

Authoritarianism and Collectivism: Antecedents and Consequences Among College Students

2016

Jasmine Samuel Ms.
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

 Part of the [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), and the [Theory and Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Samuel, Jasmine Ms., "Authoritarianism and Collectivism: Antecedents and Consequences Among College Students" (2016). *Honors in the Major Theses*. Paper 12.

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the UCF Theses and Dissertations at STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors in the Major Theses by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact lee.dotson@ucf.edu.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND COLLECTIVISM:
ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

JASMINE SAMUEL

A thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology
in the College of Sciences
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term, 2016

Thesis Chair: Dr. Doan Modianos

ABSTRACT

Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) suggests there are five distinct moral dimensions, which define morality as a whole. MFT can be broken down into two groups binding: in group/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity-which encompass group morality. Harm/Care, fairness/reciprocity are individualizing dimensions, which highlight individual morality. Recent work has found MFT predicts sociopolitical ideologies, as well as sociopolitical attitudes. In an effort to better understand the existing relationships we investigate MFT as a predictor of sociopolitical parties, and attitudes Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). We also draw on similarities between Individualism/Collectivism and MFT. Specifically we demonstrate individualizing foundations, and dimensions of individualism predict SDO, where as Binding dimensions and dimensions of Collectivism relate to RWA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Doan Modianos, Dr. Mustapha Mouloua, and Dr. Houman Saudri for their guidance and help throughout this duration of my thesis. Specifically, I'd like to thank Dr. Modianos for helping strengthen my skills as a researcher, and allowing me to gain insight into these seemingly contentious topics. Additionally, I'd like to thank Denise Crisafi for her oversight during this process, encouragement and help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Moral Foundations Theory	1
Sociopolitical Attitudes.....	3
Individualism and Collectivism	7
CHAPTER TWO: METHODS.....	10
Participants.....	10
Measures	10
Demographics	10
Moral Foundations Theory	10
Right-Wing Authoritarianism.....	10
Social- Dominance Orientation.....	11
Vertical/Horizontal Individualism and Collectivism.....	11
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	12
Overview of Analysis	12
Results.....	12
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION.....	16
Hypothesis 1.....	16
Hypothesis 2.....	17
Future Research	20

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER	22
APPENDIX B: MORAL FOUNDATIONS THEORY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	24
APPENDIX C: Individualism/Collectivism Horizontal /Vertical	27
APPENDIX D: RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM	30
REFERENCES	39

ABBREVIATIONS

MFT	Moral Foundations Theory
RWA	Right-Wing Authoritarianism
SDO	Social Dominance Orientation

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research has emerged to help determine the connection between morality and sociopolitical ideologies and attitudes. Graham's et al., (2011) Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) has been the focus of these predictions. MFT has been related to political ideologies and connections to sociopolitical ideologies: right-wing authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation, however with limitations (Milojevic et al., 2014). A reevaluation of MFT with an added construct of self-view may prove to be a stronger predictor of political ideologies and attitudes. MFT and individualism/collectivism can help build on the understanding of what contributes to sociopolitical ideologies and Right-Wing Authoritarian (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) attitudes.

Moral Foundations Theory

Research on moral psychology has broadened the definition of morality with the use of MFT. Graham & et al., (2011) identified five domains of morality: Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, In Group/Loyalty, Autonomy/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity. The five domains known as The MFT assess differences in opinions, beliefs, and values that affect moral judgment (Graham, Haidt, Iyer, Koleva, & Ditto 2011). Previous morality measures assess issues of harm and fairness (Kohlberg, 1967). The five foundations can be categorized into two different dimensions: "individualizing" dimensions or "binding" dimensions. Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity are referred to as the individualizing foundations; these foundations are concerned with the ethics of autonomy and social

justice. In-group/loyalty, autonomy/respect, and purity/sanctity are referred to as “binding foundations” which involve an interest in community, respect for authority and divinity (Graham et al., 2011). These foundations combined help to fully cover the “domain” of morality (Graham et al., 2011).

MFT has shown to have distinct relationships to political ideologies (Day et al., 2014; Federico, Weber, Ergun & Hunt, 2013; Kugler, Jost, & Noorbalochi, 2014). The five domains are said to explain the (moral) views of liberals and conservatives (Graham et al., 2011). Liberals are motivated by social progress and freedom of the individual. Socially and economically, they promote the improvement of the individual to the fullest potential (Bertrand, 2004). Unlike liberals, conservatives are less concerned with progress and change, and more concerned with tradition and proper order. These individuals tend to believe changes in social class, economic standing, and powers may pose threats to the country’s stability (Schlesinger, 1956). Conservative policy opposes decisions that may negatively affect the traditional views of the “in-group.” Same sex marriage, abortion and immigration are contentious issues because of the threat to traditional views of the group. Conservatives emphasize tradition, in-group, and respect more regularly than liberals. Liberal morality has been concerned with fairness and equal opportunities regardless of current standing. The two dimensions of MFT are endorsed differently by conservatives and liberals the individualizing foundations, harm and fairness, are endorsed significantly by liberals. Unsurprisingly, the binding foundations, which emphasize group interests, were not found to be of importance (Day et al., 2014; Federico et al., 2013; Graham et al., 2011). Conservative policy is typically made in

favor of the “good of the group,” and places a large weight on binding factors.

Conservative values and views almost mimic dimensions of the binding foundations.

Graham et al. (2011) reported that conservatives regularly endorse binding foundations.

This finding is of interest because different “moral signatures” can be derived from the five moral domains, and distinct moral signatures can predict membership in different groups.

Research has also shed light on another sociopolitical ideology- libertarianism. Often thought to be a mixture of conservative and liberalism, libertarianism has a unique political perspective (Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto & Haidt, 2012). Libertarians are concerned with the protection of each individual's liberties, and rights of others are not encroached on. Government's ideal place is less involved, than in conservative and liberal ideology. Social issues, and at one time issues of federal income tax were not seen as the government's job (Iyer et al., 2012). This is a result of the belief that each individual is responsible for themselves. Libertarians have been found to have a unique “moral signature” (Milojevic et al., 2014). Libertarian ideology greatly differs from conservatism and liberalism, in that they did not endorse any of the moral domains. “On the basis that these moralities are based on obligation to other people, groups, traditions, and authorities (Iyer et al., 2012).” Although it might be assumed they would value individualizing foundations, harm and fairness is not an important value.

Sociopolitical Attitudes

Sociopolitical attitudes assess morality on a multi-dimensional level, assessing attitudes, motivators and personality traits. These two attitudes in particular, SDO and

RWA focus on intergroup relations; in-group dominance and Group cohesion (Milojevic et al., 2014). Right-Wing authoritarianism (RWA) is an attitude motivated by beliefs in total social cohesion (Altemeyer, 1996; Shaffer & Duckitt, 2013). This attitude has proved to be threatening, as it has been a motivator in fascist states like Italy and Germany during WWII (Bobo, 1990; Shaffer & Duckitt, 2013). Authoritarianism is blind submission to authority, and the suppression of freedom (Triandis 1995). RWA is a “covariation” of three attitudinal clusters as proposed by Altemeyer (1996). These clusters are based around the idea that some individuals submit to authority with very little difficulty, while the majority do not (Altemeyer, 1996). “Authoritarian submission,” “authoritarian aggression,” and “authoritarian conventionalism” have been proposed as being three dimensions of how individuals respond to authoritarian stimuli (Altemeyer 1996).

Altemeyer (1996) defines these clusters as follows:

Authoritarian submission is a high degree of submission to authority. Authoritarian aggression is a general aggressiveness, directed against various persons, and authoritarian conventionalism is a high degree of adherence to the social conventions that are endorsed by society (p.6).

These clusters contribute to an attitude dominated by beliefs in submission, complete trust, and respect for authority.

An RWA “personality” is categorized by strong prejudices against those in out-groups, likings for hierarchies and power distances, and traditional beliefs.

Individuals with these attitudes typically have traditional views of marriage, sex, gender roles, religion, and politics (Altemeyer, 1995; Crawford & Pilanski, 2014;

Shaffer & Duckitt, 2013,). Alternative out-group opinions are seen as threatening and dangerous. This can be problematic and be relevant in diverse democratic areas because, RWA individuals are shown to be politically intolerant of others (Crawford & Pilanski, 2014)

SDO relates to in-group/out-group inequality, it is the extent to which individuals desire their in-group to be dominate over out-groups (Pratto, Sindanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) “This attitude is the result at the attempt to minimize conflict amongst groups by predetermining which groups are “better” in a society (Pratto et al.,).” The extent or degree to which individuals believe different groups have a ranking or hierarchy is SDO. Individuals who value equality are low in SDO, where as individuals who prefer group based inequality are higher (Pratto et al.,). Like RWA this attitude can be used as the basis for group based discrimination.

Although seemingly related, these attitudes have different motivators. Authoritarianism is the belief in total group cohesion, and although they discriminate against out-groups it is typically because they have different values/ beliefs that are not based on tradition, and authority. Authoritarians would like everyone to submit to authority and hold the same types of values (tradition, conservative, contemporaneous issues). Where as SDO is discrimination based on socially created rankings. This attitude prefers the inequality of the groups, and rejects programs that might equalize groups or “change” their current social standing. This also denotes a competitiveness of individuals towards out-groups. SDO has shown to have a positive relationship with conservatism (Pratto et al.,).

Similar characteristics can be seen among those who identify as conservative and those who hold RWA. These two groups have a vested interest in traditional beliefs, and values: same sex marriage, abstinence education, and education. Inequalities of individuals are common. Power distances (the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally) in religion and government are preferred among these groups, as well as a general belief that their in-group is superior in beliefs (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski & Sulloway, 2003; Greenberg & Jones, 2003). Although Altemeyer (1995) has said that one does not prove the other, in comparison to liberals, conservative values are probably more likely to indicate RWA attitudes.

Although SDO is shown to correlate with conservatism, there are certain qualities of libertarianism that SDO possess. Iyer et al., (2012) found libertarianism to negatively correlate with individualizing foundations, and Milojevic et al., (2014) found SDO to negatively correlate with individualizing foundations. Libertarians aren't necessarily concerned with equality of others, similar to conservatives (Iyer et al., 2012). Also both groups are not in favor of government socially funded projects (Iyer et al., 2012; Pratto et al., (1994).

RWA and SDO are sociopolitical attitude that can assess moral motivation on deeper level. Sociopolitical attitudes have multiple dimensions, unlike political ideologies, which tend to be one dimensional, and as a result assess more general, superficial qualities (Milojevic et al., 2014; Federico et al., 2013). Similar to political ideologies MFT should predict RWA and SDO attitudes. This assumes that like liberals,

conservatives and libertarians, RWA and SDO has a unique moral signature. MFT binding foundations are parallel to the characteristics of RWA. Research, however, has pointed to unresolved findings. Federico et al., (2013) found an indirect relationship among RWA, binding factors and individualizing factors. Despite binding dimensions appearing to be similar to RWA attitudes, neither binding nor individualizing factors proved to have a relationship to RWA (Federico et al., 2013). In a similar study, Milojevic et al., (2014) found RWA did in fact predict individuals' emphasis on binding foundations, leaving the relationship between RWA and MFT disputed. SDO Research has indicated a negative relationship to the individualizing factors of MFT. This SDO attitudes lack interest in harm and fairness as opposed to other moral dimensions(Milojevic et al., 2014).

Individualism and Collectivism

Individualism and collectivism is a definition of self. It is one dimension of how people see themselves (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, Gelfand, 1995). These dimensions define how people view themselves in terms of their culture. Collectivists (Interdependent self-view) define themselves as part of a group, or as a member of a community (Cheng et al., 2011; Chirkov, Lynch & Niwa, 2005; Singelis et al., 1995;Triandis, 1995). Collectivists typically put the group interest before their own (Cheng et al., 2011; Chirkov et al., 2005; Triandis, 1995). Individualists are motivated by personal and individual goals (Cheng et al., 2011). Individualists see themselves independently of the group, and focus on issues independent of the group. A major difference between individualists and collectivists is how these individuals handle

relationships (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, 1995). Collectivists emphasize the importance of relationships, and maintain relationships even if they are not beneficial. Individualists do not remain in relationships that are not seen as positive or beneficial.

Further research has suggested additional dimensions of individualism and collectivism. Known as horizontal and vertical dimensions, they define “same” or “different” (Singelis, 1995, Triandis, 1995). The horizontal aspect of self highlights equality (Chirkov et al., 2005; Singelis, 1995; Triandis 1995). In high hierarchical cultures, where religion or government is seen to have high power distance, the horizontal dimension would not readily be seen. In contrast, in cultures which are not hierarchical, on the horizontal dimension large power distances would be viewed as unacceptable. Vertical cultures view inequality as natural, and rankings are viewed positively and are desired (Chirkov et al., 2005; Komarraju; Cokley, 2008; Triandis 1995).

Triandis summarizes the definitions of self as:

Vertical Individualism: Achievement and individualism (USA)

Horizontal Individualism: Universalism and individualism (Sweden)

Vertical Collectivism: Power and Collectivism (India)

Horizontal Collectivism: Benevolence and Collectivism (Sweden, Australia) (Triandis, 1995).

In conjunction with moral foundations theory, the four definitions of self may explain the cultures that breed these attitudes and morals, as well as how these individuals define themselves. The preceding literature clearly indicates a relationship

between moral foundations theory and the sociopolitical attitudes of RWA and SDO. It has indicated possible overlapping qualities between Moral Foundations Domains, and Horizontal/Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. Thus based on the research it is anticipated that individuals who score highly on MFT binding dimensions and vertical collectivism will also have strong Right-Wing Authoritarianism attitudes. Also it is expected that individuals who rate individualizing dimensions poorly will have SDO attitudes, and a vertical individual self-view.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODS

Participants

Five- hundred and twenty-four University of Central Florida students were surveyed through the university Sona system. Sona consists of students enrolled in a psychology course. The majority of participants were females (n= 374, 71.1%) and males (n=150, 28.5%). Participants self reported race Caucasian (n=318, 60.5%), African American (n=51, 9.7%), Hispanic (n=90, 17.1%), Asian (n=31, 5.9) and other (n=34, 6.5%). The average ages range from 18-25 (n=455, 86.5%). All 524 students received credit for participation in the study.

Measures

Demographics

Background characteristics were assessed for each participant. Participants responded to questions in the following categories: Gender, Age, Race, Educational Background, Political Party, and Religion.

Moral Foundations Theory

Participants responded to the Moral Foundations Theory questionnaire. The 34-question scale assessed participants' moral judgments and decisions on the five dimensions of MFT: Harm, Fairness, In-group, Authority, and Purity. Responses ranged from 0 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely relevant*), and 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*)

Right-Wing Authoritarianism

Participants responded to an adapted version of Funke et al (2004) and Duckitt et al. (2011) RWA Authoritarian scale. The scale assessed: Submission, Conventionalism and

Aggression. Participants rated questions 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*).

Social- Dominance Orientation

A 12 question scale developed by (Pratto, Sindanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) assesses individual attitudinal tendencies towards social dominance orientation. 1(strongly disagree) - 6(strongly agree). Half of the questions are worded “pro” and half are worded “con.”

Vertical/Horizontal Individualism and Collectivism

Scales developed by Singelis et al., (1995) evaluate individualism/collectivism and vertical/horizontal dimensions of self. The 30 question scales rated 1(strongly disagree) - 6(strongly agree). Questions varying in assessment of beliefs.

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Overview of Analysis

In order to explore the relationship between morality, sociopolitical attitudes and Horizontal/Vertical collectivism and the relationships among individual variables multiple regression analyses were conducted. An Analysis of Variance was conducted to examine the possible differences between political party, and religion between RWA and SDO attitudes.

Results

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between RWA and various potential predictors. Table 1 summarizes the results. As predicted ($R^2 = .60$, $F [3,520] = 99.73$, $p < .001$; was calculated predicting Right-Wing Authoritarianism (*See table 1*) which included vertical collectivism, horizontal collectivism, and MFT binding foundations as predictors. The binding foundations were positively and significantly ($\beta = .42$, $t = 10.73$, $p = .01$) correlated with the criterion variable. This suggests that higher scores on the binding foundations results in higher scores of RWA. Additionally, Vertical Collectivism ($\beta = .32$, $t = 7.78$, $p = .01$) was positively correlated with RWA However Horizontal collectivism ($\beta = -.22$, $t = -5.95$, $p = .01$) was negatively correlated with the criterion. This effect confirms our hypothesis, members of RWA endorse one dimension of collectivism more highly.

A multiple regression ($R^2 = .51$, $F [4, 511] = 45.15$, $p < .001$; (*See Table 2*) was calculated to predict Social Dominance Orientation based on libertarian attitudes and values, Individualizing foundations, Individualism, and Vertical and Horizontal

predictors. Vertical Individualism ($\beta = .25, t = 6.72, p = .001$) was found to positively and significantly correlate with SDO. The individualizing ($\beta = -.42, t = -10.64, p = .001$) foundations had a negative and significant relationship. Libertarians ($\beta = .70, t = 1.816, p < .001$) was found to be a marginally significant predictor. Horizontal Individualism was not found to be significant ($\beta = -.15, t = -.38, n.s$)

A multiple regression ($R^2 = .01, F [3, 520] = 3.02, p < .03$; predicting Right-Wing Authoritarianism, included: Individualizing foundations, Vertical Individualizing and Horizontal individualizing. No significance was found. Between variables

An ANOVA was conducted to see how political party and religious affiliation effect Right-Wing Authoritarian Attitudes. A two-way between factors ANOVA was conducted. Results indicated a significant main effect for religion ($F(5,495)=6.215, p < .05, \eta^2=.059$). Which indicated those who were Protestant had the highest RWA attitudes ($M=67, SD=8.177$), followed by Catholics ($M= 67.65, SD= 6.004$). Among the groups Muslims ($M=59.50, SD=7.556$) had the lowest RWA attitudes. The significant main effect for political party ($F(5,495)=2.282, p < .05, \eta^2=.023$) indicated members of the Tea party ($M= 72.00, SD=.00$) and Republican Party ($M= 69.16, SD=7.570$). The Democratic ($M=63.86, SD=7.71$). party being the lowest. No significant interaction was found ($F(17,495)= .618, n.s$). Tukey Post Hoc Comparisons were conducted for Religion. Significant differences were found between Catholics ($M=67.65, SD=6.00$) and agnostic/atheists ($M=60.30, SD=7.35$). Agnostics/atheists were found to have a significant differences with participants who responded as none of the above ($M=65.69, SD=8.12$). Agnostics and atheists also had significant differences with Protestants ($M=69.64, SD=8.18$). Protestants were also found to have a significant difference with

Islam ($M=59.50, SD=7.56$) and individuals who identified as none of the above ($m=65.59, sd=8.12$). Protestants also had a significant differences with jewish ($M=62.45, SD=7.38$) individuals. No other significant differences were found. Post Hoc comparisons were also conducted for Political Party. A significant difference was found between democrats ($M=63.86, SD=7.71$) and republicans ($M=69.16, SD=7.57$). As well as republicans and independents ($M=64.35, SD=7.19$). Additionally republicans, and individuals reported none of the above ($M=66.02, SD=8.20$). No other significant differences were found.

A with-in subjects anova was conducted to see the effect of Political Party and Religious affliction on Social-Dominance Orientation. A significant main effect for religion ($F(5,488)= 2.548, p<.05, \eta^2=.025$) was found. Catholics ($M=66.62, SD=20.37$) were found to have the highest SDO attitudes followed by Judaism ($M=65.36, SD=15.75$). Among the lowest were Muslims ($M=40.83, SD=6.85$). Political Party ($F(5,488)=2.335, p<.05, \eta^2=.041$) also showed a significant main effect. Libertarians ($M=70.79, SD=23.765$), followed by Republicans ($M=69.10, SD=19.29$). were found to have the highest SDO attitudes. Democrats ($M=58.16, SD=17.40$) and the Tea Party ($M=49.50, SD=12.021$) were among the lowest scores. Tukey Post Hoc comparisons were conducted for religion. Significant differences were found between Catholics ($M=66.62, SD=20.37$) and muslims ($M=40.83, SD=6.85$). No other significant differences were found. Tukey post hoc comparisons revealed significant differences for Political Party. Democrats ($M=58.16, SD=17.40$) and Republicans ($M=69.10, SD=19.29$). Democrats also differed significantly with libertarians ($M=70.79, sd=23.76$). Republicans had significant difference with independents ($M=61.32, SD=19.99$). Those who identified as

n/a (M=61.09,SD=18.86) differed significantly with republicans.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1

The current study found that MFT Binding Foundations and Vertical Collectivism both predict right-wing authoritarianism. As indicated by previous literature, those with a moral foundation based upon binding dimensions have higher RWA attitudes. This suggests that individuals who base their moral decisions on in-group, authority, and purity have RWA attitudes. There is a common theme between RWA and binding dimensions due to their vested interests in authority, interests in the in-group, and “traditional” values. Additionally, individuals with RWA attitudes tend to be aggressive to others who disagree with others and have high levels of discrimination and prejudice towards out-groups. This indicates individuals who base their moral decisions strongly on the binding dimensions, are more inclined to be aggressive to others who are in the respected out group and discriminatory towards them than others.

Vertical collectivism was found to positively predict RWA. Similar to RWA it values inequality, prefers hierarchies. They also believe in low freedom meaning, freedom. These individuals see themselves as a part of the in-group, however the members are considered to be different in status and rank. This is similar to RWA attitudes, where hierarchies are preferred.

As predicted horizontal collectivism was found to have a negative relationship with RWA. Similar to vertical collectivism, these individuals see themselves as part of a group, and do base decisions on the group. The horizontal dimension however, represents all equality among individuals.

As predicted, participants RWA attitudes differed according to religion. Among religions RWA attitudes were highest among Protestants and Catholics, while Muslims were among the lowest. Similar to previous literature, the hypothesis was supported that Catholics and Protestants would have higher RWA. Significant differences were found among Catholics and atheists. Atheists had significantly lower RWA scores than Catholics. Additionally we found Protestants and Muslims significantly differ*. Protestants also were different from Jewish respondents. This suggests Protestants RWA attitudes are higher among several religions.

Similar to the previous literature, political parties had differing RWA attitudes. Conservatives and Tea Party voters had among the highest RWA scores. Conservative values are in line with tradition, and in-group interests. In contrast, democrats were among the lowest for RWA attitudes, and republicans and democrats were significantly different from one another.

The present study found several indicators of RWA attitudes related to morality, religion, political party and culture. Together these predictors facilitate a better understanding of what contributes to strong RWA attitudes. The current research suggests individuals who endorse binding foundations, are vertical collectivists and affiliate with conservative politics. Those who identify as Catholic and Protestant are more likely to possess strong RWA attitudes than others.

Hypothesis 2

SDO attitudes are a belief that the in-group deserves to dominate other groups, called out-groups, and groups have rankings and hierarchies. Individuals who do not value equality tend to have strong SDO attitudes. In MFT, the individualizing

foundations are based on avoiding harm and ensuring fairness with respect to individuals. The individualizing dimensions of moral values try to ensure equality for every individual, and not causing harm to others. We predicted that individuals endorsing the individualizing foundations that value equality are going to have low SDO attitudes. Based on previous literature, we also expected that liberals would score low on SDO attitudes.

Vertical individualism was found to predict SDO. Vertical individualists and those high in SDO are highly competitive among others, and there is the implicit expectation that people are not equal to one another.

Previous research links SDO and conservative political beliefs. We found similar results, with Republicans being one of the highest in SDO attitudes. However, in line* with our hypothesis we found libertarians to have the highest SDO scores. Libertarians are opposed to government funded social programs that may help elevate the social and economic status of others, especially if it encroaches on them. Our findings suggest libertarians aren't concerned by the existence of inequality, are accept hierarchies among classes. Libertarians and democrats, and democrats and republicans were significantly different. Results also indicate Catholics and Jewish individuals have the highest SDO attitudes.

Implications

As aforementioned, MFT binding foundations, Vertical/Horizontal Collectivism are predictors of RWA. Additionally, conservatives, Catholics, Protestants have significantly higher RWA attitudes. The current study sheds light on the sociopolitical attitudes RWA. To gain a better understanding, and knowledge of what contributes to

these strong RWA attitudes, morality, culture, religion and political party has been explored. The current investigation shows what contributes to RWA, on a number of different scales. Although not a new construct, RWA relates to many contemporary issues (ie: police brutality, extremist groups). The understanding of kinds of social cultures and the moral basis of attitude formation among people high in RWA is an important kind of social understanding. Having an understanding of how these constructs relate can help facilitate the understanding of RWA and how these attitudes begin. It can also help deter strong RWA groups from starting. The current research has now identified cultural aspects of RWA, that have not been previously studied. This suggests that certain cultures, societies, etc. are more likely to have RWA attitudes.

SDO is often seen hand-in-hand with RWA, however the present research found it has a distinct moral signature, culture, religiosity, and political party preference. Similar to hypothesis 1, we are able to have a better understanding of the attitudes that go along with SDO. Previously conservative ideology has been investigated. We have now better characterized the ideology that has a relationship with SDO. This suggests other factors may be related to SDO than just “in-group” and “traditional values.” We have an existing knowledge that SDO negatively endorses the individualizing foundations, and that has been confirmed* by our research. Like our previous hypothesis, we have a greater understanding of what contributes to SDO. SDO is a discriminatory attitude, one that attempts to maintain group inequalities. It continues to prejudice groups and can be as dangerous as RWA.

The current research has also uncovered an important dimension in determining RWA and SDO attitudes. Individualism and Collectivism has shed light on the “type” of

culture an individual belongs too. This understanding is important to note, because it depicts what countries and cultures are more likely to have strong attitudes. The added dimensions of horizontal and vertical however, are even more specific and detailed about the culture. We see with RWA, individuals with this attitude tend to come from vertical collectivistic cultures, and they negatively endorse the horizontal collectivistic. This implies a vertical horizontal culture, is more likely to have RWA attitudes, is susceptible to an authoritarian regime and conservative political and religious groups.

Limitations

The present study has some limitations. We have different sample sizes among individual's affiliated political party and religion. Additionally, we used a revised RWA scale. The data used was survey data, and as a result no manipulations were made.

Future Research

In the current research we examined a new construct to better understand RWA. Future research should look at Vertical/Horizontal Individualism and Collectivism again in relation to the sociopolitical attitudes. A major finding of the study is that, indeed libertarians do have strong SDO attitudes; research should investigate more about the relationship of libertarians and SDO.

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Doan T. Modianos and Co-PI: Jasmine Samuel**

Date: **October 27, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 10/27/2015, the IRB approved the following minor modification to human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Modification Type: An additional research tool – the Social Dominance Orientation scale – has been added to the study in iRIS.
Project Title: Authoritarianism and collectivism: Antecedents and consequences
Investigator: Doan T Modianos
IRB Number: SBE-15-11671
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewska, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 10/27/2015 01:14:06 PM EDT

IRB manager

**APPENDIX B: MORAL FOUNDATIONS THEORY
QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally
2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others
3. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his country
4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority
5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency
6. Whether or not someone was good at math
7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable
8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly
9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group
10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society
11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting
12. Whether or not someone was cruel
13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights
14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty
15. Whether or not an action cause chaos or disorder
16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of
17. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial value
18. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly
19. I am proud of my country's history.
20. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn
21. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed
22. It is better to do good than to do bad

23. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal
24. Justice is the most important requirement for a society
25. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong
26. Men and women each have different roles to play in society
27. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural
28. It can never be right to kill a human being
29. I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing
30. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself
31. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyways because that is my duty
32. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue

APPENDIX C: Individualism/Collectivism Horizontal /Vertical

1. I often do "my own thing"
2. I like my privacy
3. I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people
4. I am a unique individual
5. What happens to me is my own doing
6. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities
7. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways
8. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do
9. Competition is the law of nature
10. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused
11. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society
12. Winning is everything
13. It is important that I do my job better than others
14. I enjoy working in situations involving competing with others
15. Some people emphasize winning: I'm not one of them
16. The well being of my co-workers is important to me
17. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud
18. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means
19. It is important to maintain harmony within my group
20. I like sharing little things with my neighbors
21. I feel good when I cooperate with others
22. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me

23. To me, pleasure is spending time with others
24. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve
25. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity
26. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends
27. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group
28. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure
29. I hate to disagree with others in my group
30. We should keep our aging parents with us at home
31. Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award.

APPENDIX D: RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn
2. The real keys to the "good life" are respect for authority and obedience to those who are in charge.
3. The authorities should be obeyed because they are in the best position to know what is good for our country.
4. There is nothing wrong with premarital sex
5. Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences
6. People should pay less attention to the bible and other old-fashioned forms of religious guidance
7. People should develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral
8. Our society does not need tougher government and stricter laws
9. We should smash all the negative elements that are causing trouble in our society
10. People who say our laws should be enforced more strictly and harshly are wrong
11. Capital punishment is barbaric and never justified
12. Having law and order is more important than having civil rights
13. Our country desperately needs a strong and determined president
14. The rights of those who have unpopular opinions must be supported
15. The bible teaches us that women should be submissive in all matters
16. College students should learn to respect authority
17. The freedom to protest against government is an important American right

18. Our country was built by people who were unafraid to challenge conventional wisdom
19. There are many good and virtuous people who nonetheless do not believe in religion
20. The best way for people to ensure that our country stays great is to respect our traditional beliefs
21. The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path
22. People who do not believe in religion are dangerous elements and they should be suppressed
23. We should always remember that we are a Christian country, founded by God-fearing men.

APPENDIX E: Social-Dominance Orientation

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups
2. Inferior groups should stay in their place
3. All groups should be given an equal chance in life
4. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups
5. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom
6. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others
7. Increased social equality
8. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally
9. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups
10. If fewer groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems
11. We should strive to make incomes are equal as possible
12. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place
13. No one group should dominate in society
14. Group equality should be our ideal
15. If certain groups should stay in place
16. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups

APPENDIX F: POLITICAL AFFILIATION

1. The federal income tax should be abolished
2. The government should have no say in the legality of abortion
3. Education of a child is the parents responsibility
4. Parent's and guardians have the right to raise their children according to their own statements and beliefs
5. It should be illegal for the government to have telephone surveillance on American citizens
6. Minimum wage should be determined between the employer and employees
7. What is your political preference?
8. Which party do you dislike the most?
9. Do you vote in the presidential elections?
10. Do you vote in local elections?
11. Which religion do you belong to/prefer
12. How often do you attend religious services?

APPENDIX G: Demographic Questions

1. What is your age?
2. What is your Class standing?
3. What is your intended major of study?
4. What is your age?
5. What is your Race/ Ethnicity

REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B. (1995). *The Authoritarian Specter*. Harvard University Press.
- Bertrand, R. (2004). *History of Western Philosophy*. Routledge.
- Bobo, L. (u.d.). Rethinking Authoritarianism. *Public Opinion Quarterly*.
- Chaney, C., & Robertson, R. V. (2013). Racism and Police Brutality in America. *Journal of African American Studies*, 4 (480).
- Cheng, C., Jose, P. E., Sheldon, K. M., Singelis, T. M., Cheung, M. W., Tiliouine, H., et al. (2011). Sociocultural Differences in Self-Construal and Subjective Well-Being: A Test of Four Cultural Models. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 42 (5), 832-855.
- Chirkov, V. I., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S. (2005). Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 469-490.
- Crawford, J. T., & Pilanski, J. M. (2014). The Differential Effects of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation on Political Intolerance. *Political Psychology*, 35 (4).
- Day, M. V., Fiske, T. S., Downing, E. L., & Trail, T. E. (2014). Shifting Liberal and Conservative Attitudes Using Moral Theory Foundations Theory. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 40 (12), 1159-1573.
- Funk & Wagnalls New World Encyclopedia, 2014. (2014). *Conservatism*.
- Funk & Wagnalls New World Encyclopedia, 2014. (2014). *Liberalism*. world book.
- Federico, C. M., Weber, C. R., Ergun, D., & Hunt, C. (2013). Mapping the Connections between Politics and Morality: The Multiple Sociopolitical Orientations Involved in Moral Intuition. *Political Psychology*, 34 (4).

- Fisher, A. (2015). *KKK rallies for Confederate Flag in S carolina.*
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the Moral Doamin. *Personality and Social Psychology , 101* (2), 366-385.
- Greenburg, J., & Jones, E. (2003). Psychological Motives and Political Orientation—The Left, the Right, and the Rigid: Comment on Jost et al. (2003). *Psychological Bulletin , 129* (3), 376-382.
- Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Understanding Libertarian Morality: The psychological Dispositions of Self-Identified Libertarians. *PLOS ONE , 7* (8).
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglasnski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition. *Psychological Bulletin , 129* (3), 339-375.
- Kugler, M., Jost, J. T., & Noorbaloochi, S. (2014). Another Look at Moral Foundations Theory: Do Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientations Explain Liberal-Conservative Differences in "Moral" Intutions? *Social Justice Research .*
- Komarraju, M., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism-Collectivism: A Comparison of African Americans and European Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology , 14* (4), 336-343.
- Lawrence, K. (1969). *Stage and Sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization.* Randy McNally.
- McCann, S. J. (2010). Authoritarianism, Conservatism, Racial Diversity Threat, and the State Distribution of Hate Groups. *The Journal of Psychology , 144* (1).

- Milojev, P., Osborne, D., Greaves, L. M., Bulbulia, J., Wilson, M. S., Davies, C. L., et al. (2014). Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Different Moral Signatures. *Social Justice* , 27, 149-174.
- Pratto, F., Sindanius, 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.
- Schlesinger, A. M. (1956). Liberalism in America. *Perspectives* , 55-63.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: A Theoretical and Measurement Refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research* , 29 (3), 240-275.
- Shaffer, B., & Duckitt, J. (2013). The dimensional structure of people's fears, threats, and concerns and their relationship with right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *International Journal of Psychology* , 48 (1), 6-17.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Westview Press.