

## Original Research Reports

# The Relationship Between Value and Ideological Orientations Using the Refined Theory of Basic Values

Stefano Passini\*<sup>a</sup>

[a] Department of Education Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

## Abstract

By considering the theory of basic values, several studies have considered the different underlying value patterns of social dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). Recently, the value theory has been developed into a finer set of conceptually distinct values. Specifically, the same key assumptions have been retained, but 19 instead of 10 motivationally distinct values have been distinguished. The aim of the present research is to analyze the relationship between ideological and value orientations, using the refined theory of basic values. In line with previous studies, it was hypothesized that SDO would be mainly placed on the self-enhancement vs. self-transcendence value opposition, while RWA on that of the conservation vs. openness to change. Results on two hundred participants confirm the hypotheses. In particular, dominant people are characterized by a sense of superiority, supremacy, and unfairness, while authoritarian people by the perception of social instability and passive conformism with rules and laws. Moreover, by considering the underlying dimensions of both RWA and SDO, our results provide evidence of some differences existing in their mirror on specific value priorities.

*Keywords:* values, RWA, SDO, conformism, security

## Riassunto

Prendendo in considerazione la teoria dei valori, diversi studi hanno analizzato quali valori caratterizzassero l'orientamento alla dominanza sociale (SDO) e l'autoritarismo di destra (RWA). Recentemente, la teoria dei valori è stata ampliata tenendo conto di un numero maggiore di valori concettualmente distinti. In particolare, seppure gli autori hanno mantenuto gli stessi presupposti teorici, sono stati individuati 19 invece di 10 valori, distinti dal punto di vista motivazionale. Lo scopo della presente ricerca è quello di analizzare il rapporto tra gli orientamenti ideologici (SDO e RWA) e i valori, utilizzando questa rinnovata teoria. In linea con gli studi precedenti, si è ipotizzato che l'SDO si collocherebbe principalmente sull'asse di opposizione tra i valori di auto-affermazione e auto-trascendenza, mentre l'RWA su quello tra conservatorismo e apertura al cambiamento. I risultati su 200 partecipanti confermano le ipotesi. In particolare, le persone dominanti sono caratterizzate da un senso di superiorità, supremazia e inequità, mentre le persone autoritarie dalla percezione di instabilità sociale e dal conformismo passivo con le regole e le leggi. Inoltre, considerando le componenti specifiche sia della RWA che della SDO, i risultati evidenziano alcune ulteriori differenze esistenti nel loro rapporto con specifiche priorità di valori.

*Parole-chiave:* valori, RWA, SDO, conformismo, sicurezza

Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 2020, Vol. 8(2), 708–720, <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v8i2.1177>

Received: 2019-03-05. Accepted: 2020-06-06. Published (VoR): 2020-10-20.

Handling Editor: Alessandro Nai, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

\*Corresponding author at: Department of Education Studies, University of Bologna, 40136, Bologna, Italy. E-mail: [s.passini@unibo.it](mailto:s.passini@unibo.it)



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Values may be considered as general beliefs about desirable or undesirable goals, worldview, and ways of behaving in everyday life that vary in importance and that serve as a guiding principle in one's own life (Corey et al., 2003; Schwartz, 1992). That is, values summarize the way people perceive and interpret the society all around as well as their everyday attitudes, preferences and actions (Knafo et al., 2011). In 1992, Schwartz conceived an organization of basic values into a coherent structure based on the social and psychological conflict or congruity between them that people experience every day and that should explain individual decision-making, attitudes, and behaviors (Schwartz et al., 2012). This theory has been confirmed by numerous studies that have verified the associations and predictions of values with a wide variety of attitudes and behaviors (see Schwartz et al., 2017). Among them, an interesting line of research has analyzed how the values are connected in a congruent or discriminating way with people's ideological orientations. In particular, some studies (e.g. Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002) have considered the relationships between values on one side and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and social dominance orientation (SDO) on the other. Although the literature has highlighted the common aspects of these two orientations, stressed by the frequent significantly high correlation between the two constructs (see Perry et al., 2013), many studies have indeed focused on the different motivations and drives underlying the two ideological orientations (e.g. Crawford et al., 2013).

The aim of the present research is to replicate and elaborate those studies that have considered the relationship between ideological and value orientations, by considering the recently refined Schwartz's theory (Schwartz et al., 2012, 2017). In the following paragraph, the original and refined value theory will be introduced, underlining the reasons that have led the authors to define a more complex structure. Subsequently, the various studies that have analyzed the relationship between ideological and value orientations, with reference to the original structure of the basic values, will be illustrated.

## The Original and Refined Theory of Basic Values

In the former theory of basic values, Schwartz (1992) has developed a structural model of values that distinguishes between ten content types. This model represents these ten basic motivations on a circular continuum that reflects the motivational conflict or compatibility among them. Indeed, the ten value types are structured along a circular structure organized within a two-dimensional space: openness to change (composed by values of self-direction, stimulation, hedonism) vs. conservation (security, conformity, tradition) and self-transcendence (benevolence, universalism) vs. self-enhancement (achievement, power).

With the aim of reaching greater universal heuristic and predictive power, in 2012 Schwartz and colleagues decided to refine and separate this structure into a finer set of conceptually distinct values. The authors started by considering that it was possible to identify conceptually distinct subtypes in some of the ten original value types, both at the level of theoretical definition and item formulation. Moreover, they took into account those studies (e.g. Davidov et al., 2008) that have identified methodological and measurement problems, such as multicollinearity between adjacent values, cross-loadings of items on multiple factors, and low internal reliabilities of some indexes. Some initial statistical evidence of the refined structure was found by Schwartz and colleagues (2012) by computing a reanalysis across many multidimensional scaling maps of various studies. This reanalysis revealed separate subregions for each subtype within a value type region. The subsequent analysis of discriminant power of these refined categories on other attitude and behaviour variables confirmed the validity of considering such subtypes (Schwartz et al., 2017).

The recently refined theory of basic values (Schwartz et al., 2012, 2017) has therefore retained the same key assumptions and circular structure, but identified 19 motivationally distinct values (see Table 1). In various studies, the authors (Schwartz et al., 2012, 2017) provided empirical support to the refined structure in many countries. While the four higher order and the ten basic values remain the same, some of the latter have been further divided into subtypes, on the grounds of their conceptualization. For instance, the original definitions of both self-direction and security values (Schwartz, 1992) already implied two conceptual facets each: i.e., independence of thought and action, and safety for the self and societal order, respectively (see Schwartz et al., 2012). Specifically, in the refined theory self-direction contains two subtypes (autonomy of thought and of action), as well as power (dominance and resource), security (personal and societal), conformism (interpersonal and compliance), and benevolence (caring and dependability). Universalism comprises three subtypes: nature, concern, and tolerance. Moreover, some unidentified value constructs were detected on the motivational continuum: i.e., face and humility. Distinct relationships of these new values with attitudes, beliefs, and demographic characteristics were detected (see Schwartz et al., 2012, 2017). For instance, Vecchione and colleagues (2012) have shown that only societal (and not personal) security values led to perceiving immigration as a threat, which leads us to assume that immigration might be perceived as frightening as it breaks the social order and not because it is experienced as a personal risk. Moreover, only values of power resources (and not dominance) positively correlate with attaching importance to a high income when choosing a job.

Table 1

*The 19 Values of the Refined Theory, Their Correspondent Value in the Original Theory, and Their Conceptual Definitions*

Refined Value	Original Value	Conceptual definitions in terms of motivational goals
Self-direction thought	Self-direction	Freedom to cultivate one's own ideas and abilities
Self-direction action	Self-direction	Freedom to determine one's own actions
Stimulation	Stimulation	Excitement, novelty, and change
Hedonism	Hedonism	Pleasure and sensuous gratification
Achievement	Achievement	Success according to social standards
Power-dominance	Power	Power through exercising control over people
Power-resources	Power	Power through control of material and social resources
Face	–	Maintaining one's public image and avoiding humiliation
Security-personal	Security	Safety in one's immediate environment
Security-societal	Security	Safety and stability in the wider society
Tradition	Tradition	Maintaining and preserving cultural, family or religious traditions
Conformity-rules	Conformity	Compliance with rules, laws, and formal obligations
Conformity-interpersonal	Conformity	Avoidance of upsetting or harming other people
Humility	–	Recognizing one's insignificance in the larger scheme of things
Universalism-nature	Universalism	Preservation of the natural environment
Universalism-concern	Universalism	Commitment to equality, justice and protection for all people
Universalism-tolerance	Universalism	Acceptance and understanding of those who are different from oneself
Benevolence caring	Benevolence	Devotion to the welfare of in-group members
Benevolence-dependability	Benevolence	Being a reliable and trustworthy member of the in-group

Note. Source: Schwartz et al. (2012).

## The Relationship Between Value and Ideological Orientations

By using the 10-values original structure, many scholars (e.g. Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Feather & McKee, 2008, 2012; Kuşdil & Akoğlu, 2014; Leone et al., 2016) have analyzed the underlying value patterns of SDO and RWA. Although there are small differences in the various studies, in general when statistically corrected for RWA, SDO is more characterized on the self-enhancement vs. self-transcendence opposition: i.e., it is positively related with values of power and achievement, and negatively with universalism and benevolence. Instead, RWA, when corrected for SDO, is more characterized on the openness to change vs. conservation opposition: i.e., it is positively related with conformity, security, and tradition, and negatively with self-direction, and stimulation. This is in line with the conceptualization of RWA by Feldman (2003) who considers it as originating in the conflict between the values of social conformity and personal autonomy. It is also relevant to underline that some studies have shown that the confluence of the importance attached to certain values, on one side, and SDO and/or RWA attitudes, on the other, influence certain individual attitudes and behaviors, such as hostility towards women (Feather & McKee, 2012), support for the death penalty (McKee & Feather, 2008), and political engagement (Federico et al., 2017).

Moreover, some studies (e.g. McKee & Feather, 2008; Passini, 2017a) have recently observed in more detail the relationships between RWA and values considering its three underlying clusters separately. These studies have shown that the three components of RWA reflect specific value priorities: when controlled for the other two clusters, authoritarian submission (RWAsub) is related to conformity and less to self-direction, authoritarian aggression (RWAagg) to power, achievement, security and less to universalism, and conventionalism (RWAcon) to tradition. Likewise, a recent research study by Ho and colleagues (2015) has considered the existence of two facets of SDO. Namely, SDO dominance (SDO-D) and SDO anti-egalitarianism (SDO-E). The former identifies a more blatant and aggressive preference for dominance hierarchies characterized by strong competitive beliefs, support for aggression and violence toward low status groups, and unconcealed prejudicial attitudes. Instead, SDO-E detects a subtler preference for unequal hierarchies, distinguished by great support for unequal distribution of resources and opposition to equality, both as expressions of a relatively subtle prejudice. Two studies (Caricati, 2007; McKee & Feather, 2008) have considered the relationships between values and SDO in its two subtypes. Although partial correlations were not computed, results of both studies did not show great differences in the correlation patterns, except that SDO-D was the only dimension positively related to hedonism and security in the former study, and SDO-E was the only dimension positively related to achievement and negatively to tradition in the latter.

As concerns the refined structure of basic values, currently there are no studies that have analysed the relationship of this structure with authoritarian and dominant attitudes. However, some studies suggest possible relationships between the new values and ideological orientations. By using the HEXACO Personality Inventory, Lee, Ashton, Ogunfowora, Bourdage, and Shin (2010) have found that RWA was negatively correlated with Openness to Experience and SDO with Honesty–Humility. Whereas the first is a confirmation of the already established link between RWA and lack of self-direction, the latter suggests that the humility value should be negatively related to SDO.

## Hypotheses

The aim of the present research was to analyze the relationships of SDO and RWA with the basic values in the recently refined Schwartz and colleagues' (2017) theory. In line with previous studies using the original Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ), it was hypothesized that SDO, when statistically corrected for RWA, would be pos-

itively related to values of self-enhancement (i.e., power and achievement), while negatively to values of self-transcendence (i.e., universalism and benevolence). When statistically corrected for SDO, RWA would be positively related to values of conservation (i.e., tradition, conformity, and security), while negatively to values of openness to change (i.e., self-direction and stimulation).

As concerns the new narrowly defined values in the Portrait Values Questionnaire-Refined (PVQ-R), it was expected that SDO would be positively related to both subtypes of power, as both concerns a push to control and rule the world around, and negatively to both subtypes of benevolence, as the preference for dominance over others should also extend to members of the in-group. Moreover, it would be negatively related to the universalism-concern, as this dimension is referred to support of politics of inequality. Instead, it would not be significantly related to universality-tolerance, as this subtype implies the acceptance of people perceived as different. In line with [Duckitt and Sibley \(2007\)](#), SDO is related more to the negative attitudes towards those lower on the social ladder than towards those perceived as different (who are instead disparaged by authoritarian people). As concerns the new value types, SDO would be negatively related to humility, as this dimension pertains to one's own sense of interpersonal modesty. As concerns the two SDO dimensions, considering that – as shown above – the subdivision is quite recent and the few studies that have analyzed the relationships with Schwartz's values have shown few discriminating correlations, in this research a substantially exploratory approach was adopted. Nevertheless, starting from the inspection of the items, it was expected that SDO-D – a more blatant preference for dominance hierarchies – would be mainly related to self-enhancement values while SDO-E – a subtler preference for unequal hierarchies – to self-transcendence values.

As concerns RWA, it is expected that it would be positively related to conformity-rules, that is compliance with rules, a characteristic of authoritarian people. Instead, it would not be significantly related to conformity-interpersonal, as this value identifies a tendency to please and not upset other people. As concerns security, RWA would be positively related to both security-societal and -personal. Both subtypes are indeed related to an anxiety over the worsening of social stability, an aspect classically underlying authoritarian attitudes, as exemplified by their connection with a dangerous worldview ([Perry et al., 2013](#)). Moreover, it will be negatively correlated to both subtypes of self-direction. As concerns the new value types, RWA would be positively related to face, as this value is referred to maintaining one's own public image, an aspect related in some ways to conformist and acquiesced attitudes.

In view of the differences between the authoritarian attitudinal clusters, it was expected that RWAsub would be positively related to conservation values (except for conformism-interpersonal and face) and negatively to openness to change values, as it identifies passive compliance with established authorities; RWAagg to security values (especially those societal) and negatively to universalism-tolerance, as it detects feelings of aggression towards those who are perceived as deviants and as a threat to the social order; and RWAcon to tradition, as it discerns a strict adherence to conventional values and norms (see [Altemeyer, 1981](#)).

## Method

### Participants

Participants were contacted online by means of a *snowballing* procedure. Specifically, two final year students were asked to recruit friends, relatives, and family members to answer the questionnaire. The questionnaire was

publicly accessible and an invitation with the link to the questionnaire was emailed to the potential participants. Respondents were advised that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. No fee was offered. The questionnaire was drafted in Italian. In order to check and prevent anyone from re-entering the survey site, the subject's IP address was monitored. The data were collected in 2018.

A total of 203 Italian citizens (69.5% women) responded by accessing the website and filling out the questionnaire. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 73 years ( $M = 27$ ,  $SD = 11.91$ ). As regards their level of education, 2.5% declared they had finished middle school, 72.1% declared they had earned a high school diploma, 21.9% had a university degree and 3.5% a master's or Ph.D. qualification.

## Measures

### Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA)

This construct was measured by the 12-item scale constructed and validated by Passini (2017a) and based on the original scale by Altemeyer (1981). The subjects responded to each item on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). The scale measures the three underlying clusters: authoritarian submission (4 items, e.g. "our country will be great if we do what the authorities tell us to do,"  $\alpha = .76$ ), authoritarian aggression (4 items, e.g. "our government has to eliminate any opponents,"  $\alpha = .68$ ) and conventionalism (4 items, e.g. "our country will be great if we respect our traditions,"  $\alpha = .75$ ). Moreover, a total RWA index was computed ( $\alpha = .88$ ).

### Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

Social dominance orientation was measured with the 4-item Italian version of the SDO scale (Pratto et al., 2013). The items were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). A sample item of the scale is "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups" ( $\alpha = .67$ ). In line with some recent work (see Ho et al., 2012), two dimensions were also considered, each one measured with two items: SDO dominance (SDO-D) and SDO anti-egalitarianism (SDO-E).

## Values

Participants completed the Italian version of the Portrait Values Questionnaire Revised (PVQ-R, Vecchione & Alessandri, 2017), which replaced the previous version by considering a more complex structure. The PVQ-R (Schwartz et al., 2012) includes 57 sentences and contains three items to measure each of the 19 values (see Table 1). Like previous versions of the PVQ, each item describes a person in terms of his or her values and respondents are asked to rate "How much is this person like you" on a scale ranging from 1 (*not like me at all*) to 6 (*very much like me*). Cronbach values are listed in Table 2. Except for humility<sup>1</sup>, all the values are higher of .60 and thus can be considered acceptable.

## Results

As concerns the partial correlations with the 10 original PVQ value types and as hypothesized, the results (see Table 2) showed that when statistically corrected for RWA, SDO ( $M = 1.79$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ) was positively related to self-enhancement (both achievement and power) and negatively to self-transcendence (both universalism and benevolence).

Table 2  
Means, Standard Deviations, Zero-Order and Partial Correlations

Variable	M	SD	α	Zero-Order				Partial Correlations <sup>a</sup>						
				SDO	RWA	SDO	SDO-D	SDO-E	RWA	RWAsub	RWAagg	RWAcon		
<b>Openness to change</b>	4.72	0.62	.84	-.18**	-.40***	.05	-.10	.15*	-.37***	-.28***	.14*	-.22**		
<b>Self-direction</b>	5.18	0.75	.87	-.31***	-.44***	-.09	-.22**	.10	-.34***	-.20**	.07	-.21**		
Self-direction thought	5.24	0.78	.76	-.31***	-.41***	-.12	-.17*	.03	-.30***	-.29***	.10	-.09		
Self-direction action	5.12	0.85	.86	-.23***	-.37***	-.04	-.22**	.15*	-.30***	-.06	.03	-.27***		
<b>Stimulation</b>	3.82	1.01	.66	.01	-.16*	.12	.09	.05	-.20**	-.11	.11	-.18**		
<b>Hedonism</b>	4.67	0.79	.65	.04	-.10	.11	-.02	.13	-.14*	-.24***	.10	.03		
<b>Self-Enhancement</b>	3.15	0.75	.82	.40***	.13	.39***	.27***	.21**	-.12	-.03	-.05	-.04		
<b>Achievement</b>	4.16	0.92	.63	.17*	-.05	.23***	.11	.16*	-.17**	-.01	-.01	-.16*		
<b>Power</b>	2.64	0.80	.79	.42***	.19**	.39***	.29***	.19**	-.05	-.02	.06	.04		
Power-dominance	2.37	0.96	.79	.32***	.13	.31***	.22**	.15*	-.06	.01	-.14	.07		
Power-resources	2.91	0.93	.73	.38***	.19**	.33***	.25***	.15*	-.02	-.05	.05	-.02		
<b>Conservation</b>	4.06	0.78	.88	.30***	.64***	-.07	-.04	-.05	.60***	.38***	.10	.19**		
<b>Face</b>	4.31	1.02	.71	.04	.14	-.04	-.08	.02	.14*	.01	.13	.00		
<b>Security</b>	4.35	0.97	.85	.16*	.48***	-.13	-.15*	.00	.47***	.23***	.20**	.06		
Security-personal	4.43	0.93	.67	.18**	.29***	.02	-.02	.04	.24***	.11	.07	.06		
Security-societal	4.28	1.20	.85	.10	.48***	-.22**	-.22**	-.04	.51***	.26***	.25***	.04		
<b>Tradition</b>	2.87	1.12	.82	.43***	.54***	.15*	.17*	.01	.49***	.14*	-.09	.47***		
<b>Conformity</b>	4.23	0.95	.81	.13	.32***	-.06	.02	-.08	.30***	.34***	-.05	-.03		
Conformity-rules	4.22	1.18	.87	.08	.33***	-.13	-.11	-.04	.35***	.42***	-.01	-.11		
Conformity-interpersonal	4.25	1.08	.77	.12	.15*	.04	.14*	-.08	.11	.10	-.07	.07		
<b>Self-Transcendence</b>	5.06	0.52	.85	-.52***	-.54***	-.32***	-.11	-.26***	-.36***	-.19**	-.18**	.01		
<b>Humility</b>	4.46	0.85	.46	-.24***	-.24***	-.14*	.00	-.15*	-.13	.02	-.14*	-.01		
<b>Universalism</b>	5.09	0.59	.78	-.46***	-.53***	-.25***	-.10	-.19**	-.37***	-.18**	-.21**	.02		
Universalism-nature	4.78	0.96	.86	-.12	-.13	-.07	-.04	-.04	-.07	-.06	-.04	.03		
Universalism-concern	5.47	0.66	.68	-.52***	-.55***	-.32***	-.19**	-.19**	-.38***	-.29***	-.13	.06		
Universalism-tolerance	5.02	0.75	.66	-.37***	-.48***	-.15*	.02	-.18**	-.36***	-.05	-.26***	-.06		
<b>Benevolence</b>	5.31	0.66	.84	-.35***	-.30***	-.23***	-.10	-.17**	-.14*	-.15*	.03	-.01		
Benevolence-caring	5.33	0.70	.78	-.26***	-.23***	-.17**	-.09	-.11	-.11	-.09	.01	-.01		
Benevolence-dependability	5.29	0.74	.75	-.34***	-.29***	-.23***	-.09	-.17**	-.13	-.16*	.05	-.01		

Note. SDO = Social dominance orientation; RWA = Right-wing authoritarianism; RWAsub = Authoritarian submission; RWAagg = Authoritarian aggression; RWAcon = Conventionalism. Bold type indicates the hypothesized effects.

<sup>a</sup>SDO was corrected for RWA and SDO-E, SDO-E for RWA and SDO-D, RWA for SDO, RWAsub for SDO, RWAagg and RWAcon, RWAagg for SDO, RWAsub and RWAcon, RWAcon for SDO, RWAsub, and RWAagg.

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01. \*\*\*p < .001.

Contrary to the hypotheses, SDO was also moderately correlated to tradition. RWA ( $M = 2.49$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), when statistically corrected for SDO, was positively related to conservation and its dimensions (i.e. security, tradition, and conformity) and negatively to openness to change and its dimensions (i.e. self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism). Moreover, it was negatively correlated to self-transcendence (universalism and moderately benevolence) and to achievement.

As concerns the new narrowly defined value types of the PVQ-R, SDO was positively correlated both to power-dominance and -resources, was negatively correlated to both universalism-concern and -tolerance (in this case, just moderately), but not significantly to -nature, to both benevolence-caring and -dependability, and moderately to humility. Moreover, it was negatively correlated to security-societal. RWA was positively correlated both to security-personal and -societal, conformity-rules, but not significantly to -interpersonal, while negatively to both self-direction thought and action, universalism-concern and -tolerance, but not significantly to -nature. Moreover, it was positively correlated to face.

Finally, considering the sub-dimensions of RWA and SDO, these results acquired more specificity. As concerns the two SDO subtypes, as hypothesized SDO-D ( $M = 1.63$ ,  $SD = 0.81$ ) was positively related to all the self-enhancement values (except for achievement), although SDO-E was positively correlated as well (contrary to the hypotheses). Moreover, SDO-D was negatively correlated with self-direction and its subtypes, security, universalism-concern, and positively with tradition. According to the hypotheses, SDO-E ( $M = 1.94$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ) was negatively related to all the self-transcendence values (except benevolence-caring). Moreover, it was positively correlated to self-direction action and to self-enhancement values. SDO-D was also more related to RWA as compared with SDO-E ( $r = .44$ ,  $p < .001$  vs.  $r = .16$   $p < .05$ ).

As hypothesized, the three attitudinal clusters of authoritarianism had a mirror on specific values: i.e., RWAsub ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ ) was positively related to conservation values, while negatively to openness to change values; RWAagg ( $M = 2.69$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ) was positively related to security-societal, while negatively to universalism-tolerance; RWAcon ( $M = 1.93$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ) was positively related to tradition. Moreover, RWASUB was negatively correlated to universalism-concern, and benevolence-dependability; RWAagg negatively to humility, and it was the only cluster significantly correlated to SDO ( $r = .26$ ,  $p < .001$ ); RWAcon negatively to self-direction action, stimulation and achievement.

## Discussion

The current study confirms research (e.g. Feather & McKee, 2012; Sinn, 2019) that has shown that SDO and RWA are characterized by a different mirror on value orientations. Moreover, by using the recent refined and more complex theory of values, insights on the relationships between ideological and value orientations are extended in several ways. As hypothesized, when statistically corrected for RWA, people who attach great importance to SDO are mainly positioned on the axis that opposes values of self-enhancement (positively related) to those of self-transcendence (negatively related). Furthermore, the use of Schwartz's refined theory of values in this research adds some interesting considerations to previous research. Firstly, the search for power is related to both domination and resource. That is, dominant people attach relevance to the use of power through the control and the supremacy over people, and through the control of material resources. Secondly, the low importance attributed to self-transcendence values is related to both universalism and benevolence, but it is particularly linked to a dis-



engagement from and a disregard for fairness and equality (i.e., universalism-concern), rather than to a general intolerance. As hypothesized, this result could be explained with reference to the Dual Process Model (DPM, Duckitt & Sibley, 2010). Moreover, SDO does not affect the preservation of the natural environment (i.e., universalism-nature). This result suggests that, at least in relation to the participants in this research, the lack of protection of nature is not linked to a drive for dominance. It would be interesting to see whether this negative correlation emerges instead in people in leading positions in multinational corporations and companies. In such cases, the issue of nature conservation could be more central (in a negative sense). Thirdly, SDO is related to a lack of humility and to a lack of loyalty and care towards in-group members (i.e. benevolence). This is in line with the SDO theory, as the route to arrogant superiority, supremacy, and unfairness are all characteristics of dominant people (Pratto et al., 1994). Contrary to the hypotheses, SDO is also correlated positively – although moderately – with tradition. This is not surprising as dominant people are also characterized by opposing such policies that contest traditional conservative values, such as those prescribing equality between men and women, heterosexuals and homosexuals (Pratto et al., 1994). Moreover, SDO is negatively correlated with security-societal (although there was no significant zero-order correlation). By considering the partial effect of RWA, again in accordance with the DPM it would seem that a dangerous worldview and a consequent perception of insecurity is a component characterizing the profile of the authoritarian more than the dominant person.

With reference to the two SDO subtypes, as hypothesized SDO-E is the dimension negatively related to tolerance of others. In contrast to the hypothesis, both subtypes are positively correlated with self-enhancement, although the correlation coefficients of SDO-D are slightly higher. This dimension is also negatively related to self-direction. This is in contrast with considering dominant people as self-sufficient and not as passive conformists. In view of the non-significance with conformism values, this lack of self-direction could be interpreted as characterizing a person being competitive, while at the same time following the strong and dominating powers. Altogether and as a confirmation of the few studies that have used this division (Caricati, 2007; McKee & Feather, 2008), the two subtypes do not show great differences in relation to values. Whether this result depends on the SDO scale – still under development – or on the data of this research can only be understood with future studies.

On the other side and as hypothesized, when statistically corrected for SDO, people who attach great importance to RWA are mainly positioned on the axis that opposes values of conservation (positively related) to those of openness to change (negatively related). Specifically, the refined theory of basic values shows that authoritarian people attach particular importance both to the stability of the society and social order (i.e., security-societal) and to one's own safety (i.e., security-personal), and to a conformism with rules and laws (i.e., conformity-rules), rather than a tendency to please other people (i.e., conformity-interpersonal). This is confirmed by the mirror on openness to change values – that underlines this passive adherence to the dictates of society – and on face values, linked to a tendency not to want to appear publicly in a negative way. The latter are defined as the maintenance and protection of one's own public image, a form of conformism close to the classic definition of compliance (Asch, 1956). It should be noted that, unlike the hypothesis, RWA is negatively related to both universality-concern and tolerance. These correlations may be explained by the fact that RWA is a variable that also comprises negative attitudes towards those who are different, as shown by DPM (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007), and adherence to a strong authority can result in support for unfair and exclusive policies. Moreover, it is negatively correlated to achievement, as a confirmation of authoritarian people as being more remissive and less competitive.

As concerns the three attitudinal clusters of RWA, the present research confirms that some differences exist in their mirror on specific value priorities. Specifically, as hypothesized, RWAsub is related to a passive conformism

to rules, a sense of societal danger, and a lack of self-direction, that is a less relevance attached to the development of one's own ideas and pleasure. In line with [Fromm \(1941\)](#), submissive people appear as those who have set aside their own freedom, in favor of a quiet and safety life. As already suggested by other scholars ([Feldman, 2003](#); [Passini, 2017a](#)), this dimension should be considered the real core of the classic conceptualization of RWA, as it is determined solely by compliant and passive attitudes. It should be noted that, contrary to the hypotheses, this dimension is also related to biased attitudes towards the other people. Being submissive to authority may lead to less attention being given to equality issues and the refusal of unfair policies (universalism-concern). Indeed, passive submission to authority is characterized by an obedience that does not indulge into the content of the policies, but follows orders whatever they may be (see [Kelman & Hamilton, 1989](#)). RWAagg is confirmed as more related to a lack of tolerance and a certain emphasis on the importance of living in a non-dangerous society. It worth noting that RWAagg is also characterized by a lack of humility. As also confirmed by the fact that it is the only facet of RWA which shares aspects with SDO, RWAagg should be considered more an active and less weak compliance with authority. However, unlike SDO, RWAagg is not significantly related to power, and is more characterized by intolerance than by inequality. Finally, RWAcon is almost exclusively referred to traditionalism, as a confirmation of previous studies (see [Passini, 2017b](#)). Moreover, contrary to the hypotheses, it is also characterized by a perception of less freedom of choice and achievement. This makes sense as the great respect for conventional values and norms clearly lead these people to feel less competitive, self-sufficient and free in their thoughts and actions.

This research has some limitations that can be overcome in future studies. Firstly, the use of a snowballing procedure in the recruitment of participants leads to a circle of interconnected people, with the risk of having more similar responses. Moreover, such a non-probability sampling technique does not allow us to make generalizations as it cannot be considered to be representative of the population being studied. However, although this still remains a convenience sample, it returns more heterogeneous samples than most college-student ones, inferred from the enlarged age group. Nevertheless, the discussion of the results must be considered specific to the data analyzed, and subsequent generalizations can only be supported by means of other studies. Secondly, results are based on one single convenience sample and referred to the Italian socio-cultural context. Although the Schwartz value model has been confirmed to apply almost invariably to different countries, the specific relationship between value and ideological orientations may take different directions depending on the values shared at the societal level. Despite their limits of over-generalization, the theories on collectivist vs. individualist ([Triandis, 2018](#)) and materialistic vs. post-materialist societies ([Inglehart, 1977](#)) suggest possible variations in such relationships. It would be interesting, in this sense, to compare the data from this research with data from other cultures far removed from the so-called Western model. Thirdly, the SDO scale used was the short version. For a better discrimination of its two dimensions (i.e. SDO-D and SDO-E), future studies should use the 16-item version.

Notwithstanding some limitations, the present research provides novel insights into the social-psychological analysis of the relationship between value and ideological orientations. Specifically, by the use of a more complex and refined theoretical framework, such as that of the PVQ-R, it returns a more detailed picture of the specific characteristics of authoritarian and dominant people and suggests various intervention policies designed to reduce those people's impact on the rise of intolerant feelings and behaviors. Without delving too much into what individual choices about the importance attached to a certain worldview are, adolescents and young adults could be enabled to reason about what is a mature relationship with authority and society in general. Schwartz's model, in this sense, suggests that we may start from the development of a balance between the various value oppositions,

in order to be obedient but not passive people, and to realize one's own aspirations without being obstructive of other people's freedoms.

## Notes

i) Considering the intent of this research and the fact that the dimensions are composed of a limited number of items, it was decided to keep this dimension too.

## Funding

The authors have no funding to report.

## Competing Interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## Acknowledgments

The authors have no support to report.

## References

- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs*, 70(9), 1-70. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093718>
- Caricati, L. (2007). The relationship between social dominance orientation and gender: The mediating role of social values. *Sex Roles*, 57, 159-171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9231-3>
- Corey, G., Corey, M. S., & Callahan, P. (2003). *Issues and ethics in the helping professions* (6th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA, USA: Brooks/Cole.
- Crawford, J. T., Brady, J. L., Pilanski, J. M., & Erny, H. (2013). Differential effects of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on political candidate support: The moderating role of message framing. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 1, 5-28. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v1i1.170>
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Bringing values back in the adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 420-445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfn035>
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 21, 113-130. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.614>
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2010). Personality, ideology, prejudice, and politics: A dual-process motivational model. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 1861-1893. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00672.x>
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1199-1213. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(01\)00086-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00086-1)

- Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2008). Values and prejudice: Predictors of attitudes towards Australian Aborigines. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 60*, 80-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530701449513>
- Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2012). Values, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and ambivalent attitudes toward women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*, 2479-2504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00950.x>
- Federico, C. M., Fisher, E. L., & Deason, G. (2017). The authoritarian left withdraws from politics: Ideological asymmetry in the relationship between authoritarianism and political engagement. *The Journal of Politics, 79*, 1010-1023. <https://doi.org/10.1086/692126>
- Feldman, S. (2003). Enforcing social conformity: A theory of authoritarianism. *Political Psychology, 24*, 41-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00316>
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York, NY, USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ho, A. K., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels, R., . . . Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO7 scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 1003-1028. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000033>
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2012). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 583-606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211432765>
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of obedience: Toward a social psychology of authority and responsibility*. New Haven, CT, USA: Yale University Press.
- Knafo, A., Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (2011). The value of values in cross-cultural research: A special issue in honor of Shalom Schwartz. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*, 178-185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110396863>
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Akoğlu, S. Ç. (2014). Relationships among social dominance orientation, social axioms, and values. *Social Behavior and Personality, 42*, 1395-1407. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.8.1395>
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Ogunfowora, B., Bourdage, J. S., & Shin, K.-H. (2010). The personality bases of socio-political attitudes: The role of Honesty-Humility and Openness to Experience. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 115-119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.08.007>
- Leone, L., Livi, S., & Chirumbolo, A. (2016). Political involvement moderates the impact of worldviews and values on SDO and RWA. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 418-427. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2170>
- McKee, I. R., & Feather, N. T. (2008). Revenge, retribution, and values: Social attitudes and punitive sentencing. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 138-163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-008-0066-z>
- Passini, S. (2017a). Different ways of being authoritarian: The distinct effects of authoritarian dimensions on values and prejudice. *Political Psychology, 38*, 73-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12309>
- Passini, S. (2017b). Freedom, democracy, and values: Perception of freedom of choice and readiness to protest. *Culture and Psychology, 23*, 534-550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X17692116>
- Perry, R., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2013). Dangerous and competitive worldviews: A meta-analysis of their associations with social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 47*, 116-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.10.004>

- Pratto, F., Çidam, A., Stewart, A. L., Zeineddine, F. B., Aranda, M., Aiello, A., . . . Henkel, K. E. (2013). Social dominance in context and in individuals: Contextual moderation of robust effects of social dominance orientation in 15 languages and 20 countries. *Social Psychological & Personality Science*, *4*, 587-599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612473663>
- 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*, 741-763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1–65). San Diego, CA, USA: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., . . . Demirutku, K. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*, 663-688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Torres, C., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Butenko, T. (2017). Value tradeoffs propel and inhibit behavior: Validating the 19 refined values in four countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*, 241-258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2228>
- Sinn, J. S. (2019). Mapping ideology: Combining the Schwartz value circumplex with evolutionary theory to explain ideological differences. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *5*, 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-018-0165-5>
- Triandis, H. C. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Vecchione, M., & Alessandri, G. (2017). Un contributo alla validazione italiana del Portrait Values Questionnaire-Revised (PVQ-R) [Validation of the Italian version of the Portrait Values Questionnaire-Revised (PVQ-R)]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *44*, 322-346.
- Vecchione, M., Caprara, G., Schoen, H., Castro, J. L. G., & Schwartz, S. H. (2012). The role of personal values and basic traits in perceptions of the consequences of immigration: A three-nation study. *British Journal of Psychology*, *103*, 359-377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02079.x>