database.

Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social class with psychological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy White women. *Health Psychology, 19*, 586-592. doi:10.1037//0278-6133.19.6.586

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Their roots in big-five personality factors and facets. *Journal of Individual Differences, 27*(3), 117-126. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.27.3.117

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., & Araya, T. (2000). Classical and modern racial prejudice: A study of attitudes towards immigrants in Sweden. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 521–532. Retrieved from the Academic Search Alumni Edition database.

Altemeyer, R. A (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Altemeyer, R. A. (1996). *The authoritarian specter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altemeyer, B. (2003). What happens when authoritarians inherit the earth? A simulation. *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy. 3*(1), 161-169. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2003.00020.x.

Altemeyer, R. A. (2006). *The authoritarians*. Retrieved from

http://members.shaw.ca/jeanaltemeyer/drbob/TheAuthoritarians.pdf

Asbrock, F., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2010). Right-wing authoritarianism and social

dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice: A

longitudinal test. *European Journal of Personality, 24*(4), 324-340.

doi:10.1002/per.746

Baumrind, D. 1971. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology

Monograph 4*. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES database.

Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice.

Journal of Individual Differences 28(1), 10–17. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.10

Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A.,

Demoulin, S., & Leyens, J. P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does

prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among

majority and minority groups in three European countries. Jo*urnal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 96*(4), 843-856. doi:10.1037/a0013470

Brent, E. E & Granberg, D. (1982). Subjective agreement with the presidential candidates

of 1976 and 1980. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*(3), 393-403.

doi:10.1037/0022-3514.42.3.393

Bryan, C. J., Dweck C. S., Ross, L., Kay A.C., & Mislavsky N. O. (2009). Political

mindset: Effects of schema priming on liberal-conservative political positions.

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 45(1), 890–895.

doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.007

Bryman. A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Qualitative Research 6*(1) 97-113. doi:10.1177/1468794106058877

Caprara, G. V., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). Personalizing politics: A congruency model of political preference. *American Psychologist, 59*, 581–594. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.581

Christie, A. M. & Barling, J. (2009). Disentangling the indirect links between socioeconomic status and health: The dynamic roles of work stressors and personal control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1466-1478. doi:10.1037/a0016847

Cohen, S., Alper, C. M., Doyle, W. J., Adler, N., Treanor, J. J., & Turner, R. B. (2008). Objective and subjective socioeconomic status and susceptibility to the common cold. *Health Psychology, 27*(2), 268-274. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.27.2.268

Correia, I., & Vala, J., & Aguiar, P. (2001). The effects of belief in a just world and victim's innocence on secondary victimization, judgments of justice and deservingness. *Social Justice Research, 14*(3), 327-42. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

Courser, Z. (2010) The Tea Party at the election, *The Forum. 8*(4), Article 5, 1-21. doi: 10.2202/1540-8884.1410

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M.J. (2001). Attitudes Toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(2), 207-227. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00209

Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research Design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

    approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cross, J. R., Cross, T. L.., & Finch, H. (2010). Maximizing student potential versus

    building community: An exploration of right-wing authoritarianism, social

    dominance orientation, and preferred practice among supporters of gifted

    education. *Roeper Review, 32*(4), 235-248. doi:10.1080/02783193.2010.508155

Crouse, J., & Stalker, D. (2007). Do right-wing authoritarian beliefs originate from

    psychological conflict? *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 24*(1), 25-44.

    doi:10.1037/0736-9735.24.1.25

Crowson, H. M. (2009). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation:

    As mediators of worldview beliefs on attitudes related to the war on terror. *Social*

    Psychology, 40(2), 93-103. doi:10.1027/1864-9335.40.2.93

Cundiff, J. M., Smith, T. W., Uchino, B. N., & Berg, C. A. (2011). An interpersonal

    analysis of subjective social status and psychosocial risk. *Journal of Social &*

    Clinical Psychology, 30(1), 47-74. doi:10.1521/jscp.2011.30.1.47

Dambrun, M., Kamiejski, R., Haddadi, N., & Duarte, S. (2009). Why does social

    dominance orientation decrease with university exposure to the social sciences?

    The impact of institutional socialization and the mediating role of "geneticism".

    European Journal of Social Psychology, 39(1), 88-100. doi:10.1002/ejsp.498.

Dayen, D. (2011, April 6). Democrats offer strong pushback to Ryan budget… except for

    MIA President. *Firedoglake*. Retrieved from

http://news.firedoglake.com/2011/04/06/democrats-offer-strong-pushback-to-ryan-budget-except-for-mia-president/

de St. Aubin, E. (1996). Personal ideology polarity: Its emotional foundation and its manifestation in individual value systems, religiosity, political orientation, and assumptions concerning human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(1), 152-165. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

de St. Aubin, E., Wandrei, M., Skerven, K., & Coppolillo, C. M. (2006). A narrative exploration of personal ideology and identity. In D. P. McAdams., R. Josselson,, & A. Lieblich, (Eds.). *Identity and story: Creating self in narrative* (pp. 223-248). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Duckitt, J, Wagner, C, & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(1), 75-93. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.1.75

Durieza, B., Soenensb, B., & Vansteenkisteb, M. (2008). The intergenerational transmission of authoritarianism: The mediating role of parental goal promotion. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(3), 622-642. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2007.08.007

Eibach, R. P. & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and White and Black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(3), 453-467. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453

Erzberger, C & Kelle, U. (2003). Making inferences in mixed methods: The rules of Integration. In A, Tashakkori & C, Teddlie. (2003). (pp. 457-488). *Handbook of*

mixed methods in social & behavioral research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications, Inc..

Executive Branch. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/our-

government/executive-branch

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses

using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior*

Research Methods, 41, 1149-1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Feather, N. T. (1998). Reactions to penalties for offenses committed by the police and

public citizens: Testing a social–cognitive process model of retributive justice.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75(2), 528-544. Retrieved from the

PsycARTICLES Database.

Federico, C.M., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Racism, ideology, and affirmative action revisited:

the antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82(4), 488–502.

doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.4.488

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping.

American Psychologist, 48(1), 621-628. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02479.x

Gallo, L. C., Bogart, L. M., Vranceanu, A. M. & Matthews, K. A. (2005) Socioeconomic

status, resources, psychological experiences, and emotional responses: a test of

the reserve capacity model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(2),

386-399. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.386

Gathje, P. R. (2007). Speaking the truth to the power of the presidency. *Political Theology, 8*(4), 483-492. doi:10.1558/poth.v8i4.483

Gatto, J., & Dambrum, M. (2012). Authoritarianism, social dominance, and prejudice among junior police officers. *Social Psychology, 43*(2), 61–66. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000081

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029-1046. doi:10.1037/a0015141

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 366-385. doi:10.1037/a0021847

Guimond, S., Dambrun, M., Michinov, N., & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 697-721. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.697

Hafer, C.L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from a modified Stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(2), 165-173. doi:10.1037/AW22-3514.79.2.165

Haidt (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion.* New York. Phantom Books.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral

   intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20*(1), 98–116.

   doi:10.1007/s11211-007-0034-z

Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009). Above and below left–right: Ideological

   narratives and moral foundations. *Psychological Inquiry, 20*(2-3), 110-119.

   doi:10.1080/10478400903028573

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate

   culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus, 133*(4), 55–66. Retrieved from the

   Academic Search Complete Database.

Hall, W. C. (2002). The invention of 'quantifiable safe rhetoric': Richard Wirthlin and

   Ronald Reagan's instrumental use of public opinion research in presidential

   discourse. *Western Journal of Communication, 66*(3), 319-46. Retrieved from the

   Academic Search Complete Database.

Heaven, P. C. I., Organ, L.A., Supavadeeprasit, S., & Leeson, P. (2005). War and

   prejudice: A study of social values, right-wing. *Personality and Individual

   Differences 40*, 599–608. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.08.005

Johnson, L. (2012, July 10). Van Wanggaard, Republican Wisconsin state senator, drops

   recount appeal. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

   http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/10/van-wanggaard-wisconsin-state-

   senate-recount_n_1661876.html

Johnson, B., & Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods

   research. In A, Tashakkori & C, Teddlie. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in*

social & behavioral research (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications, Inc..

Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist, 61*(1), 651–669. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.651

Jost, J. T. Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(3), 339-375. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339

Kinder, D. R. (1978) Political person perception: The asymmetrical influence of sentiment and choice on perceptions of presidential candidates. Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*(8), 859-871. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Kluegel, J.R. Singleton, R, Jr. & Starnes, C.E. (1977). Subjective class identification: a multiple indicator approach. *American Sociological Review, 42*(1), 599-611. Retrieved from the SocINDEX database.

Kosloff, S., Greenberg, J., Schmader, T., Dechesne, M., & Weise, D. (2010). Smearing the opposition: Implicit and explicit stigmatization of the 2008 U.S. Presidential candidates and the current U.S. President. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 139*(3), 383-398. doi:10.1037/a0018809

Kossowska, M.,Trejtowicz, M., de Lemus, S., Bukowski, M., Van Hiel, A.,& Goodwin, R . (2011). Relationships between right-wing authoritarianism, terrorism threat, and attitudes towards restrictions of civil rights: A comparison among four

European countries. *British Journal of Psychology. 102*(2), 245-259. doi:10.1348/000712610X517262.

Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2009). Signs of socioeconomic status: A thin-slicing approach. *Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell), 20*(1), 99-106. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(2), 196-210. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think (2nd ed.).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lazarus, J., & Reilly, S. (2010). The electoral benefits of distributive spending. Political *Research Quarterly, 63*(2) 343-355. doi:10.1177/1065912908329355

LeCompte, M., & Schensul, J. (1999). *Designing & conducting ethographic research.* New York: Altamira Press

Leventhal, H., Jacobs, R. L., & Kudirka, N. Z. (1964). Authoritarianism, ideology, and political candidate choice. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 69*(5), 539-549. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Lupfer, M. B., Hopkinson, P. L.., & Kelley, P. (1988). An exploration of the attributional styles of Christian fundamentalists and of authoritarians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27*(3), 389-398. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

MacArthur Research Network on Socioeconomic Status and Health. (2008). *The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status*. Retrieved from http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/research/psychosocial/subjective.php

Malahy, L.W., Rubinlicht, M.A., & Kaiser, C.R. (2009). Justifying Inequality: A Cross-Temporal investigation of U.S. income disparities and just-world beliefs from 1973 to 2006. *Social Justice Research, 22*(1), 369–383. doi10.1007/s11211-009-0103-6

McAdams, D. P. (2001). *The person: An integrated introduction to personality psychology (3rd ed.)*. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt.

McAdams, D. P., Albaugh, M., Farber, E., Daniels, J., Logan, R. L., & Olson, B. (2008). Family metaphors and moral intuitions: How conservatives and liberals narrate their lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(4), 978-990. doi:10.1037/a0012650

McDermott, K. (2011, September 5). Public workers feel targeted. *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. Retrieved from http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/article_c0db3101-7519-528b-b401-fe1890d4f630.html

McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Abalakina-Paap, M. A. (1992). Authoritarianism in the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(6), 1004-1010. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R.A. (2005). Advanced and multivariate and statistical methods: *Practical application and interpretation (3rd ed.)*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Milton, O. (1952). Presidential choice and performance on a scale of authoritarianism. *American Psychologist, 7*(10), 597-598. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Moody, K. (2011). Two-sided class war at last? Wisconsin and beyond. *Against the Current, 26*(2), 13-17. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22*, 103-122. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

Nichols, J. (2011, August 10) Wisconsin recall replaces two Republican senators. *The Nation*. Retrieved from http://www.thenation.com/blog/162654/wisconsin-recall-replaces-two-republican-senators

O'Neill, P. (2005). The ethics of problem definition. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 46*(1), 13-20. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Onwiegbuzie, J.O., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed methods research. In A, Tashakkori & C, Teddlie. (pp. 351-384). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

Operario, D., Adler, N. E., & Williams, D. R. (2004). Subjective social status: Reliability and predictive utility for global health. *Psychology & Health, 19*(2), 237-246, doi:10.1080/08870440310001638098

Ostrove, J. M., Adler, N. E., Kuppermann, M. & Washington, A. E. (2000). Objective and subjective assessments of socioeconomic status and their relationship to self-

rated health in an ethnically diverse sample of pregnant women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 613-618. doi:10.1037//0278-6133.I9.6.613

Passini, S. (2008). Exploring the multidimensional facets of authoritarianism: Authoritarian aggression and social dominance orientation. *Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Revue Suisse de Psychologie, 67*(1), 51-60. doi:10.1024/1421-0185.67.1.51

Peña, Y., & Sidanius, J. (2002). U.S. patriotism and ideologies of group dominance: A tale of asymmetry. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(6), 782-790. Retrieved from the Academic Search Complete Database.

Peterson, B. E., & Duncan. L. E. (1999). Authoritarianism of parents and offspring: Intergenerational politics and adjustment to college. *Journal of Research in Personality 33*, 494–513. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1999.2260

Peterson, B. E., Smirles, K. A., & Wentworth, P. A. (1997). Generativity and authoritarianism: Implications for personality, political involvement, and parenting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(5). 1202-1216. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES database.

Prasad, M., Perrin, A. J., Bezila, K., Hoffman, S. G., Kindleberger, K., Manturuk, K., Powers, A. S., & Payton, A.R. (2009). The undeserving rich: "moral values" and the white working class. *Sociological Forum, 24*(2), 225-253. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.01098.x

Pratto, F., Liu, J.H., Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Shih, M., Bachrach, H., & Hegarty, P., (2000). Social dominance orientation and the legitimization of inequality across

cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*(3), 369-409. doi:10.1177/0022022100031003005

Pratto, F., & Shih, M. (2000). Social dominance orientation and group context in implicit group prejudice. *Psychological Science, 11*(6), 515-518. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00299

Pratto, F., 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Rasinski, K. A. (1987). What's fair is fair—or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(1), 201-211. Retrieved from the SocINDEX database.

Riggio. H. R. (2007). Political party, strength of identification, and knowledge and evaluation of Bush v. Gore. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(1), 234–279. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00304.x

Roccato, M. (2008). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and attachment: An Italian study. *Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Revue Suisse de Psychologie, 67*(4), 219-229. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES Database.

Roccato M., & Ricolfi L. (2005). On the correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27*(3), 187–200. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp2703_1

Rove, K. (2010). *Courage and consequence.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rubinstein. G. (2006). Authoritarianism among border police officers, career soldiers, and airport security guards at the Israeli border. *Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(6), 751-761. Retrieved from the SocINDEX with Full Text database.

Scherer, M. (2012, November 8). How Obama's data crunchers helped him win. *Cable News Network*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/07/tech/web/obama-campaign-tech-team

Sherman, J. W., Stroessner, S. J., Conrey, F. R., & Azam, O. A. (2005). Prejudice and stereotype maintenance processes: Attention, attribution, and individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(4), 607-622. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.4.607

Shoon Li., Melzer, S., & Reese, E. (2006, January 17). *Constructing threat and appropriating "civil rights": Rhetorical strategies of conservative movement organizations*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 70*(3), 476–490. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.476

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Mithchell, M. (2001). In-group identification, social dominance orientation, and differential intergroup social allocation. *Journal of Social Psychology, 134*(2), 151-67. doi:apa.org/?uid=1994-40943-001

Skitka, L. J., Mullen, E., & Griffin, T. (2002). Dispositions, scripts, or motivated correction?: Understanding ideological differences in explanations for social problems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(2), 470-487. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.2.470

Skocpol, T. (1999). Advocates without members: The recent transformation of American civic life (pp. 461-511). In T, Skocpol., &, M. P., Fiorina,. *Civic engagement in American democracy*. New York: Brookings Institution Press.

Son Hing, L. S., Bobocel, D. R., Zanna, M. P., & McBride, M. V. (2007). Authoritarian dynamics and unethical decision making: High social dominance orientation leaders and high right-wing authoritarianism followers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 67-81. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.67

Stryker, R., & Wald, P. (2009). Redefining compassion to reform welfare: How supporters of 1990s us federal welfare reform aimed for the moral high ground. *Social Politics, 16*(4) 519-557. doi:10.1093/sp/jxp022.

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 199–214. Retrieved from the PsycARTICLES database.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003) The past and future of mixed methods research from data triangulation to mixed model designs In A, Tashakkori & C, Teddlie,

Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research (pp. 671-701). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

Tausch, N., & Hewstone, M. (2010). Social dominance orientation attenuates stereotype change in the face of disconfirming information. *Social Psychology, 41*(3), 169-176. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000024

Tetlock, P. E., Bernzweig, J., & Gallant, J. L. (1985). Supreme Court decision making: Cognitive style as a predictor of ideological consistency of voting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(5), 1227-1239. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.48.5.1227Trent, J. S., Short-Thompson, C., Mongeau, P. A., Metzler M. S., & Trent, J. D. (2005). The idealized presidential candidate: A vision over time. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*(1) 130-156. doi:10.1177/0002764205279437

Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 9*(2), 187-204. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420090207

Vaughan, G. M., Tajfel, H., & Williams, J. (1981). Bias in reward allocation in an intergroup and an interpersonal context. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*(1), 37-42. doi:10.2307/3033861

Weisberg, J . (2011, October 13) Occupy Wall Street and the Tea Party: Compare and contrast. *Slate*. Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/the_big_idea/2011/10/occupy_wall_street_and_the_tea_party_do_they_agree_on_anything_.html

Winter, D. G. (1987). Leader appeal, leader performance, and the motive profiles of
leaders and followers: A study of American presidents and elections. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology. 52*(1). 196-202. doi:10.1037//0022-
3514.52.1.196

Woike, B. A. (2007). Content coding of open-ended responses. In R. W.Robins, R. C.
Fraley, & R. F. Krueger (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in personality
psychology* (pp. 292–307). New York: Guilford Press.

Yee, M.D., & Brown, R. (1992). Self-evaluations and intergroup attitudes in children
aged three to nine. *Child Development, 63*(3), 619-629. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
8624.1992.tb01650.x

Zakrisson (2005). Construction of a short version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism
(RWA) scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 863–872.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.026

Appendix A: Voter Worldview and Presidential Candidate Choice Demographic

Information Request Form.

Please provide the following information:

Age__

Gender_____

Income_____

Occupation_____

Education_____

Ethnicity_____

Appendix B: RWA Scale.

The RWA Scale

With 1 representing the most disagreement and 7 the most agreement indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements, by placing a number between 1-7 in the space allotted at the beginning of each statement.

__1. Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral currents prevailing in society today.

__2. Our country needs free thinkers, who will have the courage to stand up against traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.

__3. The ''old-fashioned ways'' and ''old-fashioned values'' still show the best way to live.

__4. Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions.

__5. God's laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished.

__6. The society needs to show openness towards people thinking differently, rather than a strong leader, the world is not particularly evil or dangerous.

__7. It would be best if newspapers were censored so that people would not be able to get hold of destructive and disgusting material.

__8. Many good people challenge the state, criticize the church and ignore ''the normal way of living''.

__9. Our forefathers ought to be honored more for the way they have built our society, at the same time we ought to put an end to those forces destroying it.

__10. People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards.

__11. There are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society ought to stop them.

__12. It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it.

__13. Facts show that we have to be harder against crime and sexual immorality, in order to uphold law and order.

__14. The situation in the society of today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.

__15. If the society so wants, it is the duty of every true citizen to help eliminate the evil that poisons our country from within.

(Zakrisson, 2005)

Appendix C: Social Dominance Orientation Scale.

The 16-Item Social Dominance Orientation Scale

Below are a series of statements with which you may agree or disagree. For each statement please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement by placing an X by the appropriate number from 1 to 7. Once again, please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups._1_2_3_4_5_6_7

2. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

3. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

5. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

6. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

7. Inferior groups should stay in their place. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

9. It would be good if groups could be equal. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

10. Group equality should be our ideal. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

12. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

13. Increased social equality. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

14. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

15. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

16. No one group should dominate in society. _1_2_3_4_5_6_7

(Sidanius & Pratto, 1999)

Appendix D: Life Experiences Scale

McAdams and Associates (2008) Life Experiences Scale

Please answer the following questions. Your response can be as long or as short as you need to describe your experiences.

(a) Please describe a high point or peak experience in your overall life

(b) Please describe a low point in your life

(c) Please describe a turning point in your life

(d) Please describe a positive scene from your childhood

(e) Please describe a negative scene from your childhood,

(f) Please describe a vivid scene from your adolescent years

(g) Please describe a vivid scene from your adult years,

(h) Please imagine a scene from your future,

(i) Please describe a scene of religious (or spiritual) faith, from your childhood.

(j) Please describe a high point in your religious (or spiritual) faith,

(k)Please describe a low point of in your religious (or spiritual) faith, and

(l) Please describe a political scene or experience in your life that comes to mind to you.

(McAdams, Albaugh, Farber, Daniels, Logan, & Olson, 2008)

Appendix E: Subjective SES Scale

Subjective SES Scale

Think of a ladder as representing where people stand in the United States.

At the top of this ladder are the people who are the best off-those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the **bottom** are the people who are the worst off-who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?

Please indicate by number from 1 (being the lowest rung) and 10 (being the highest rung) in the space below where you think you stand on this ladder at this time in your life relative to other people in the United States.

Please answer here:__

Appendix F: Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Part 1. When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale:

[0] = not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)
    [1] = not very relevant
      [2] = slightly relevant
        [3] = somewhat relevant
         [4] = very relevant
          [5] = extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

_____Whether or not someone suffered emotionally

_____Whether or not some people were treated differently than others

_____Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country

_____Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority

_____Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency

_____Whether or not someone was good at math

_____Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable

_____Whether or not someone acted unfairly

_____Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group

_____Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society

_____Whether or not someone did something disgusting

_____Whether or not someone was cruel

_____Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights

_____Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty

_____Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder

_____Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

Part 2. Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement:

[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

_____Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.

_____When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.

_____I am proud of my country's history.

_____Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.

_____People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

_____It is better to do good than to do bad.

_____One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

_____Justice is the most important requirement for a society.

_____People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done

   something wrong.

_____Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

_____I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

_____It can never be right to kill a human being.

_____ I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor

   children inherit nothing.

_____ It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

_____ If I were a soldier and I disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

_____ Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

Appendix G: Presidential Candidate Preference Questionnaire

The Presidential Candidate Preference Questionnaire

In the following questionnaire please indicate your choice of personal characteristics that define your ideal U.S. presidential candidate.

1. Please read the following characteristics, and check the ones you look for in a good president?

_____ caring and protection from harm

_____ fairness between individuals and groups/reciprocity in relationships between individuals and groups

_____ loyalty to one's own family, friends, and group,

_____ respect for authority figures,

_____ purity/sanctity towards the religious and secular values and traditions that one is raised by and accepts as legitimate

Please explain the choices you made above.

2. Please rate each of the following characteristics from the question above on a scale of 1-10 in terms of how important they are to you when choosing a candidate

1. harm/care__

2. fairness__

3. ingroup loyalty __

4. respect for authority__

5. moral and philosophical purity__

3. On a scale from 1-10, with one being choice A being 1 choice B being 10, which worldview focus would you prefer your president to exhibit when he is in office? Please indicate your choice by circling the number that best represents your preference on the line below.

A. A president who advocates a worldview that teaches individual responsibility, self-reliance, hard work, and fierce competition with others (individuals, groups, and other nations) in order to teach a personal outlook and skills that insure a successful life outcome.

B. A president who advocates a worldview that emphasizes mutual cooperation and shared sacrifice by people at all levels of society to achieve shared goals in which he or she see the fostering of interpersonal skills leading to cooperation as the best path for a person's self-actualization.

A 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 B

What reasons do you have for this preference and for its rating?

4. **Please place a check beside the statement below that you agree with most.**

___ **A. The president should understand that hostile nations, other nations in general, international terrorist movements, and unfamiliar social movements both in America and abroad can present threats to American's well being, cultural values, and national unity. He should prioritize protecting America, your social group, and your family against such threats.**

___ **B. The president should view international and national society as being pluralistic in which nations, groups, families, and individuals maximize their wellbeing by helping each other and working together. He or she should avoid a "go it alone" approach that excludes America, his or her political party, and your social group from involvement in cooperative arrangements with others.**

Please explain why you selected the one you chose.

5. **Please place a check beside the statement below that you agree with most:**

____ **A. The President should use his or her power and authority to implement policies to insure that all social, racial, and ethnic groups and all individuals have an equal share of society's resources and of social outcomes and can only survive by working together. He or she should work to resolve disputes between feuding parties and to punish those who foster inequity by putting their own selfish interests above the social well-being. The president should also work to correct longstanding discrimination and other barriers that prevent social equality.**

_____ **B. The President should implement policies that insure that both groups and individuals have the maximum opportunity to achieve their aspirations and goals without interference from needless disruptions due to government regulations, burdensome taxation, and government intervention that bolsters one group's interest over another (affirmative action, welfare, and social services). He or she**

should be willing to uphold the merit based society formed as a result of these policies.

Please explain why you selected the choice you did.

Questionnaire developed by Thomas Kulbickas.

Appendix H: The Life Experiences Questionnaire Permission.

Subject :	Re: Use of Strict Father/Nurturing Parent Model in Dissertation Study
Date :	Mon, Jun 24, 2013 04:54 PM CDT
From :	Dan McAdams
To :	Thomas Kulbickas

Hi Thomas,

There is no copyright on the life story interview. Feel free to use or adapt for your purposes.

dan mcA

Dan P. McAdams
The Henry Wade Rogers Professor of Psychology
Chair, Department of Psychology
Professor of Education and Social Policy
Director, Foley Center for the Study of Lives
Northwestern University
2120 Campus Drive
Evanston, IL 60208
http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/foley/
http://www.redemptiveself.northwestern.edu

On Jun 24, 2013, at 4:14 PM, Thomas Kulbickas wrote:

Hello Dr. McAdams. My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate student at Walden University working on my dissertation. I contacted you before back in January of 2011.I am planning a study design that uses the variables from the Lakoff strict father/nurturing parent model that you used in your study. However I made some changes in my study design before my proposal was approved. I am still using the Lakoff variables, social dominance orientation, subjective SES, right wing authoritarianism, and the five moral foundations variables. The moral foundations will be the dependent variable, but I moved the exploration of presidential candidate choice to a qualitative portion of the study in which it rated with open ended questions and rating items. Since I already wrote to you before I need only ask if you have any additional suggestions. I also need to know if there

is a copyright holder for your interview protocol and if so how I could contact that person.

Thomas Kulbickas

PhD Psychology Graduate Student
Walden University
Cleveland, Ohio

Original E-mail
   From : Dan McAdams]
   Date : 01/05/2011 12:27 PM
      To : Thomas Kulbickas
Subject : Re: Use of Strict Father/Nurturing Parent Model in Dissertation Study

Dear Thomas,

Thank you for your note. The study you are describing, as reported in JPSP (2008), is part of a larger project examining the life stories of especially religious American adults. The extensive interviews we conducted with them served many purposes. The Lakoff analysis was only one small part of the overall effort. Therefore, unless you have a strong interest in and facility for life-narrative research, you may want to find simpler ways to assess his general ideas regarding the relations between family metaphors on the one hand and political orientation on the other. I do agree that pitting the Lakoff variables against others (e.g., RWA, etc.) in the prediction of voting behavior would be interesting, but my guess is that the self-report scales will suck up a great deal of the variance, leaving little for a Lakoff assessment to predict. But I could be wrong. Best wishes,

dan mcAdams

Dan P. McAdams, Chair
Department of Psychology
Professor of Human Development & Social Policy and Professor of Psychology
Director, Foley Center for the Study of Lives
Northwestern University

2120 Campus Drive

Evanston, IL 60208

http://www.redemptiveself.northwestern.edu/

http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/foley/

On Jan 4, 2011, at 2:05 PM, Thomas Kulbickas wrote:

Hello Dr. McAdams

My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate student at Walden University working on my dissertation. I am planning a study design that uses the variables from the Lakoff strict father/nurturing parent model that you used in your study. The goal of this project is to assess presidential candidate choice and rating (on a seven point scale) based on the score on a number of surveys: SDO, RWA, subjective SES, age, gender, and possibly prejudice. The idea is to differentiate among participants according to how they respond on each of the variable measures and to differentiate them into an overall explanatory matrix that could be used to reveal why certain people rate a particular candidate a certain way. Before I proceeded, I thought it would be best to ask your advice on a couple of matters related to the design you used. Instead of proposing 12 open-ended questionnaires that covered differing turning points of life I proposed that I should instead summarize the turning points under three or four life areas and use that number. This would reduce the accuracy of the assessment, but could also make it more practical in a dissertation context. Since I am planning to use my (Walden's) university's participant pool, it would also be an internet adaption of the instrument. My other option was that I use the results obtained in your original studies to devise profiles for the candidates to be presented to participants (shifting the use of the model from the independent to the dependent variable). Doing this would eliminate four independent variables and reduce the number of participants necessary to achieve the required .75-.80 statistical power. Then participants' assessment of candidate characteristics based on their reflection of the strict father/nurturing parent characteristics and their issue positions based on the five factor model would be evaluated in terms of the other participant variables mentioned above. Any advice or comments that you could offer would be appreciated,

Thanks,

Thomas Kulbickas
PhD Psychology Graduate Student

Walden University
Cleveland, Ohio

Appendix I: The Five Moral Foundations Scale Permission.

Subject :	Re: Use of The Five Foundations in Dissertation Work
Date :	Tue, Jun 25, 2013 08:51 AM CDT
From :	Jonathan Haidt
To :	Thomas Kulbickas

sounds like a great project.
just don't expect to find much influence of parenting -- nobody can
find it. See Judith Harris, the nurture assumption. Look to peer
culture in adolescence and young adulthood instead.

use mFQ as you like,
all is at
www.moralfoundations.org

good luck,
jh

On Mon, Jun 24, 2013 at 12:15 PM, Thomas Kulbickas
< > wrote:
> Hello, Dr. Haidt. My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate
student at
> Walden University working on a dissertation with a social psychology
topic
> that involves the use of your five moral foundations variables. I
have
> completed my proposal and need IRB approval, but before that happens
I am
> informing you of my effort and seeking any advice you might have in
> proceeding. Basically the proposed study involves using the strict
> father/nurturing variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES as
independent
> variables against your five moral foundations analyzed in terms of
the two
> individualizing and three binding foundations. Then assessing how
these
> variables, especially the moral foundations impact people's choice of
their
> ideal presidential candidate. The goal of the study is to determine
how
> parental upbringing impacts adult morality in a context involving
> interactions between differing groups and in which a person's social
> standing and interests are in play. That is to obtain a birds eye
view of
> how morality, group loyalty, and personal interest interact with one
another
> as a basis for conducting more detailed research into each part of
the

> picture later on. After this is done the second part of the study which
> will examine how these variables help determine people's preference of their
> ideal presidential candidate may help to confirm whether or not there are
> four types of political personalities in the population. Finally, I also
> need to confirm who holds the copyright on the MFQ scale and if it and its
> scoring booklet are in the public domain. If they are not where can I
> acquire a legal copy?

--
Jonathan Haidt
    Thomas Cooley Professor of Ethical Leadership
    NYU-Stern School of Business
    Business and Society Program, Tisch Hall 434
    40 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012

jhaidt@stern.nyu.edu,
 (All publications available here)
www.HappinessHypothesis.com
www.RighteousMind.com
Test your morals at www.YourMorals.org
Follow me @JonHaidt

Appendix J: Social Dominance Orientation Scale Permission.

Subject :	RE: Dissertation Project involving the SDO Scale.
Date :	Mon, Jun 24, 2013 03:56 PM CDT
From :	"Sidanius, James"
To :	Thomas Kulbickas
Attachment :	✔SDO6SCAL.doc

Dear Thomas,

　　　No, the SDO scale is not copyrighted and you are free to use it for your research. I am attaching the scale to you now. Just be aware that items 9-16 should be reverse coded. You will know that you have coded the items correctly when all of the 16 items correlate positively with each other.

Good luck in your research.

Jim Sidanius
Department of Psychology
Department of African and African American Studies
Harvard University
William James Hall
Room 1430
33 Kirkland Street
Email:

From: Thomas Kulbickas
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Sidanius, James
Subject: Dissertation Project involving the SDO Scale.

Hello, Dr. Sidanius. My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate student at Walden University working on a dissertation with a social psychology topic that involves the use of your social dominance orientation scale. I have completed my proposal and need IRB approval, but before that happens I am informing you of my effort and seeking any advice you might have in proceeding. Basically the proposed study involves using the strict father/nurturing variables, SDO, RWA, and subjective SES as independent variables against the five moral foundations analyzed in terms of the two individualizing and three binding foundations developed by Haidt and Graham (2009). Then assessing how these variables, especially the moral foundations impact people's choice of their ideal presidential candidate. Any advice or comments that you could offer would be

appreciated. I also need to know who holds the copyright on the SDO scale and if it and its scoring booklet are in the public domain. If they are not where can I acquire a legal copy?

Appendix K: The MacArthur Subjective SES Scale Permission.

Subject :	RE: Use of The MacArthur Subjective SES Scale in Dissertation Work.
Date :	Thu, Jul 11, 2013 05:53 PM CDT
From :	**"Da Luz, Michael"**
To :	**"Thomas Kulbickas"**

No, that will not affect the permission.

Michael A. Da Luz
Program Coordinator

UCSF Center for Health & Community

From: Thomas Kulbickas
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 3:18 PM
To: Da Luz, Michael
Subject: Re: Use of The MacArthur Subjective SES Scale in Dissertation Work.

Hello, Dr. Da Luz, thank you for your response. I have one more question. I might need to use a variation of the scale which describes the ladder (instead of picturing it) and asks participants to visualize their place on it. Would doing this affect permission to use the scale?

Original E-mail
From :   "Da Luz, Michael"
Date :   06/25/2013 03:22 PM
To :   Thomas Kulbickas
Subject : RE: Use of The MacArthur Subjective SES Scale in Dissertation Work.

Hello Thomas,

You are more than welcome to use the scale. Attached are several documents we hope will help you with your research. If you need it, I also have a Spanish version of the questionnaire. Let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you,

Michael A. Da Luz
Program Coordinator

UCSF Center for Health & Community

From: Thomas Kulbickas
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 12:46 PM
To: Da Luz, Michael
Subject: Use of The MacArthur Subjective SES Scale in Dissertation Work.

To whom it may concern: My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate student at Walden University I am planning to use the MacArthur Subjective SES Scale in my dissertation study. I have completed my proposal and it was approved, but I need to ask your permission to use the scale. Basically the proposed study involves using the strict father/nurturing variables of McAdams and associates (2008), SDO, RWA, and subjective SES as independent variables against the five moral foundations analyzed in terms of the two individualizing and three binding foundations developed by Haidt and Graham (2009). Subjective SES would be assessed in terms of its relationship with SDO to verify if a cyclical relationship exists between social dominance and ambition and subjective social status. In addition, relationships would be determined between all the independent variables and the dependent variables. Then assessing how these variables, especially the moral foundations impact people's choice of their ideal presidential candidate. The goal of the study is to determine how parental upbringing impacts adult morality in a context involving interactions between differing groups and in which a person's social standing and interests are in play. I need to know who holds the copyright for the MacArthur Ladder Scale and whose permission I need to use it. Finally, does this scale have a scoring booklet? If so, how can I obtain a legal copy?

Appendix L: The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale Permission.

Hi,
I am so sorry. I was sure that I had responded. Anyhow, you are free to use the scale, it is published in an accessible journal, and the convention says that the only thing you have to do is to refer to the article properly in your own publications.

Good luck!
Ingrid Z

Från: Thomas Kulbickas
Skickat: den 17 september 2013 21:38
Till: Zakrisson Ingrid
Ämne: Re: Use of RWA Scale in Dissertation Work.

Hello Dr. Zakrisson,
I sent you this email requesting copyright and permission information to use your RWA Scale. In case you have not received it I am resending it here. Please let me know if your scale is in the public domain. If it is not and if you own the copyright do I have your permission to proceed in my study with your scale? I am awaiting IRB approval for my study and cannot proceed unless I hear from you.

Thank You, Thomas Kulbickas

Original E-mail
From :   Thomas Kulbickas
Date :   09/11/2013 06:48 AM
To :   i
Subject : Use of RWA Scale in Dissertation Work.

Hello Dr. Zakrisson

My name is Thomas Kulbickas. I am a graduate student at Walden University working on a dissertation with a social psychology topic that involves the use of your right wing authoritarianism scale (which I believe has some advantages over Altemeyer's work in the way it is constructed).

Basically the proposed study involves using the strict father/nurturing variables (McAdams et al., 2008), RWA, SDO, and subjective SES as independent variables against the five moral foundations analyzed in terms of the two individualizing and three binding foundations developed by Haidt and Graham (2009). Then assessing how these variables, especially the moral foundations impact people's choice of their ideal

presidential candidate. Any advice or comments that you could offer would be appreciated.

I have completed my proposal and need IRB approval. For this I need to know who, if anyone, holds the copyright on the RWA scale and if it and its scoring booklet are in the public domain. If they are not where can I acquire a legal copy?

References

Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009). Above and below left-right: Ideological narratives and moral foundations. Psychological Inquiry, 20(2-3), 110-119. doi: 10.1080/10478400903028573

McAdams, D. P., Albaugh, M., Farber, E., Daniels, J., Logan, R. L., & Olson, B. (2008). Family metaphors and moral intuitions: How conservatives and liberals narrate their lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(4), 978-990. doi: 10.1037/a0012650

Appendix M: Text of Internet Ad Distributed by Old Brooklyn CDC and Flyer

Distributed by Grace Church.

The internet ad read as follows:

    Thomas Kulbickas a PhD student at Walden University is conducting a study called voter worldview and candidate choice to assist people in determining how their parental upbringing perspectives impact their adult morality in a context involving interactions between differing groups and in which a person's identity, social standing, and interests are in play. The impact of this morality as affected by these factors will be rated in participants' determination of the characteristics of their ideal presidential candidate. To participate in this study please come to Grace Church at 2503 Broadview Rd on December 2, or 9 (from 5:30 to 7:30 PM) or for one hour on November 28, December 5, 12, or 19 from 12 noon to 1:00 PM. Participants will fill out six paper and pencil surveys. This should take no more than one hour to complete. For those who cannot attend during the times stated above a link to access the study online is also available. Anyone with questions can contact the researcher at thomas.kulbickas@waldenu.edu. Such contact however is not required for participation.
    The results that are obtained may help participants assess their own moral beliefs, social history and background, and how they relate to their political and social group membership, their positions on various issues, and how such positions could be invoked by political interests to get them to join their causes or to obtain their support and assistance for agendas that they might not otherwise support. This should assist participants in making well educated choices in political matters in terms of their own and their family's interests, the good of their neighborhood and the good of society in general.

The flyers distributed had the following text:

In cooperation with Old Brooklyn CDC and Grace Church Thomas Kulbickas a PhD student at Walden University is conducting a study called voter worldview and candidate choice.

This study will assist people in determining how their parental upbringing perspectives impact their adult morality in a context involving interactions between differing groups and in which a person's identity, social standing, and interests are in play. The impact of this morality as affected by these factors will be rated in participants' determination of the characteristics of their ideal presidential candidate.

To participate in this study please come to Grace Church at 2503 Broadview Rd

on December 2, or 9 (from 5:30 to 7:30 PM) or for one hour on November 28, December 5, 12, or 19 from 12 noon to 1:00 PM. Participants will fill out six paper and pencil surveys. This should take no more than one hour to complete. For those who cannot attend during the times stated above a link to access the study online is also available. Anyone with questions can contact the researcher at. Such contact however is not required for participation.

The results that are obtained may help participants assess their own moral beliefs, social history and background, and how they relate to their political and social group membership, their positions on various issues, and how such positions could be invoked by political interests to get them to join their causes or to obtain their support and assistance for agendas that they might not otherwise support. This should assist participants in making well educated choices in political matters in terms of their own and their family's interests, the good of their neighborhood and the good of society in general.