
Harmony and Security Value Orientations in Political Evaluation

Valerie Braithwaite
Australian National University

Responses from 197 students to the Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory were used to support the hypothesis that personal, interpersonal, and social values cohere around two broad value orientations—security and harmony—and that these value orientations are central in predicting political evaluations. The security scales—the National Strength and Order, the Propriety in Dress and Manners, and the Social Standing scales—intercorrelated highly and mirrored each other in predicting conservative attitudes, unwillingness to protest, and voting for the right. The harmony value scales—the International Harmony and Equality scale and the Personal Growth and Inner Harmony scale—were intercorrelated and independent of the security scales. They both predicted liberal attitudes, but only the International Harmony and Equality scale predicted willingness to protest and voting for the left.

In reviewing the sources of American political beliefs, Kinder and Sears (1985) conclude that although "Americans are not creatures of coherent, wide ranging ideologies," their political beliefs are interconnected in "a mosaic of partisan attachments, social relations, values, personality, and history" (p. 682). They support greater attention being paid to values, regarding them as "stand[ing] in an intermediate position between broad, encompassing ideological frames of reference . . . and specific opinions on particular topics and candidates, which come and go as the political seasons change" (p. 676).

The argument has met with approval from those favoring a principle-based model of voting behavior (Rose & McAllister, 1986). The thesis is opposed, however, by those who argue that voting is best understood as a rational process that is guided by specific evaluations of specific issues (Denver & Hands, 1990; Himmelweit, Humphreys, Jaegar, & Katz, 1981). This study examines the importance of values in understanding political evaluations, starting with the supposition that values do

not shape political judgments as independent entities but cohere to form two fundamental value orientations.

Evidence for Two Underlying Social Value Orientations

Kinder and Sears (1985) identify three major values that affect public opinion and political action: egalitarianism, individualism, and postmaterialism. Although postmaterialism is the invention of Inglehart (1971, 1977) and has attained prominence through his work, egalitarianism and individualism have a longer tradition that has spanned different disciplines and theories.

Social psychologists most frequently associate egalitarianism and individualism with Lipset (1979), for whom equality and achievement were "the core of the American creed" (p. xxxiii). Equality means that "all persons must be given respect simply because they are human beings; . . . differences between high- and low-status people reflect accidental, and perhaps temporary, variations in social relationships" (p. 1). Lipset argues that achievement is a corollary of belief in equality of opportunity. For people to become equal, they need a chance to succeed and to overcome disadvantages of birth, class, or race. Although emphasizing their codependency, Lipset acknowledges potential tension between the two: Those who achieve do not want to give up their status and start the race again. They want to preserve the inequalities that they have created. Nevertheless, Lipset rejects any notion that achievement and equality are opponents. He conceptualizes them as com-

Author's Note: My thanks to Janine Bush and Pat Piedrafita for research assistance, to Toni Makkai and Robert Lynd-Stevenson for assistance with data collection, and to Yvonne Pittelkow for statistical advice. Address correspondence to Valerie Braithwaite, Research School of the Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia, 0200, E-mail valerie.braithwaite@anu.edu.au.

PSPB, Vol. 23 No. 4, April 1997 401-414

© 1997 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

petitors in the political scene, each "offering different versions of what everyone wants" (p. xxxiii).

A similar view was adopted by Rokeach (1973) in his two-value model of political ideology. Rokeach identified two key value dimensions for political behavior—equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all) and freedom (independence, free choice). Although equality proved to be a highly effective discriminator in subsequent empirical research, freedom did not (Bishop, Barclay, & Rokeach, 1972; Cochrane, Billig, & Hogg, 1979; Jones, 1982; Linder & Bauer, 1979; Rokeach, 1973). As a result, Rokeach's two-value model of political ideology fell into disrepute.

Working from the thesis that linguistic ambiguity rendered *freedom* ineffective as a valid and reliable measure of the second dimension (Cochrane et al., 1979; Mueller, 1974a, 1974b), Braithwaite (1982) and Braithwaite and Law (1985) undertook to sample the value domain more extensively within the conceptual framework of values outlined by Rokeach (1973). Using an 18-item Social Goal Values Inventory, two major value orientations were identified: *national strength and order* (security) and *international harmony and equality* (harmony). The harmony dimension encompassed equality, welfare, empowerment, international cooperation, and environmental conservation and correlated highly with Rokeach's equality dimension (Braithwaite, 1982). The security dimension brought together the social goals of national economic development, the rule of law, and national strength. The security-harmony model differed from that of Rokeach in two important respects. First, values were interrelated and formed stable and relatively independent value constellations. Second, the value item *freedom* was not central to the interpretation of the second dimension, although support for free markets was relevant. The security and harmony dimensions have successfully discriminated conservatives from progressives on a range of attitudes and on voting intentions (Braithwaite, 1994; Heaven, 1990, 1991).

Empirically, the security and harmony model sits comfortably alongside other findings. Scott (1960) identified two clusters of foreign policy goals, one espousing the virtues of competition, the other of cooperation. The former has been shown to correlate positively with security, and the latter with harmony (Braithwaite, 1982). More recently, Feldman (1988) evaluated the predictive power of values in relation to a range of social issues and claimed support for egalitarianism and, to a lesser degree, economic individualism. Rasinski (1987) identified two dimensions representing the way in which resources should be allocated within society. One represents proportionality, a preference for rewarding individual contributions and withholding benefits from noncontributors. The second represents egalitarianism and

advocates equal access to basic services and the redistribution of wealth.

Evidence of Links With Interpersonal and Personal Values

Of particular interest in this article are research findings that suggest that these two broad social value dimensions concerned with equality and individualism may be linked with interpersonal and personal values. Scott (1960) tested this hypothesis in the 1950s and concluded that subjects conceptualized international relations in quasi-personal terms. Such links between the personal and international are also evident in a number of other studies. Using the Survey of Interpersonal Values, Gordon (1972) observed that those who lent toward the left on political issues espoused concern for the welfare of others at an interpersonal level, whereas those inclined to the right placed importance on adherence to social conformity and regulations. The Australian work of Feather (1979, 1984), using the Rokeach Value Survey to predict conservatism and the Protestant ethic, identified a set of values—some personal, some social—that shared a concern with order, discipline, and achievement. Furthermore, Lipset (1979) draws together personal and social values. The legacy of Americans' placing a high value on equality, he argued, was an ambiguous class structure. In the midst of such ambiguity, conformity and sensitivity to the opinions of others assumed great importance. Through conformity, status was sought and achieved.

Although not strictly belonging to the value domain, the literature on authoritarianism also reveals connections between the personal, interpersonal, and social domains of enquiry (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Sanford, 1973). Peterson, Doty, and Winter (1993) have linked authoritarianism with attitudes to contemporary social issues, demonstrating that the concept still has relevance to current political debate. The concept also has reemerged in challenges to Inglehart's (1977) unidimensional representation of materialism-postmaterialism. In reconceptualizing Inglehart's model, both Flanagan (1987) and Hellevik (1993) have proposed two dimensions, one of which corresponds to authoritarianism-liberalism.

Thus studies of values and political evaluations over the decades converge on similar themes. One consistently central dimension has to do with equality and the welfare of others; the other has to do with competition, order, and discipline. Furthermore, there are strong indications that values that relate to the way society should be are not divorced from values that relate to an individual's personal values. Thus one may hypothesize that specific values from the personal, interpersonal, and social domains cohere to form value orientations that

guide more specific evaluations and actions. One of these value orientations is expected to represent harmony, equality, and concern for others. The other is expected to represent respect for authority, competitiveness, and security.

A Theoretical Framework for These Findings

The above empirical findings can be embedded within a number of long-standing traditions in social psychology and sociology. Fromm (1949), Weber (1946), Sorokin (1962), and Hogan (1973) have all differentiated two major ethical orientations, one concerned with adherence to externally imposed rules to regulate access to society's resources and rewards, the other representing the individual's capacity for internal regulation through a humanistic moral code.

Fromm (1949) proposed two consciences, the authoritarian and the humanistic, both of which are to be found within every individual. According to Fromm, the humanistic conscience is an expression of personal integrity, of harmony within and with the external world, of knowledge of oneself and one's own moral principles, and, most important, of productiveness and the realization of human potential. Freedom for self-realization and development and respect for the freedom of others are fundamental to the humanistic conscience.

In the case of the authoritarian conscience, authorities such as the church, the state, parents, and public opinion are accepted as ethical and moral legislators whose laws and sanctions one adopts and internalizes. According to Fromm (1949), the authoritarian conscience represents "the voice of . . . whoever the authorities in a culture happen to be" (pp. 143-144). Its motivational strength is derived from both fear of and admiration for the authority. Individuals find security through aligning themselves with powerful others and participating in the authority's strength. Thus having a "good" conscience is gaining approval and feeling part of an authority that is greater and more powerful than oneself (p. 146).

Fromm's (1949) description of the individual parallels Sorokin's (1962) depiction of the mentalities of cultures. Sorokin describes a preoccupation with the external world and the gratification of needs through material well-being as prototypical of sensate culture. Cultural tendencies toward interpreting reality in spiritual terms and focusing on the internal world of the individual characterize ideational culture. In practice, Sorokin notes the compatibility of the two, defining their cultural integration as the idealistic culture.

Whereas Fromm (1949) and Sorokin (1962) articulate ethical systems on a grand scale, Weber (1946) and Hogan (1973) offer accounts that are more constrained contextually. Both draw a distinction between social con-

trol that is externally imposed and social control that is internally generated. Within the context of political institutions, Weber drew the distinction between the ethic of ultimate ends and the ethic of responsibility. The ethic of ultimate ends represents absolutism in following rules, whereas the ethic of responsibility demands that attention be paid to consequences in deciding on courses of action. Acting according to the ethic of ultimate ends means acceptance of and obedience to authority, accompanied by attribution of responsibility to that authority. Acting by the ethic of responsibility, on the other hand, involves acceptance of responsibility for the consequences of one's conduct and self-determination in deciding one's actions. Weber conceives of these two ethics not as "contrasts but rather supplements, which only in unison constitute a genuine [hu]man" (p. 127).

Hogan (1973) used the term *ethic of responsibility* to refer to the moral code that arises from the view that humans are malevolent and that institutions must restrain their antisocial impulses through the imposition of laws and rules. The ethic of responsibility is, therefore, a rule-following ethic. The ethic of conscience, on the other hand, rests on a belief in natural human goodness and subscribes to higher moral law that should be used to judge the fairness of all human-made law. Like the other theorists, Hogan argues that an appreciation of both ethics is essential for moral maturity.

The Present Study

The goals of this study are threefold. First, interrelationships among personal, interpersonal, and social values are examined to test for the presence of a security dimension and a harmony dimension that transcend the personal, interpersonal, and social levels of analysis. The security and harmony value orientations are both postulated as socially acceptable value orientations that operate independently of each other.

The second goal is to examine the contribution of values to political evaluations. Of central importance is understanding the role played by values that are society oriented and those that are personally oriented, and the extent to which measurements at these different levels complement each other.

The third goal is to examine the importance of values as predictors of political behavior when specific attitudes to election issues are controlled. A resurgence of interest in the rational voter model has led to an emphasis on attitudes to specific issues and candidates as the major determinants of voting behavior (Dalton & Wattenburg, 1993). An important question is the role played by values in shaping political behavior directly and/or in shaping the specific attitudes that, in turn, influence political choice.

Testing for Two Value Orientations

Following Rokeach's (1973) model of the value-attitude-belief system, values are defined as prescriptive beliefs about desirable goals in life and modes of behaving that transcend specific objects and situations. Attitudes, on the other hand, focus on specific objects and comprise a set of beliefs that could be descriptive, prescriptive, and/or evaluative. Values are more central than attitudes; they shape attitudes and guide behavior both directly and indirectly.

The Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory (Braithwaite & Law, 1985), an instrument composed of 14 multi-item scales, was developed to more comprehensively sample the value domain than was possible through the Rokeach Value Survey. Two scales represent social values: National Strength and Order, and International Harmony and Equality. Six scales represent personal goals in life: Traditional Religiosity, Personal Growth and Inner Harmony, Physical Well-Being, Secure and Satisfying Interpersonal Relations, Social Standing, and Social Stimulation. Six scales represent personal modes of conduct: Positive Orientation to Others, Competence and Effectiveness, Propriety in Dress and Manners, Religious Commitments, Assertiveness, and Getting Ahead.

The Value Orientation Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. The security value orientation is expected to be represented by the following scales: National Strength and Order, Traditional Religiosity, Social Standing, Propriety in Dress and Manners, and Getting Ahead. These scales capture desire for authority structures, achievement within these structures, and conformity to their norms and standards of behavior both at the individual level of analysis and at the national level.

Hypothesis 2. The harmony value orientation is hypothesized as being represented by the social value scale International Harmony and Equality and by the personal value scales Positive Orientation to Others, and Personal Growth and Inner Harmony.

The remaining value scales have aspects that relate to both security and harmony¹ and are likely, therefore, to have modest positive correlations with both orientations.

Hypothesis 3. The third hypothesis is that the security and harmony value orientations are relatively independent of each other.

Assessing Political Evaluations

Political evaluations were defined in terms of attitudes, behavioral intention, and behavior. Attitudes were measured through evaluations of five specific issues that were debated in the 1987 Australian federal election campaign (McAllister & Warhurst, 1988). Political par-

ties of the left and right disagreed on policies relating to income redistribution, crime control, uranium mining, special benefits for Aborigines, and women's job opportunities. The responses were used individually, as well as being combined into a left-right attitude scale.

Political behavior was represented through two measures. The first was a political activism scale that encompassed actual behavior and behavioral intention. The second was voting behavior in the 1987 federal election.

Hypotheses Linking Values and Political Evaluations

Hypothesis 4. The social and the personal security value scales should predict political evaluation net of the other. They should be associated with conservative political evaluations.

Hypothesis 5. The social and personal harmony value scales should predict political evaluation net of the other. They should be associated with liberal political evaluations.

Finally, values and political attitudes are used in an additive regression model to predict political behavior (activism and voting) to find out (a) if values add to the predictive power of political attitudes and/or (b) if values have an indirect effect on political behavior through shaping political attitudes.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

A total of 197 Australian undergraduate students completed a questionnaire designed to measure values, social attitudes, political beliefs, and behaviors. They were allowed to complete the questionnaire in their own time. Participation was voluntary. Women comprised 47% of the sample. Ages ranged from 17 to 64 years, with a mean of 22.42 ($SD = 6.72$).

Measures

Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory. This instrument has three parts. In Part 1, respondents are asked to read through 36 goals in life and to rate each on a 7-point asymmetrical scale in terms of its importance as a guiding principle in their life (1 = *I reject this*, 2 = *I am inclined to reject this*, 3 = *I neither reject nor accept this*, 4 = *I am inclined to accept this*, 5 = *I accept this as important*, 6 = *I accept this as very important*, 7 = *I accept this as of the greatest importance*). Part 2 requires respondents to evaluate 71 ways of behaving in the same way. In Part 3, respondents are presented with 18 social goals. Here, the instructions differ from those used previously, as respondents are asked to focus on world affairs rather than individual affairs and judge each value as a standard that they would use to make judgments about world and community events and sometimes to guide their actions (e.g., voting, joining

organizations). Sample items for the value scales are given in the appendix, and descriptive statistics are provided in Table 2 (see Braithwaite & Scott, 1991, for further details).

Political attitudes and beliefs. The five contemporary issues were (a) whether wealth should be redistributed from the rich to the poor (four items listed in the appendix under "Income redistribution," each scored 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*; $\alpha = .63$, $M = 3.10$, $SD = .77$); (b) whether deterrence should be used to reduce crime (three items listed in the appendix under "Crime deterrence," each scored 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*; $\alpha = .72$, $M = 2.80$, $SD = .96$); (c) whether uranium should be mined and sold on the world market (8%), mined with restricted sale (42%), mined without sale outside Australia (8%), or left in the ground (42%) (scored consecutively from 1 to 4); (d) whether Australian Aborigines should be given special benefits by the government (37% scored 1 for *no*, 39% scored 2 for *depends*, and 24% scored 3 for *yes*); and (e) whether women's job opportunities were worse than those of men with similar education and experience (37% scored 1 for *no difference* or *women are better off*, 54% scored 2 for *women are worse off*, and 9% scored 3 for *women are much worse off*). These measures were taken from the 1987 Australian Election Survey (McAllister & Mughan, 1987), a regular survey conducted by Australian political scientists prior to each federal election. The questions have a tradition of use in Australian population surveys (see the Australian National Social Science Survey, RISS, ANU) and have been related to left-right political preferences (Kelley & Bean, 1988; McAllister & Warhurst, 1988).

As well as being used individually, the five attitude measures were combined to represent a left-right attitude scale. In forming the composite measure, scores for each attitude were standardized before they were summed, thereby ensuring that no one issue dominated the others. Scales were rescored so that a high score indicated a more progressive social outlook on all attitude components. The alpha reliability coefficient for the composite scale was .74, with the component attitudes intercorrelating between .26 and .55. A principal components analysis of the five attitudes produced a single factor solution that accounted for 49% of the variance in the item set.

Political activism. The items for this scale were taken from McAllister (1992), based on the work of Barnes and Kaase (1979). Respondents indicated their likelihood of engaging in seven forms of political protest: (a) signing a petition; (b) joining in boycotts; (c) attending lawful demonstrations; (d) joining unofficial strikes; (e) occupying buildings and factories; (f) damaging things, like breaking windows and removing road signs;

and (g) using personal violence like fighting with other demonstrators or the police. For each item, respondents indicated whether they had done it (scored 3), might do it (scored 2), or would never do it (scored 1). The alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was .74, with a mean of 12.72 and a standard deviation of 2.13.²

Voting behavior. Respondents were asked whether they voted for the Liberal-National Party coalition, the Democrats, or the Labor Party in the preceding election. Voting data were collected for both the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House of Representatives is composed of members from local electorates, whereas the Senate is composed of members from the six states and two territories.

Voting is compulsory in Australia for those aged 18 years or older. Of the 197 students who participated in the study, 151 were eligible to vote. For the House of Representatives, 73% voted for parties on the left—that is, either the Labor Party or the Democrats. For the Senate, 74% favored these parties. Voting behavior was dichotomized, with 0 representing parties of the right and 1 representing parties of the left.

Personal information. Respondents were asked to provide information regarding age and sex (0 = female; 1 = male).

RESULTS

Interrelationships Among the Value Scales

The 14 value scales from the Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory were intercorrelated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (see Table 1). The correlations showed some support for the separation and cohesiveness of the security and harmony orientations, but there was a high degree of interconnectiveness among all the value scales. To simplify the interpretation of these interrelationships, a principal components analysis (PA1 in SPSS^x) was used, followed by an oblique rotation (OBLIMIM).³ Using the scree test, three components were extracted, accounting for 30%, 14%, and 10% of variance, respectively (54% total). The loadings of the scales on the three factors are presented in Table 2.

The first factor brought together the following scales: National Strength and Order, Social Standing, Getting Ahead, and Propriety in Dress and Manners. These scales share a concern for status and security within the social structure and were hypothesized as core values in the security cluster. The Assertiveness scale and the Competence and Effectiveness scale also have significant loadings on this factor. Both are in keeping with valuing status and achievement. The significant negative loading for the International Harmony and Equality scale reflects resistance toward equality among status seekers

TABLE 1: Pearson Product-Moment Intercorrelation Coefficients for the 14 Scales From the Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory

Value Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Social														
1. National strength and order		.05	.43	.19	.03	.29	.25	.15	.47	.52	.26	.26	.37	.18
2. International harmony and equality			-.22	.12	.44	.29	.12	.03	-.10	.06	.07	.25	.20	.44
Personal goals														
3. Social standing				-.09	.07	.24	.14	.25	.53	.24	.24	.01	.28	.01
4. Traditional religiosity					.16	.15	.19	-.04	.06	.33	.16	.60	.10	.25
5. Personal growth and inner harmony						.27	.32	.22	.14	.24	.22	.23	.42	.35
6. Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations							.30	.28	.16	.32	.19	.27	.26	.48
7. Physical well-being								.22	.30	.30	.20	.20	.30	.23
8. Social stimulation									.24	.06	.11	.06	.16	.15
Personal modes of conduct														
9. Getting ahead										.37	.44	.27	.36	.05
10. Propriety in dress and manners											.24	.40	.52	.46
11. Assertiveness												.37	.50	.20
12. Religious commitment													.25	.45
13. Competence and effectiveness														.47
14. Positive orientation to others														

NOTE: All correlations of .14 and greater are significant at the .05 level (two-tailed test).

TABLE 2: Descriptive Statistics and Pattern Matrix Loadings for the 14 Value Scales After a Principal Components Analysis and an Oblimin Rotation

Value Scale	Alpha Reliability	M	(SD)	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
National strength and order	.78	17.48	(4.45)	.70	-.02	-.20
Social standing	.61	11.66	(3.22)	.79	-.07	.30
Getting ahead	.56	8.62	(2.57)	.84	-.07	.00
Propriety in dress and manners	.76	28.52	(5.14)	.51	.20	-.42
Assertiveness	.63	15.03	(2.84)	.50	.13	-.20
International harmony and equality	.85	54.99	(7.95)	-.41	.72	-.13
Positive orientation to others	.88	68.02	(9.22)	-.05	.71	-.28
Personal growth and inner harmony	.74	32.98	(4.69)	-.03	.72	.06
Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations	.64	26.89	(4.02)	.15	.62	.03
Physical well-being	.78	15.25	(2.75)	.28	.41	.00
Traditional religiosity	.80	9.88	(4.84)	.06	.01	-.80
Religious commitment	.51	12.06	(3.38)	.19	.20	-.73
Social stimulation	.45	9.86	(1.87)	.24	.44	.45
Competence and effectiveness	.84	66.25	(9.05)	.43	.47	-.06

NOTE: Numbers in bold indicate the scales that have the strongest loadings on the factor and contribute most to defining the factor.

(see correlations in Table 1). Factor 1 represents the hypothesized security-conscious value orientation.

The second factor represents harmony, with its emphasis on humanistic concerns at the international, interpersonal, and personal levels. The scales with high loadings on the factor are International Harmony and Equality, Positive Orientation to Others, and Personal Growth and Inner Harmony, as predicted. The significant loading for the Secure and Satisfying Interpersonal Relationships scale is in keeping with the caring aspect of the dimension. The significant contributions of the Physical Well-Being, the Social Stimulation, and the Competence and Effectiveness scales are consistent with Fromm's (1949) view that the development of individual potential is part of a humanistic conscience.

Factor 3 is defined chiefly by the two measures of religiousness. A lower loading for the Social Stimulation scale reflects rejection of an active social life and an exciting life by the more religiously committed.

The factor intercorrelations were low. The security value orientation and the harmony value orientations correlated .27. Placing a high value on religiousness was associated with having harmony concerns ($r = -.20$) rather than security concerns ($r = -.06$).

Bivariate Correlations Between Values and Political Evaluations

The 14 value scales from the Goal, Mode and Social Values Inventory were correlated with (a) attitudes to the five political issues, (b) the left-right attitude scale, (c) political activism, and (d) voting behavior.

TABLE 3: Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between the Value Scales and Attitudes to Five Political Issues

Value Scale	Income Redistribution	Crime Control	Uranium Mining Ban	Aboriginal Benefits	Women and Job Options
Security					
National strength and order	-.39**	.41**	-.33**	-.13*	-.21**
Social standing	-.30**	.26**	-.25**	-.15*	-.14*
Getting ahead	-.29**	.26**	-.16*	-.10	-.18**
Propriety in dress and manners	-.34**	.39**	-.21**	-.22**	-.21**
Assertiveness	-.10	.12*	-.02	-.03	-.10
Harmony					
International harmony and equality	.40**	-.25**	.27**	.29**	.23**
Personal growth and inner harmony	.12*	-.01	.13*	.14*	.10
Positive orientation to others	.00	.09	.00	-.07	-.04
Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations	.04	.16*	-.13*	-.01	-.04
Physical well-being	-.10	.17**	-.05	.00	-.05
Religiousness					
Traditional religiosity	.02	.22**	.00	.11	-.11
Religious commitment	.02	.16*	-.03	.08	-.14*
Other					
Social stimulation	-.08	.04	-.09	-.08	-.09
Competence and effectiveness	-.20**	.23**	-.08	-.13*	-.12*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Conservative positions on contemporary issues were consistently associated with the following scales from the security cluster: National Strength and Order, Social Standing, and Propriety in Dress and Manners (see Table 3). Liberal positions on these issues were consistently associated with only the International Harmony and Equality scale from the harmony cluster.

On four of the five issues, the Getting Ahead and the Competence and Effectiveness scales had correlations similar to the National Strength and Order scale. On three of the five issues, the Personal Growth and Inner Harmony scale showed relationships that paralleled the International Harmony and Equality scale.

Table 4 shows the results of a similar correlational analysis using the remaining political evaluation indicators: a global measure of left-right attitude, political activism, and voting behavior in the House of Representatives and the Senate elections. These data reveal three consistent predictors: the two social value scales National Strength and Order, and International Harmony and Equality; and the personal value scale Propriety in Dress and Manners from the security cluster. The security-oriented personal value scale Social Standing was associated with conservative positions on three of the four criteria.

Summary of Interrelationships

Of the five value scales originally hypothesized as part of the security constellation (National Strength and Order, Social Standing, Getting Ahead, Propriety in Dress and Manners, and Traditional Religiosity), all except Traditional Religiosity were part of a coherent cluster

and were associated with conservative political attitudes. When the behavioral criteria of activism and voting were used as the dependent variable, the National Strength and Order, the Propriety in Dress and Manners, and the Social Standing scales predicted nonactivism and voting for the right.

The three value scales—International Harmony and Equality, Personal Growth and Inner Harmony, and Positive Orientation to Others—also showed coherence, defining the hypothesized harmony orientation as relatively independent of the security orientation. The International Harmony and Equality scale and the Personal Growth and Inner Harmony scale predicted liberal political attitudes, but only the International Harmony and Equality scale was linked with activism and voting for the left.

Do Personal Values Contribute Net of Social Values?

The fourth and fifth hypotheses concern the contribution of personal values net of the social values. Both personal and social values were entered in regression models predicting left-right attitudes, political activism, and voting. To avoid problems of multicollinearity (see correlations in Table 1), three pairs of value scales were combined. The Social Standing and the Getting Ahead scales formed the Social Standing and Achievement scale. The Traditional Religiosity and the Religious Commitment scales formed the Religiosity scale. The Propriety in Dress and Manners and the Competence and Effectiveness scales formed the Propriety and Effectiveness scale.

An ordinary least squares regression model predicting scores on the composite left-right political attitude

TABLE 4: Correlation Coefficients Between the Value Scales and Holding Leftist Attitudes, Level of Political Activism, and Voting for Parties of the Left in the House of Representatives and the Senate Elections

<i>Value Scale</i>	<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Political Activism</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	<i>Senate</i>
Security				
National strength and order	-.45**	-.30**	-.24**	-.23**
Social standing	-.36**	-.24**	-.09	-.18*
Getting ahead	-.31**	-.11	-.15	-.20*
Propriety in dress and manners	-.41**	-.39**	-.30**	-.22**
Assertiveness	-.11	.15*	-.03	-.07
Harmony				
International harmony and equality	.43**	.28**	.26**	.26**
Personal growth and inner harmony	.15*	.01	-.02	.00
Positive orientation to others	-.07	-.05	-.03	.00
Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations	-.10	-.11	-.11	-.15
Physical well-being	-.11	-.13	-.20*	-.13
Religiousness				
Traditional religiosity	-.03	-.16*	-.19*	-.15
Religious commitment	-.05	.00	-.08	-.04
Other				
Social stimulation	-.12	-.07	-.10	-.10
Competence and effectiveness	-.22**	.01	-.15	-.13

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

scale from the reduced set of 11 value scales accounted for 46% of the variance (adjusted R^2). Four variables were important in that they contributed significantly to the explained variance net of the other variables: National Strength and Order ($\beta = -.33$, $p < .001$), Propriety and Effectiveness ($\beta = -.25$, $p < .01$), International Harmony and Equality ($\beta = .52$, $p < .001$), and Personal Growth and Inner Harmony ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$). Thus personal values from the security and harmony clusters contributed to the stance adopted on election issues when social values were controlled. Propriety and Effectiveness was associated with a conservative influence, whereas Personal Growth and Inner Harmony was associated with a liberal influence.

A similar analysis was conducted using political activism as the dependent variable. The adjusted R^2 was 25% for this model, with the significant predictors being National Strength and Order ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .05$), International Harmony and Equality ($\beta = .38$, $p < .001$), and Assertiveness ($\beta = .33$, $p < .001$). In this analysis, there was no support for security and harmony personal values making a contribution above and beyond the social values. Whereas Assertiveness was part of the security constellation in the principal components analysis, it did not perform as a security value in this analysis. Assertiveness increased the likelihood of activism. Thus, at the social level, activists are likely to value equality and social change and to question authority. At a personal level, they are committed to standing up for their beliefs publicly.

Because voting behavior was dichotomized (0 = right, 1 = left), the effect of values on voting behavior was examined using logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression analysis weights the predictor variables in an additive regression model, where the dependent variable is the log of the odds of the outcome occurring. In this case, the odds of the outcome occurring is the ratio of the probability of a vote for the left to the probability of a vote for the right.

When the value scales were considered simultaneously in predicting voting in the House of Representatives, the B coefficients improved prediction significantly compared with the null model in which all coefficients apart from the constant are assigned the value of zero ($\chi^2 = 41.24$, $p < .001$). The value scales that maintained their significance after adjusting for all others were the Propriety and Effectiveness scale from the security cluster (decreasing the odds for a vote for the left; $B = -.06$, $p < .05$) and the International Harmony and Equality scale from the harmony cluster (increasing the odds for a vote for the left; $B = .15$, $p < .001$). The other value scales from the security cluster were no longer significant because of their relationships with each other and, most important, with Propriety and Effectiveness.

For the Senate ballot, the value scales made a significant contribution to the prediction of voting ($\chi^2 = 38.08$, $p < .001$), with the Propriety and Effectiveness scale ($B = -.06$, $p < .05$) and the Secure and Satisfying Interpersonal Relations scale ($B = -.17$, $p < .05$) decreasing the odds for voting for the left, and the International Harmony and

TABLE 5: Beta Coefficients and Adjusted Multiple R^2 for the Prediction of Political Activism From Left-Right Attitudes and Values

Predictor	r	β	
		Model 1	Model 2
Attitudes			
Left-right social attitudes	.46	.46**	.31**
Values			
National strength and order	-.30	na	-.18*
Propriety and effectiveness	-.18	na	-.11
Assertiveness	.16	na	.30**
International harmony and equality	.27	na	.18*
Personal growth and inner harmony	.01	na	-.11
Adjusted R^2		.21**	.29**

NOTE: na = not applicable.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 6: Parameter Estimates for Values and Left-Right Attitudes in Two Logistic Regression Models Differentiating Left and Right Voters in the House of Representatives and the Senate Elections

Predictor	House of Representatives			Senate		
	r	Model 1	Model 2	r	Model 1	Model 2
Attitudes						
Left-right attitudes	.40**	.31**	.21*	.42**	.34**	.24**
Values						
National strength and order	-.24**	na	-.10	-.23**	na	-.08
Propriety and effectiveness	-.23**	na	-.04	-.18**	na	-.03
Assertiveness	-.03	na	.13	-.07	na	.06
International harmony and equality	.26**	na	.07*	.26**	na	.06
Personal growth and inner harmony	-.02	na	-.05	.00	na	-.02

NOTE: na = not applicable.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Equality scale ($B = .13$, $p < .001$) increasing the odds for a vote for the left.

Do Values Predict Political Evaluations?

These analyses point to four value scales as central players in political evaluation: the National Strength and Order scale and the Propriety and Effectiveness scale from the security cluster, and the International Harmony and Equality scale and the Personal Growth and Inner Harmony scale from the harmony cluster. Although they are not equally important across all dependent variables, there is sufficient consistency to justify their inclusion in any model seeking to explain political behavior. For the dependent variable, political activism, an additional personal value appears to be important—assertiveness, or the belief in standing up for what one thinks is right in the public forum. The question that remains is whether values exert their influence through political attitudes or whether they act relatively independently of political attitudes.

Do Values Predict Political Behavior Directly?

Two types of analyses were carried out. In the first (see Table 5), the left-right political attitude measure was

entered in a least squares regression model predicting activism, with values entered at the second stage to test for a significant change in R^2 . In the second set of analyses (see Table 6), left-right political attitudes and values were again entered in two separate stages, but this time a logistic regression model was used to predict voting in the House of Representatives election. The analysis was repeated for voting in the Senate election.

The value scales used to predict political behavior were the five scales that had consistently emerged in earlier analyses. In this way, the number of predictors was limited, and precautions were introduced to avoid having a number of correlated value scales competing to add trivial amounts of variance to the R^2 .

The left-right attitude scale accounted for 21% of variance in political activism, $F(1, 179) = 47.53$, $p < .001$. With the addition of the five value scales, a significant change in the R^2 of 10% was obtained, $F(5, 176) = 5.07$, $p < .001$. The significant contributions in the full regression model were made by left-right attitudes, the personal value of assertiveness, and the social values of international harmony and equality and of national strength and order (see Table 5).

Logistic regression analysis was used to predict voting behavior, first in the House of Representatives election and then in the Senate election. Attitudes favoring the left increased the likelihood of a vote for the left in the House of Representatives election ($\chi^2 = 26.66, p < .001$) and the Senate election ($\chi^2 = 29.00, p < .001$). When the value scales were added, prediction was not improved significantly. The full models and their B coefficients are given in Table 6. Bivariate correlation coefficients are also included for comparative purposes.

DISCUSSION

Using Rokeach's (1979) conceptualization of the value-attitude-belief system, this article finds support for two relatively independent value dimensions representing security and harmony. In contrast with Rokeach's freedom-equality model, the security and harmony dimensions are defined by sets of values that extend across the personal, interpersonal, and social domains rather than by single political values. The security values legitimate social order, prosperity, and competition as ethical codes of behavior at the individual and collective levels. The harmony values give voice to cooperation, goodwill, and self-actualization as codes of ethical behavior.

A finding that was not in keeping with original expectations was that values concerned with religious belief and practice defined a dimension that was separate from security. The independence of the religious values is troubling given that acceptance of authority is the essence of the security value orientation. One possible explanation for these findings is that the church has declined in power in the eyes of the public in recent times, and its universal desirability to those who seek security in the social structure has been diminished. A second explanation grows out of differentiating the types of authority that the religiosity scales represent: the authority of God as distinct from the authority of the church. If the type of security offered through religion is of a different kind to that offered by earth-bound authorities, the separation of religiousness from security does not undermine the validity of the security-harmony model.

In accord with Hypothesis 3, security and harmony values were not found to be incompatible. Indeed, the correlation between the factors was positive, suggesting that if anything, people value both orientations. Previous work has shown that this positive relationship is not due to response bias⁴ but reflects the very nature of values as goals and modes of conduct that transcend the specific and that are not only personally preferable but also socially preferable in the society. Most people want peace, cooperation, and democracy, but they also want security, order, and prosperity (Braithwaite, 1994).

The most neatly organized set of values was those concerned with security, reflecting a desire for hierarchy, order, competitiveness, strength, status, and conformity at an individual and a collective level. Functional theorists have pointed out that values give expression to basic human needs (Rokeach, 1979). Fromm's (1949) concept of the human need for security through identification with external authorities is particularly useful for providing theoretical unity to this empirically cohesive set of values.

The value scales National Strength and Order, Social Standing, Getting Ahead, and Propriety in Dress and Manners mirrored each other remarkably in their relationships with the political evaluation variables. In the multivariate analyses, the correspondence was so strong that National Strength and Order often captured the variance that Social Standing and Achievement shared with the outcome variable. Both represented competitiveness, the former at a national and international level, the latter at the individual level (see items in the appendix), and both were associated with conservative attitudes and actions. Propriety in Dress and Manners, a scale combined with Competence and Effectiveness in the regression analyses, consistently represented the personal side of a security orientation, conformity to and endorsement of the codes of conduct of powerful and traditional institutions. High scorers on this scale tended to hold conservative attitudes, to resist the idea of protesting, and to vote for the right.

Contrasting with the security values on consistency of prediction of political evaluations were the harmony values. Yet, there appeared to be just as much theoretical and empirical coherence among the value scales that defined the harmony dimension. International Harmony and Equality, Positive Orientation to Others, and Personal Growth and Inner Harmony encapsulated the ethic of concern for the well-being of others and transcendence of the material world, whereas Secure and Satisfying Interpersonal Relations, Physical Well-Being, and Competence and Effectiveness supported Fromm's (1949) contention that fundamental to a social order based on the principles of equality and justice is the development of the potentialities of the individual, a state described by Fromm as productiveness.

When the harmony value scales were used to predict political evaluations, however, their effects were not overlapping and reinforcing as was the case with the security values. International Harmony and Equality was the only consistent predictor of attitudes, protest potential, and voting. Personal Growth and Inner Harmony was associated with some attitudes (support for income redistribution and Aboriginal benefits and opposition to uranium mining) but was not predictive of either willingness to

protest or voting. The other harmony scales tended to be poor predictors of political evaluations.

These data suggest that political decision making is going to involve less conflict and more decisiveness for the security oriented than for the harmony oriented. When driven by security values, there are many values of either an individual or a collective kind that can be used to guide or justify decision making. If links with some values are discredited, there are other values to take their place. Personal values can be brought into play to replace social values, and the imperatives for action are likely to remain the same.

When the harmony value orientation comes into play, this is not the case. Social values, captured by international harmony and equality, may push the individual in one direction, but personal values from the same harmony cluster may not reinforce this point of view. Their influence, as in the case of secure and satisfying interpersonal relations, for example, may be in quite the opposite direction. The action potential arising from harmony values, therefore, may be more amenable to change once specific value-political judgment linkages have been discredited.

These data have interesting implications for research on cognitive complexity and cognitive differentiation (Tetlock, 1986) and for work on authoritarianism and dogmatism (Christie, 1991). A long-standing debate in social psychology has been whether cognitive rigidity is a characteristic of the extreme right or if it also characterizes the extreme left. Rokeach (1956) tried to measure a personality style of dogmatism that characterized both the right and left with his D (dogmatism) scale. The scale was found to correlate more highly with authoritarianism of the right than predicted (Christie, 1991). More recently, Tetlock (1986) has met with more success in demonstrating that reductions in cognitive complexity and differentiation occur as left-right extremes are approached on particular social issues, with maximum complexity and differentiation being found left of center.

The findings of the present study have some relevance to the left and right cognitive rigidity debate. Given that security and harmony value orientations can coexist in any one person, four prototypes can be postulated: the case in which both harmony and security value orientations are strong, the case in which both are weak, the case in which security values dominate, and the case in which harmony values dominate. The present findings suggest differences in cognitive complexity for those whose security values dominate and those whose harmony values dominate. Low cognitive complexity and differentiation should be associated with those for whom the security value orientation dominates because of the coherence and consistency among their dominant values. In con-

trast, those who give priority to harmony values should show greater cognitive differentiation because their social and personal values may give different directives for action.

This line of reasoning sits comfortably with the finding that maximum cognitive complexity and differentiation is found somewhat to the left of center (Tetlock, 1986), but it is not compatible with the idea of cognitive rigidity in the extreme left. One way of resolving this conflict is to propose that rigidity is achieved in different ways by the extreme left and right.

The coherence of the values of the right guarantees consistent and strongly held positions on social issues by those with a strong security value orientation. Such value coherence does not guarantee consistency for those with strong harmony values. At a value level of analysis, they are more likely to be "loose cannons." This is not to say, however, that there are not other psychological mechanisms at the disposal of supporters of the left to achieve consistent and unified support on social issues. Rationalization, denial, or compartmentalization are all strategies that can be used to simplify the action plan that is derived from one's value system. Such strategies would be expected to produce low cognitive differentiation and complexity of an order that parallels that of the extreme right. These propositions await further research.

This study confirms the hypothesized relationships between values and political evaluations. Security and harmony values of both a personal and a social kind made their most substantial contribution in explaining variation in attitudes to election issues. Security and harmony values also correlated significantly with willingness to protest, although their significance was reduced when attitudes were taken into account. In the multivariate analysis predicting willingness to protest, the following made significant contributions: the two social value scales National Strength and Order, and International Harmony and Equality; the personal value scale Assertiveness; and left-right attitudes. When voting behavior was used as an indicator of political evaluation, security and harmony values were significant at the bivariate level but were not significant in the multivariate analysis. Attitudes, not values, proved to be the significant predictors of voting behavior. These findings are consistent with the thesis that values are more likely to indirectly influence political behavior through attitudes than to directly influence behavior.

The dominance of the specific attitudinal indexes over the value scales supports the general principle that more specific measures that take into account behavioral context will be better predictors of specific behavior than abstract global measures (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). At the time of this study, political protests in Australia were most likely to be about environmental and welfare issues.

Greenpeace was active on nuclear-free zones, and the government was under criticism for neglecting its social responsibilities in the fields of health, welfare, education, and employment. Thus the left-right attitude scale captured the situation-specific issues of the day.

By the same token, inferences concerning the relative importance of attitudes and values in political evaluations are limited by the nature of the sample used in this study. A large proportion of respondents either had just voted for the first time or were yet to become eligible to vote. Many, therefore, were likely to be in the process of formulating political views. Some may have identified with political parties because of their beliefs about the way the world should be—that is, because of their values. In this sample, however, an alternative interpretation is highly plausible. Parents' political preferences are known to play a major role in shaping the political preferences of their children (Graetz & McAllister, 1988). The attitude-voting link may reflect the adoption of family views at a time when, for many, political belief systems are poorly developed and not well integrated with more fundamental value priorities.

Conclusion

Although much research interest has been shown in the links between specific values and political evaluation, little attention has focused on finding a conceptual framework that integrates these findings. Such a framework was proposed by Rokeach (1973) with his two-value model of political ideology. When empirical support for the model was not forthcoming, the idea was discredited as an oversimplification of ideological reasoning, and researchers were content to examine the role of specific values in shaping attitudes, beliefs, and behavior.

This article counters this line of thought by proposing a security-harmony model that brings together values from the personal, interpersonal, and social domains. Values have been shown to cohere around a security dimension and a harmony dimension. These dimensions are consistent with a significant body of empirical and theoretical work. Most important, the security and harmony value dimensions do not work in opposition but are relatively independent. Thus, for some people, one value orientation may dominate the other, whereas for other people, the value orientations will be balanced. When one value orientation dominates the other, political decision making should be relatively unproblematic. Strong commitment to both value orientations, however, is not so easily reconciled with the discourse of traditional left-right political systems. How those with value balance make their political decisions and engage with the political process is a question for future research.

APPENDIX Scale Items

Sample of Value Scale Items

National strength and order:

- national greatness (being a united, strong, independent, and powerful nation)
- national economic development (greater economic progress and prosperity for the nation)
- the rule of law (punishing the guilty and protecting the innocent)
- national security (protection of your nation from enemies)

International harmony and equality:

- a good life for others (improving the welfare of all people in need)
- rule by the people (involvement by all citizens in decisions that affect their community)
- international cooperation (having all nations working together to help each other)
- greater economic equality (lessening the gap between the rich and the poor)

Social standing:

- economic prosperity (being financially well off)
- authority (having power to influence others and control decisions)

Traditional religiosity:

- salvation (being saved from your sins and at peace with God)
- religious or mystical experience (being at one with God or the universe)

Personal growth and inner harmony:

- the pursuit of knowledge (always trying to find out new things about the world we live in)
- inner harmony (feeling free of conflict within yourself)

Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations:

- mature love (having a relationship of deep and lasting affection)
- security for loved ones (taking care of loved ones)

Physical well-being:

- physical development (being physically fit)
- good health (physical well-being)

Social stimulation:

- an active social life (mixing with other people)
- an exciting life (a life full of new experiences or adventures)

Getting ahead:

- ambitious (being eager to do well)
- competitive (always trying to do better than others)

Propriety in dress and manners:

- polite (being well-mannered)
- neat (being tidy)
- reliable (being dependable)

Assertiveness:

- standing up for your beliefs (defending your beliefs no matter who opposes them)
- determined (standing by your decisions firmly)

Religious commitment:

- self-sacrificing (putting the interest of others before your own)
- devout (following your religious faith conscientiously)

Competence:

- competent (being capable)
- resourceful (being clever at finding ways to achieve a goal)
- self-disciplined (being self-controlled)

Positive orientation to others:

- tolerant (accepting others even though they are different from you)
- helpful (always ready to assist others)
- trusting (having faith in others)

Social Attitude and Belief Items

Income redistribution:

- High income tax makes people less willing to work hard.
- Income and wealth should be redistributed toward ordinary working people.
- Too many people these days rely on government handouts.
- More money should be spent reducing poverty.

Crime deterrence:

- The police should be given more power.
- Bring back the death penalty.
- People who break the law should be given stiffer sentences.

NOTES

1. Physical well-being offers status and security but also may lead to harmony and inner peace. Secure and satisfying interpersonal relations offers social well-being but also incorporates caring and supporting loved ones. Social stimulation offers group activity and membership but also personal growth through new experiences. Competence and effectiveness captures discipline and hard work but also reflects personal development and self-actualization. Religious commitment may be directed toward traditional institutions, or it may take an unconventional form. Assertiveness may reflect acceptance of norms of competitiveness and recognition, or freedom from authority.

2. Although McAllister (1992) used the political activism items to form two scales—one representing conventional activism, the other radical activism—item intercorrelations in this sample were such that there was no justification for separating them.

3. Although an orthogonal rotation using the varimax procedure yielded a similar solution to the oblimin rotation, it was characterized by less simple structure in that more scales loaded significantly on more than one factor.

4. Partial correlations were calculated between the value scales controlling for both acquiescence and social desirability response bias. The change in the coefficients was minimal. The range of $-.16$ to $.63$ (median = $.30$) dropped to $-.13$ to $.60$ (median = $.275$; see Braithwaite, 1994).

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Barnes, S. M., & Kaase, M. (1979). *Political attitudes in five Western democracies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bishop, G. F., Barclay, A. M., & Rokeach, M. (1972). Presidential preferences and freedom-equality value patterns in the 1968 American campaign. *Journal of Social Psychology, 88*, 207-212.
- Braithwaite, V. A. (1982). The structure of social values: Validation of Rokeach's two value model. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 203-211.
- Braithwaite, V. A. (1994). Beyond Rokeach's equality-freedom model: Two dimensional values in a one dimensional world. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 67-94.
- Braithwaite, V. A., & Law, H. G. (1985). Structure of human values: Testing the adequacy of the Rokeach Value Survey. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 250-263.
- Braithwaite, V. A., & Scott, W. A. (1991). Values. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 661-753). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Christie, R. (1991). Authoritarianism and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 501-571). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Cochrane, R., Billig, M., & Hogg, M. (1979). Politics and values in Britain: A test of Rokeach's two-value model. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18*, 159-167.
- Dalton, R. J., & Wattenburg, M. P. (1993). The not so simple act of voting. In A. Finifter (Ed.), *Political science: The state of the discipline II*, (pp). Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Denver, D., & Hands, G. (1990). Issues, principles or ideology? How young voters decide. *Electoral Studies, 9*, 19-36.
- Feather, N. T. (1979). Value correlates of conservatism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1617-1630.
- Feather, N. T. (1984). Protestant ethic, conservatism, and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 1132-1141.
- Feldman, S. (1988). Structure and consistency in public opinion: The role of core beliefs and values. *American Journal of Political Science, 32*, 416-440.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Flanagan, S. C. (1987). Value change in industrial societies. *American Political Science Review, 81*, 1303-1319.
- Fromm, E. (1949). *Man for himself: An enquiry into the psychology of ethics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gordon, L. V. (1972). Value correlates of student attitudes on social issues: A multination study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*, 305-311.
- Graetz, B., & McAllister, I. (1988). *Dimensions of Australian society*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1990). Economic beliefs and human values: Further evidence of the two-value model? *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 583-589.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1991). Voting intention and the two-value model: A further investigation. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 43*, 75-77.
- Hellevik, O. (1993). Postmaterialism as a dimension of cultural change. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 5*, 211-233.
- Himmelweit, H., Humphreys, P., Jaegar, M., & Katz, M. (1981). *How voters decide*. London: Academic Press.
- Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 79*, 218-232.
- Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies. *American Political Science Review, 65*, 991-1017.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, C. H. (1982). College students' values and presidential preference in the 1980 election. *Psychological Reports, 52*, 886.
- Kelley, J., & Bean, C. (1988). *Australian attitudes: Social and political analyses from the National Social Science Survey*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1985). Public opinion and political action. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., vol. 2, pp. 659-741). New York: Random House.
- Linder, F., & Bauer, D. (1979). Interpersonal perception of the values freedom and equality. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 48*, 167-170.
- Lipset, S. M. (1979). *The first new nation: The United States in historical and comparative perspective* (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- McAllister, I. (1992). *Political behaviour: Citizens, parties and elites in Australia*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- McAllister, I., & Mughan, A. (1987). *Australian election survey, 1987* [computer file]. Canberra: Social Science Data Archives, Australian National University.
- McAllister, I., & Warhurst, J. (1988). *Australia votes: The 1987 federal election*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Mueller, D. J. (1974a). The relationship of political orientation to the values of freedom and equality. *Journal of Psychology, 86*, 105-109.

- Mueller, D. J. (1974b). A test of the validity of two scales on Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Social Psychology, 94*, 289-290.
- Peterson, B. E., Doty, R. M., & Winter, D. G. (1993). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward contemporary social issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 174-184.
- Rasinski, K. A. (1987). What's fair is fair—or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 201-211.
- Rokeach, M. (1956). Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. *Psychological Monographs, 70*.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal* (pp. 47-70). New York: Free Press.
- Rose, R., & McAllister, I. (1986). *Voters begin to choose*. London: Sage.
- Sanford, N. (1973). Authoritarian personality in contemporary perspective. In J. N. Knutson (Ed.), *Handbook of political psychology* (pp. 139-170). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, W. A. (1960). International ideology and interpersonal ideology. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 419-435.
- Sorokin, P. A. (1962). *Social and cultural dynamics* (Vol. 1). New York: Bedminster.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1986). A value pluralism model of ideological reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 819-827.
- Weber, M. (1946). Politics as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 77-128). New York: Oxford University Press.

Received April 4, 1994

Revision accepted June 26, 1996