

Authoritarianism and Social Dominance in Western and Eastern Europe: The Importance of the Sociopolitical Context and of Political Interest and Involvement

Bart Duriez

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Alain Van Hiel

Ghent University, Belgium

Malgorzata Kossowska

Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland

The present study tests whether the magnitude of the relation between Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) is stable across and within cultures, whether their differential relations with value orientations and sociopolitical attitudes remain stable in spite of these possible differences, and whether their differential relations point to a different genesis. For these purposes, two student samples (total N = 684), three adult samples (total N = 553), and a political activist sample (N = 69) were gathered in Belgium, and one adult sample (N = 235) was collected in Poland. Both cross- and intracultural differences in the strength of the RWA-SDO relation emerged. These can be attributed to specificities in sociopolitical context and differences in political socialization, interest, and involvement. In spite of these fluctuations, in the strength of the RWA-SDO relation, regression analyses revealed high stability of the relation between RWA-SDO and sociopolitical attitudes, and mediation analyses supported the hypothesis of their different genesis.

KEY WORDS: attitude constraint; authoritarianism; social dominance orientation; prejudice; values; conservatism

For several decades, the quest for the antecedents of prejudice has been an important topic within the social sciences. Two different research lines have dominated this quest. The first line has viewed prejudice as resulting from group processes (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The second has regarded it as a result of dispositional factors making people more or less likely to adopt prejudice (e.g., Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1981; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). The latter approach received support from research that demonstrated the generality of prejudice. That is, people who are unfavorable to one out-group also tend to be unfavorable to other out-groups (e.g., Duckitt, 1992). This generality principle has been interpreted as suggesting stable individual differences, such as personality characteristics or enduring beliefs, that predispose people to adopt prejudice. Two such individual difference dimensions have repeatedly received empirical support. The first dimension—the authoritarian personality—was introduced by Adorno et al. (1950) and was later reconceptualized as Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) by Altemeyer (1981). RWA was defined as the covariation of (1) a strict adherence to conventional norms and values (conventionalism), (2) an uncritical subjection to authority (authoritarian submission), and (3) feelings of aggression towards norm violators (authoritarian aggression). The second dimension—Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)—was introduced by Pratto et al. (1994) as a dimension which delineates whether one prefers intergroup relations to be equal or hierarchical, or otherwise stated, the extent to which one desires the in-group to dominate out-groups.

Research that set out to compare both concepts has shown that RWA and SDO are powerful and relatively independent predictors of prejudice (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998; Lippa & Arad, 1999; Pratto, et al., 1994; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002; Whitley, 1999). In addition, RWA and SDO were found to relate differentially to, among other things, values and sociopolitical attitudes (Altemeyer, 1996; McFarland, 1998, 1999; McFarland & Adelson, 1996). In the domain of both values and sociopolitical attitudes, research consistently reveals two roughly orthogonal dimensions (e.g., Saucier, 2000; Schwartz, 1992). According to Duckitt (2001; Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum, 2002), the value dimension Openness to Change vs. Conservation and the sociopolitical attitude dimension Social or Cultural Conservatism broadly correspond to RWA, whereas the value dimension Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence and the sociopolitical attitude dimension Economic Conservatism relate to SDO. These differential relations have been interpreted as suggesting a different genesis of RWA and SDO (e.g., Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002). According to Duckitt (2001; Duckitt, et al., 2002), RWA-based prejudice comes into play and is driven by fear and feelings of being threatened, whereas SDO-based prejudice results from viewing the world as a competitive jungle characterized by a ruthless struggle for resources and power in which the fit succeed and the unfit fail.

In a recent attempt to integrate both concepts, Altemeyer (1998) suggested that RWA and SDO constitute two different faces of the authoritarian personality.

According to Altemeyer, whereas RWA captures authoritarian submission, SDO taps authoritarian dominance. However, although Altemeyer conceptualizes authoritarianism as a personality characteristic, commentators have pointed out that the items of the RWA scale and its predecessor, the F scale (Adorno et al., 1950), capture social attitudes and beliefs of a broadly ideological nature rather than personality characteristics (see Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002). This point of view was substantiated by recent research (Van Hiel, Pandelaere, & Duriez, 2004). In line with this, Pratto et al. (1994) have described the SDO scale as a measure of enduring beliefs. This point of view was also supported by recent research (Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003; Van Hiel et al., 2004).

Aims of the Present Study

The present study has three main objectives that follow from this brief overview of past research and theorizing on the prejudice prone individual. It was already mentioned that RWA and SDO were repeatedly reported to be powerful and *relatively* independent predictors of prejudice. In spite of this, the RWA-SDO relation seems to fluctuate quite a bit across different studies. Recently, Duckitt (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002) has proposed a theoretical framework to make sense of cross- and intracultural differences in this relationship. A first objective is to investigate whether there are indeed cross- and intracultural differences in the RWA-SDO relation and whether these can be accounted for by Duckitt's theory. In addition, it was already mentioned that research has shown that RWA and SDO relate differentially to values and sociopolitical attitudes. Therefore, a second objective is to test the stability of these relationships. Stability of these relations would further substantiate the hypothesis that RWA and SDO are independent predictors of prejudice, even in samples in which RWA and SDO are strongly related. Finally, it was already argued that these differential relationships have caused some researchers to conclude that RWA and SDO have a different genesis (cf. Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002). In line with this, a third objective is to examine this potentially different genesis in more detail. For this purpose, a mediation model will be tested which states that the influence of values on sociopolitical attitudes will be differentially mediated by RWA and SDO. However, at the moment, each of these objectives is in need of further explanation.

The RWA-SDO Relation

Although RWA and SDO seem to constitute different prejudice dispositions, their relationship appears to fluctuate across cultures (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002). According to Duckitt, these differences result from differences in sociopolitical context. In Western Europe and some other countries, the political system is ideologized along a broad left-right dimension because of the existence

of both socialist left-wing political parties and liberal and conservative right-wing parties. As a consequence, RWA and SDO might influence each other because both of them refer to the political right. In the United States and several other countries, this left-right dimension would be less important because of the absence of either a large socialist left-wing party or a large liberal and/or conservative right-wing party. In line with this, RWA and SDO were found to be strongly related in Belgium (Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002), the United Kingdom, Germany, and New Zealand (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002), whereas a weak relation was obtained in the United States, South Africa (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002), Poland, and the Ukraine (Van Hiel & Kossowska, 2003).

In addition, intracultural differences might also be expected. Although the beliefs expressed in the RWA and SDO scales may be acquired independently, both refer to the political right and might influence each other as a consequence of political socialization and/or political involvement (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002). Duckitt's reasoning corroborates research on attitude constraint, which has shown that the politically interested and involved are more apt to constrain their opinions on all sorts of societal issues along a left-right dimension (e.g., Converse, 1964; Zaller, 1992). These findings were replicated in Western Europe by Middendorp (1978), who has shown that in the Netherlands, the left-right dimension that is found among politicians breaks up into the unrelated dimensions of Cultural and Economic Conservatism in the general population. Based on these findings, people with a strong political interest and involvement can be expected to show higher levels of attitude constraint and RWA-SDO relatedness.¹

In order to empirically verify this reasoning, two student samples, three adult samples, and a political activist sample were gathered in Belgium and an adult sample was collected in Poland. As far as cross-cultural differences are concerned, in Belgium, a clear left-right dimension underlies the discourse of the political "elite," and people are capable of arranging the existing political parties along this dimension. Hence, one can expect a high degree of relatedness between RWA and SDO. Conversely, in Poland, in the communist era, the political spectrum used to lack right-wing parties. After the fall of communism, a highly complicated political spectrum emerged, with no less than 60 parties participating in the first elections. However, there is no clear left-right dimension underlying people's political party preferences (see Boski, 1993). Hence, one can expect RWA and SDO to be virtually unrelated (see also Van Hiel & Kossowska, 2003). In addition, the

¹ In the domain of person perception, the number of dimensions taken into account when judging an individual is considered to be an indicator of the complexity of that judgment (i.e., Bieri, 1966; Fransella & Bannister, 1977). Conversely, political expertise is denoted as the ability to translate disparate political issues in terms of an underlying left-right dimension. However, both processes refer to the use of complex inferences and are therefore hypothesized to only take place among the well-educated and the interested.

multitude of Belgian samples allows us to investigate intracultural differences in the magnitude of the RWA-SDO relation. This relation can be expected to fluctuate according to level of political socialization and/or political interest and involvement. Due to differences in political interest and involvement, this relation should be most pronounced in the political activist sample. Due to differences in political socialization (which is thought to take place during late adolescence; see Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002), a difference in the strength of the RWA-SDO relation was expected between the adult and the student samples. Another reason to expect this difference is that, whereas the adult samples consist of voters (voting is compulsory in Belgium from 18 years on), the student samples were gathered in a time of relative political apathy among the student population and consist of people who did not participate in elections yet.

The Stability of the External Relations

Previous research has revealed that RWA relates negatively to Openness to Change and positively to Conservation and Cultural Conservatism, whereas SDO relates negatively to Self-Transcendence and positively to Self-Enhancement and Economic Conservatism (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002). Stability of these differential relationships would substantiate the claim that RWA and SDO constitute independent prejudice dispositions. This stability criterion is particularly important in samples in which RWA and SDO are strongly related. In such samples, the demonstration of stable differential relations with external variables would validate the conceptual distinction between RWA and SDO. However, not all of the depicted relations can be expected to show cross-cultural stability. Whereas authoritarians in the United States and Western Europe can be expected to adhere to traditional capitalist ideas, East European authoritarians can be expected to adhere to communist ideas, because communism constitutes the traditional ideology in these countries. This is exactly what previous research has revealed (Altemeyer, 1996; Krauss, 2002; McFarland, 2000; Van Hiel & Kossowska, 2003). Hence, in Poland, RWA can be expected to relate to left-wing economical principles or—in Western terms—to economic progressivism.

The Differential Genesis of RWA and SDO

Although both attitudes and values relate to the evaluation and justification of choices and actions, there is a conceptual difference between them (Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, & Knafo, 2002). According to Rokeach, an attitude is a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around a specific object or situation (1968, p. 112), whereas a value transcends objects and situations and refers to a desirable end-state that has a transcendental quality to it (Rokeach, 1973, p. 18). Hence, according to Rokeach (1973), values are more abstract and fundamental and guide the formation of attitudes, actions, and judgments. In line with this reasoning,

Duriez and Van Hiel (2002) have argued that the differential relationships of RWA and SDO with values suggest a different genesis. In order to investigate this, a mediation model will be tested which proposes that the influence of values on sociopolitical attitudes will be differentially mediated by RWA and SDO. That is, we assume that value orientations can account for the individual's level of RWA and SDO, and that, in turn, because RWA and SDO are more abstract than specific conservative beliefs and racism, RWA and SDO will account for differences in these target variables. In particular, the mediation model states (1) that the value dimension Openness to Change vs. Conservation will have an effect on prejudice and Cultural Conservatism but not on Economic Conservatism and that these effects will be mediated by RWA, and (2) that the value dimension Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence will have an effect on prejudice and Economic Conservatism but not on Cultural Conservatism and that these effects will be mediated by SDO. If this proposed differential mediation model holds, this can be considered evidence for a different genesis of RWA and SDO. Besides its theoretical significance, this integrative model obviously also has practical relevance because it would allow for the evaluation of the potential success of educational programs that try to reduce prejudice by promoting certain values.

Method

Samples

Six samples of Dutch-speaking Belgians (1–6) and one Polish sample (P) were collected. The student samples (1 and 2) ($N = 321$ and 363) consisted of university students participating in partial fulfillment of a requirement for introductory psychology courses. These samples consisted of 20% male participants with a mean age of 18 ($SD = 0.73$). The adult samples (3, 4, 5, and P) ($N = 293, 175, 85,$ and 235) were gathered by undergraduate students who were instructed to ask their neighbors to participate. These samples consisted of, respectively, 35%, 56%, 53%, and 47% male participants. The respective mean age was 45, 39, 40, and 44 years ($SD = 13, 15, 14,$ and 12). Sample 6 ($N = 69$; 73% male; mean age = 39, $SD = 15.22$) was recruited by undergraduate students in political sciences among militants of a variety of political movements, covering the whole political spectrum.

Measures

Participants completed a shortened RWA-scale (Altemeyer, 1981; Melen, 1991; 11 items), the SDO-scale (Pratto et al., 1994; Van Hiel & Duriez, 2002; 14 items), and a Cultural and Economic Conservatism scale (De Witte, 1990; Duriez, Luyten, Snauwaert, & Hutsebaut, 2002; both 12 items). The Cultural Conservatism scale addresses issues such as upbringing, work ethic, the position of

women in society, abortion, euthanasia, and premarital sex. The Economic Conservatism scale addresses issues like the desirability of trade unions, government interference in economics, and income differences. These scales were translated into Polish according to the guidelines of the International Test Commission (Hambleton, 1994) using the translation back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1980). In the Belgian samples, a racism scale (Billiet & De Witte; 1991; Duriez & Hutsebaut, 2000; nine items) was administered as an indicator of prejudice. The items of all of these scales were rated on a 5-point Likert scale.² Furthermore, participants completed Schwartz' (1992) Value Inventory (54 items). Within the value domain, Schwartz identified 10 value types (power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security) which can be arranged into a two-dimensional structure on the basis of the compatibilities and conflicts between their motivational goals. In this way, the value domain can be regarded as composed of two higher-order dimensions: Openness to Change vs. Conservation (stimulation and self-direction vs. tradition, conformity and security) and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence (power and achievement vs. universalism and benevolence). Each value was rated in terms of its importance as a guideline in one's life on a 9-point scale, ranging from "opposed to my principles" over "not important" to "of supreme importance." The higher-order dimensions were computed by subtracting the sum of the value types with a negative loading on these dimensions from the sum of the value types with a positive loading.³ As in Schwartz and Huisman (1995), systematic response sets were corrected for.

Results

The RWA-SDO Relation

To investigate whether there are cross-cultural differences with respect to the RWA-SDO relation, the correlations between RWA and SDO in the Belgian samples and the Polish sample were compared. In accordance with Duriez and Van Hiel (2002) and Van Hiel and Mervielde (2002), highly positive correlations

² Cronbach Alpha's were .83, .85, .86, .79, .88, .88, and .72 for SDO; .75, .74, .72, .80, .84, .89 and .79 for RWA; .74, .67, .67, .78, .81, .92 and .82 for Cultural Conservatism; and .86, .74, .76, .84, .81, .94 and .79 for Economic Conservatism for sample 1-6 and P respectively; and .82, .86, .85, .92, .86 and .94 for racism for sample 1-6.

³ Cronbach Alpha's were .54, .64, .58, .43, .78, .64 and .56 for Power; .60, .72, .62, .67, .71, .68 and .71 for Achievement; .74, .72, .68, .76, .71, .83 and .67 for Hedonism; .70, .80, .77, .60, .66, .71 and .76 for Stimulation; .66, .51, .52, .58, .50, .61 and .60 for Self-direction; .74, .76, .76, .72, .61, .82 and .78 for Universalism; .59, .63, .63, .73, .70, .69 and .73 for Benevolence; .56, .50, .46, .44, .52, .74 and .53 for Tradition; .64, .67, .60, .70, .79, .84 and .69 for Conformity; and .65, .60, .53, .68, .65, .77, and .68 for Security for sample 1-6 and P respectively. For Openness to Change vs. Conservation and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence Cronbach's Alpha were, respectively, .60, .67, .71, .54, .72, .87 and .72; and .69, .69, .60, .62, .81, .69 and .72.

were obtained in the Belgian samples ($r_s = .33, .32, .36, .24, .54$, and $.63$, $p_s < .0001$, for sample 1–6). In the Polish sample, RWA and SDO were virtually unrelated ($r = -.03$, $n.s.$). These findings corroborate Duckitt's (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002) reasoning that a strong RWA-SDO relation only occurs in cultures in which the left-right distinction is prominent.

To investigate whether there are intracultural differences with respect to the RWA-SDO relation that can be attributed to political socialization and political interest and involvement, weighted mean correlations between RWA and SDO were computed for the student samples and the adult samples separately, after which the strength of these correlations was compared. Although we expected a larger correlation among adults than among students, the weighted mean correlation of the student samples ($r = .33$) did not differ significantly from the adult samples ($r = .35$; Fisher $Z = 0.38$, $n.s.$). This result suggests that political socialization has a rather limited impact. However, both of these correlations were substantially weaker than the correlation in the political activist sample ($r = .63$) (Fisher $Z = 3.35$, $p < .001$ and 3.15 , $p < .01$). This result supports Duckitt's (2001; Duckitt, et al., 2002) reasoning, but suggests that political involvement rather than socialization is important to explain these intracultural differences.⁴ These results corroborate previous research in which the impact of political interest and involvement has been illustrated (e.g., Converse, 1964; Middendorp, 1978; Zaller, 1992). Unfortunately, we did not administer measures of political interest and involvement. However, Sniderman, Brody, and Tetlock (1991) have argued that level of education can be used as a proxy of political interest (see also Federico & Sidanius, 2002). Hence, it can be expected that RWA and SDO will be more strongly related among the higher educated than among the lower educated. To test the hypothesized importance of political interest in more detail, the adult samples were split into subgroups of different levels of education.

Sample 3 was split into a group of people who earned a secondary school diploma only (Group 1; $N = 91$), a group of people who completed college (Group 2; $N = 121$), and a group of people with a university degree (Group 3; $N = 64$). The correlations between RWA and SDO shifted from $.20$ ($n.s.$) in Group 1 over $.35$ ($p < .0001$) in Group 2 to $.61$ ($p < .0001$) in Group 3. Due to lack of information, we could not distinguish all of these groups in Sample 4. Therefore, Sample 4 was split into a group of people with a secondary school diploma only (Group 1; $N = 58$) and a group of who completed either college or university (Group 2; $N = 110$). The correlation between RWA and SDO was found to shift from $.16$ ($n.s.$) in Group 1 to $.24$ ($p < .01$) in Group 2. Due to the small sample

⁴ Similar results were found for Cultural and Economic Conservatism. Whereas both variables tend to be unrelated in Belgium ($r_s = .08, .15, .09, .01$, and $.21$, $n.s.$, for samples 1–5 respectively), they are positively related among political activists ($r = .63$, $p < .0001$). In line with the observed cross-cultural differences, both variables are negatively related in Poland ($r = -.43$, $p < .0001$).

size and an unequal distribution of the educational degrees, Sample 5 and sample 6 were split into two groups only: The first group consisted of people who earned a secondary school diploma or a college degree (Group 1; $N = 36$ and $N = 14$, respectively), and the second group consisted of people who earned a university degree (Group 2; $N = 46$ and $N = 50$, respectively). In Sample 5, the correlation between RWA and SDO shifted from .47 ($p < .01$) in Group 1 to .58 ($p < .0001$) in Group 2, and in Sample 6, this correlation shifted from .46 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 to .64 ($p < .0001$) in Group 2. Finally, the Polish sample was split into a group of people who earned a secondary school diploma only (Group 1; $N = 40$), a group of people with a college degree (Group 2; $N = 106$), and a group of people with a university degree (Group 3; $N = 73$). The correlations between RWA and SDO ranged from .05 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 over .04 (*n.s.*) in Group 2 to $-.06$ (*n.s.*) in Group 3. These results convincingly show that in the Belgian samples, the correlation between RWA and SDO generally becomes stronger as the level of education increases.⁵ However, this tendency did not occur in the Polish sample.⁶

The Stability of the External Relations

Regression analyses were performed in order to investigate the stability of the differential relations between RWA and SDO on the one hand and value orientations and ideological attitudes on the other hand. More specifically, in line with our theoretical framework, regression analyses (1) of the ideological attitudes on RWA and SDO and (2) of RWA and SDO on the value orientations were conducted. Moreover, because of the fluctuations in the RWA-SDO relation, regression analyses in which RWA was corrected for SDO and in which SDO was corrected for RWA were also conducted. These corrections allow us to compare the external relations of both constructs in their purest form. Note that although these corrections will have an impact on the Belgian results, they will hardly affect the Polish results since RWA and SDO were unrelated in this sample. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Note that the unstandardized beta weights of the

⁵ Because one of the reviewers suggested that the higher correlations for the more educated might stem from the greater internal consistency of the scales among the higher educated (see McFarland & Sparks, 1985), attenuated correlations were computed using Lisrel 8.54 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). In Sample 3, correlations shifted from .27 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 over .46 ($p < .0001$) in Group 2 to .73 ($p < .0001$) in Group 3. In Sample 4, correlations shifted from .23 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 to .28 (*n.s.*) in Group 2. In Sample 5, correlations shifted from .55 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 to .67 ($p < .0001$) in Group 2. In Sample 6, correlations shifted from .53 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 to .75 ($p < .0001$) in Group 2. These results suggest that the degree to which RWA and SDO are related does indeed vary by educational level.

⁶ Similar results were found for Cultural and Economic Conservatism. In sample 3 (the only Belgian sample that allows for a thorough differentiation of levels of education), this relation ranged from $-.02$ (*n.s.*) in Group 1 over $-.04$ (*n.s.*) in Group 2 to .58 ($p < .0001$) in Group 3. In the Polish sample, these relations ranged from $-.54$ ($p < .001$) over $-.25$ ($p < .001$) to $-.50$ ($p < .0001$).

Table 1. Unstandardized beta weights of the regression of the dependent variables on RWA and SDO and of RWA and SDO on the independent variables

Dependent Variable	Right-Wing Authoritarianism							Social Dominance Orientation						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Racism	0.58**	0.48**	0.58**	0.60**	0.87**	0.94**	–	0.63**	0.54**	0.57**	0.46**	0.81**	1.11**	–
Cultural Conservatism	0.50**	0.42**	0.61**	0.65**	0.68**	0.97**	0.77**	0.16*	0.16**	0.26**	0.24*	0.44**	0.80**	–0.16
Economic Conservatism	0.14*	0.16**	0.14	–0.10	0.11	0.75**	–0.42**	0.38**	0.28**	0.47**	0.45**	0.42**	0.86**	0.46**
Independent Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Hedonism	–0.05	–0.03	–0.10*	–0.09	–0.13	–0.30**	0.01	0.12*	0.12*	0.08*	0.06	–0.01	–0.06	0.09*
Stimulation	–0.05	–0.08*	–0.16**	–0.14**	–0.17*	–0.36**	–0.04	0.04	0.07	0.02	–0.01	–0.04	–0.13	0.09*
Self-Direction	–0.24**	–0.31**	–0.25**	–0.31**	–0.40**	–0.52**	–0.35**	–0.06	–0.15*	–0.01	–0.02	–0.28*	–0.31*	0.06
Universalism	–0.22**	–0.23**	–0.14*	–0.14*	–0.33**	–0.46**	–0.16*	–0.36**	–0.36**	–0.37**	–0.36**	–0.44**	–0.41**	–0.24**
Benevolence	–0.07	–0.01	–0.09	0.09	–0.13	0.01	–0.14	–0.27**	–0.32**	–0.27**	–0.22**	–0.33**	–0.13	–0.14*
Tradition	0.05	0.07*	0.13*	0.06	0.03	0.39**	0.16*	–0.05	–0.10*	–0.09*	–0.05	–0.15	0.12	–0.12*
Conformity	0.24**	0.22**	0.35**	0.38**	0.37**	0.47**	0.09	0.03	–0.03	0.06	0.02	0.23*	0.23*	–0.14*
Security	0.19**	0.29**	0.38**	0.38**	0.49**	0.51**	0.14	0.01	0.10*	0.13*	0.08	0.28*	0.23*	–0.04
Power	0.09*	0.09*	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.39**	0.17*	0.24**	0.29**	0.18**	0.17**	0.29**	0.31*	0.16*
Achievement	0.13*	–0.02	–0.01	–0.07	0.19	–0.04	0.07	0.16**	0.19**	0.12*	0.12*	0.30**	0.08	0.06
Openness-Conservation	0.14**	0.20**	0.24**	0.30**	0.27**	0.33**	0.14**	–0.01	–0.02	0.00	0.02	0.12	0.15*	–0.10*
Self-Enhanc.-Self-Transcen.	–0.12**	–0.08**	–0.09	–0.02	–0.15*	–0.21*	–0.13*	–0.25**	–0.28**	–0.25**	–0.22**	–0.26**	–0.23**	–0.14**

* = $p < .01$, ** = $p < .0001$.

Table 2. Unstandardized beta weights of the regression of the dependent variables on RWA (corrected for SDO) and SDO (corrected for RWA) and of the regression of RWA (corrected for SDO) and SDO (corrected for RWA) on the independent variables

Dependent Variable	Right-Wing Authoritarianism							Social Dominance Orientation						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Racism	0.39**	0.33**	0.45**	0.53**	0.64**	0.62**	–	0.51**	0.44**	0.39**	0.34**	0.45**	0.61**	–
Cultural Conservatism	0.50**	0.41**	0.60**	0.63**	0.65**	0.93**	0.76**	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.07	–0.13
Economic Conservatism	–0.00	0.07	–0.03	–0.19	–0.13	0.52**	–0.41**	0.38**	0.26**	0.48**	0.51**	0.49**	0.45*	0.44**
Independent Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Hedonism	–0.09*	–0.09*	–0.13**	–0.10*	–0.14*	–0.25**	0.01	0.14**	0.14**	0.11**	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.09*
Stimulation	–0.07*	–0.10**	–0.17**	–0.14**	–0.14*	–0.27**	–0.04	0.06	0.12**	0.09*	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.09*
Self-Direction	–0.23**	–0.27**	–0.25**	–0.31**	–0.27*	–0.35**	–0.36**	0.04	–0.05	0.07	0.04	–0.09	–0.07	0.06
Universalism	–0.15**	–0.18**	0.00	–0.07	–0.12	–0.23	–0.19*	–0.32**	–0.33**	–0.33**	–0.35**	–0.34**	–0.27*	–0.25**
Benevolence	0.02	0.10*	0.02	0.16*	0.06	0.11	–0.16*	–0.25**	–0.32**	–0.25**	–0.24**	–0.25**	–0.13	–0.15*
Tradition	0.07	0.11**	0.17**	0.07	0.13	0.30**	0.16*	–0.07	–0.13**	–0.14**	–0.06	–0.17*	–0.11	–0.13*
Conformity	0.23**	0.23**	0.33**	0.38**	0.28**	0.35**	0.09	–0.07	–0.10*	–0.07	–0.09	0.05	–0.02	–0.12*
Security	0.18**	0.26**	0.34**	0.36**	0.38**	0.38**	0.14	–0.06	–0.00	0.01	0.00	0.04	–0.05	–0.04
Power	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.07	–0.03	0.18	0.18*	0.21**	0.27**	0.15**	0.16*	0.23**	0.14	0.17**
Achievement	0.08	–0.07	–0.06	–0.10	0.02	–0.11	0.07	0.12*	0.20**	0.13*	0.12*	0.22*	0.10	0.06
Openness-Conservation	0.14**	0.20**	0.24**	0.29**	0.22**	0.26**	0.15**	–0.06	–0.10*	–0.10*	–0.06	–0.03	–0.05	–0.10*
Self-Enhanc.-Self-Transcen.	–0.07	–0.00	0.02	0.04	–0.01	–0.03	–0.13*	–0.22**	–0.26**	–0.23**	–0.21**	–0.20**	–0.14*	–0.15**

*= p < .01, **= p < .0001.

regression analyses are reported. In contrast to standardized weights, unstandardized weights are unaffected by the variance of the variables. As a consequence, the magnitude of the unstandardized beta weights delineates the change in the dependent variable that is associated with a change of one unit in the independent variable. Unstandardized beta weights can therefore be compared straightforwardly within and across different samples (see Tacq, 1997).

Although both RWA and SDO have a strong, positive effect on racism in the Belgian samples, they have a differential effect on the sociopolitical attitudes (see Table 1). This result becomes even more apparent after correcting RWA and SDO for each other (see Table 2). The results show that RWA primarily has an effect on Cultural Conservatism, whereas SDO is primarily related to Economic Conservatism. Importantly, these effects are stable across the different Belgian samples, with the exception of the political activist sample. In particular, the effects of RWA and SDO on the sociopolitical attitudes are stronger in the political activist sample than in the other samples (see Table 1). A plausible reason for this is the fact that this sample contains people from the far-left and the far-right who are known to obtain very different scores on ideological variables (Van Hiel, Kossowska, & Mervielde, 2000). This "extension of range" might have boosted the effects. However, Table 2 shows that, after correction of SDO for RWA, the effects of SDO on the ideological variables are comparable with the other Belgian samples. Hence, the differences between the political activist sample and the other samples reported in Table 1 can be accounted for by the stronger RWA-SDO relation in the political activist sample. Second, the effects of RWA on the sociopolitical attitudes show more similarity in the political activist sample (see Table 1). A plausible reason for this is the higher attitude constraint level among political activists. Again, Table 2 shows that when correcting SDO for RWA, the size of the effects of SDO on the ideological variables is comparable with the other Belgian samples. Hence, differences in this effect size can also be attributed to the stronger RWA-SDO relation in this sample. But although some intracultural differences appeared with respect to the relation of RWA and SDO with some of the sociopolitical attitudes, the differential effect of the value orientations on RWA and SDO is markedly stable across the Belgian samples (see Table 1). This result is even more apparent after correcting RWA and SDO for each other (see Table 2). The results strongly evince that, whereas RWA can be understood in terms of Conversation and low Openness to Change, SDO can be understood in terms of Self-Enhancement and lack of Self-Transcendence.

In general, the Polish SDO-related results were consistent with the Belgian results, but the RWA-related results revealed two noteworthy differences. First, whereas RWA (corrected for SDO) does not appear to have an effect on Economic Conservatism in the Belgian samples (except that it appears to have a positive effect among political activists), RWA appears to inhibit Economic Conservatism in the Polish sample (see Table 2). These findings are in line with the theory of

Altemeyer (1996), which states that, although people who obtain high RWA scores will favor conventional norms, what is conventional depends on the culture of reference. In line with the research on attitude constraint, it can be hypothesized that education will boost the relations between RWA and Economic Conservatism, leading to a more positive correlation in Belgium but to a more negative correlation in Poland. In sample 3 (the only Belgian sample that allows a thorough differentiation of levels of education), this relation ranged from $-.07$ (*n.s.*) in Group 1 over $.07$ (*n.s.*) in Group 2 to $.60$ ($p < .0001$) in Group 3. In the Polish sample, these relations ranged from $-.50$ ($p < .001$) over $-.21$ ($p < .05$) to $-.52$ ($p < .0001$). Again, these results convincingly show that in the Belgian samples, the correlation between RWA and Economic Conservatism becomes stronger as the level of education increases. However, once more, no such clear tendency emerged in the Polish sample. The second noteworthy result is that, whereas RWA (corrected for SDO) does not have an effect on Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence values in the Belgian samples, RWA appears to slightly inhibit these values in the Polish sample (see Table 2). Apparently, Polish authoritarians take a special interest in social status, prestige, and control over people and resources and are less concerned about the welfare of other people.

The Differential Genesis of RWA and SDO

Mediation analyses were conducted in order to examine the potentially differential genesis of RWA and SDO in more detail. In a first step of these analyses, the paths between the independent variables (Openness to Change vs. Conservation and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence) and the dependent variables (racism, Cultural Conservatism, and Economic Conservatism) were inspected. In those cases where a significant effect of the independent on the dependent variables was observed, mediation analyses were continued. In a second step it was then examined whether the effects of Openness to Change vs. Conservation were mediated by RWA but not by SDO, and in a third step it was examined whether the effects of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence were mediated by SDO but not by RWA. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 3. The results support the notion of a different genesis of RWA and SDO. Both Openness to Change vs. Conservation and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence were found to have an effect on racism. In all cases, the effect of Openness to Change vs. Conservation was fully mediated by RWA (and in most of the cases not by SDO), and the effect of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence was fully mediated by SDO (and in most of the cases not by RWA). In addition, in most cases, Openness to Change vs. Conservation had an effect on Cultural but not on Economic Conservatism (an effect which was mediated by RWA but not by SDO), and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence had an

Table 3. Unstandardized beta weights for the paths in the mediation analysis

Racism	Openness to Change vs. Conservation							Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Step 1	0.06*	0.09*	0.09*	0.20**	0.18*	0.29**	–	–0.18**	–0.17**	–0.21**	–0.11*	–0.25**	–0.31**	–
Step 2	–0.02	–0.01	–0.06	0.04	–0.08	–0.04	–	–0.12**	–0.13**	–0.17**	–0.09	–0.13*	–0.13	–
Step 3	0.06*	0.09*	0.08*	0.19**	0.09	0.15*	–	–0.03	–0.02	–0.08	–0.01	–0.05	–0.07	–
Step 2: Sobel Test	5.23**	6.21**	7.59**	4.54**	4.96**	5.60**	–	–4.55**	–3.47**	–2.46	–0.57	–3.00*	–2.81*	–
Step 3: Sobel Test	–0.39	–0.71	0.14	0.59	2.16	3.21*	–	–7.64**	–7.53**	–5.90**	–3.35**	–4.22**	–3.78**	–
Cultural Conservatism	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Step 1	0.14**	0.11**	0.20**	0.23**	0.28**	0.38**	0.19**	–0.06	–0.05	–0.07	–0.01	–0.09	–0.25*	–0.14*
Step 2	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.12	0.14*	0.08	–	–	–	–	–	–0.06	–0.05
Step 3	0.14**	0.11**	0.20**	0.22**	0.24**	0.32**	0.18**	–	–	–	–	–	–0.09	–0.18**
Step 2: Sobel Test	5.34**	7.12**	7.14**	5.50**	4.16**	6.15**	3.82**	–	–	–	–	–	–2.90*	–3.26*
Step 3: Sobel Test	–0.38	–0.71	0.14	0.57	1.90	2.76*	0.72	–	–	–	–	–	–3.18**	2.42
Economic Conservatism	1	2	3	4	5	6	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	P
Step 1	–0.01	0.03	0.01	–0.08	–0.02	0.24**	–0.21**	–0.14**	–0.10**	–0.17**	–0.19**	–0.14*	–0.12	–0.06
Step 2	–	–	–	–	–	–0.03	–0.16*	–0.13**	–0.09**	–0.16**	–0.19**	–0.13*	–	–
Step 3	–	–	–	–	–	0.13*	–0.17**	–0.06	–0.04	–0.07	–0.10	–0.05	–	–
Step 2: Sobel Test	–	–	–	–	–	4.84**	–3.26*	–1.07	–2.42	–1.26	0.67	–0.22	–	–
Step 3: Sobel Test	–	–	–	–	–	3.01*	–2.75*	–5.76**	–5.04**	–4.70**	–3.41**	–2.95*	–	–

Note 1. Step 1 refers to the path from the independent variable (Openness to Change vs. Conservation or Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence) to the dependent variable (Racism, Cultural Conservatism, or Economic Conservatism). Step 2 refers to the path from the independent variable to the dependent variable controlling for RWA. Step 3 refers to the path from the independent variable to the dependent variable controlling for SDO. To test whether the mediators carry the influence of the independent variables, Sobel Tests were performed for Step 2 and Step 3.

Note 2. * = $p < .01$, ** = $p < .0001$.

effect on Economic but not on Cultural Conservatism (an effect which was mediated by SDO but not by RWA).⁷

The political activist sample and the Polish sample formed an exception to some of these findings. In the political activist sample, although the effects of Openness to Change vs. Conservation on racism is primarily mediated by RWA and although the effect of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence on racism is primarily mediated by SDO, there are additional effects from Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence on Cultural Conservatism (which is mediated by both RWA and SDO) and from Openness to Change vs. Conservation instead of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence on Economic Conservatism (an effect that is primarily mediated by RWA). These effects can be explained by the higher level of attitude constraint. In the Polish sample, Openness to Change vs. Conservation also had an effect on Economic Conservatism (which was partly mediated by both RWA and SDO), and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence had an effect on Cultural instead of Economic Conservatism (an effect that was mediated by RWA but not by SDO). These findings suggest that the genesis of RWA and SDO depends at least to some extent on the sociopolitical context.

Discussion

The present study yields three important results. First, both cross-cultural and intracultural differences with respect to strength of the RWA-SDO relation were observed. Second, the differential relationships with values and sociopolitical attitudes evinced high stability, substantiating the conceptual difference between RWA and SDO. However, some important cross- and intracultural differences were also noted. Third, mediation analyses in which the value orientations were entered as independent variables, in which RWA and SDO acted as mediators, and in which the ideological attitudes constituted the dependent variables support the hypothesis of a different genesis of RWA and SDO.

⁷ These mediation analyses are in line with the theoretical framework outlined in the introduction, where it was argued that authoritarianism should be regarded as a value-based generalized belief rather than as a personality characteristic. To rule out the possibility that this is a faulty point of view, a substitute model in which Conservation and Self-Enhancement mediate the influence of, respectively, RWA and SDO was tested. Results show that, with some exceptions, Conservation did not mediate the influence of RWA on either racism (Sobel test statistic (STS) = -1.03, -0.37, -2.64*, 0.82, -1.35 and -0.72 in Sample 1 to 6), cultural conservatism (STS = 3.39*, 2.30, -2.88*, 1.75, 2.46, 3.38* and 2.30 in Sample 1 to 7), or economic conservatism (STS = -1.17, -0.12, -0.93, -1.38, -1.20, -0.42 and -3.13* in Sample 1 to 7). In a similar vein, with some exceptions, Self-Enhancement did not mediate the influence of SDO on either racism (STS = 1.24, 0.94, 2.61*, 0.14, 0.87 and 1.01 in Sample 1 to 6), cultural conservatism (STS = 2.06, 0.64, 0.04, -1.03, -0.61, 1.14, and 3.01* in Sample 1 to 7), or economic conservatism (STS = 2.50, 2.08, 1.60, 2.38, 0.96, -1.43 and -0.02 in Sample 1 to 7). This supports the view that authoritarianism should be regarded as a value-based generalized belief rather than as a personality characteristic. (STS with an asterisk are significant on the .01 level.)

The RWA-SDO Relation

In contrast to the results obtained in the United States and South Africa, but in line with previous studies in Western Europe and New Zealand, a strong positive RWA-SDO relation was observed in the Belgian samples. In the Polish sample, both constructs were virtually unrelated. These results support Duckitt's (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002) hypothesis that cross-cultural differences can be attributed to differences in sociopolitical context. In Belgium, like in most other Western Europe countries, political parties can be placed on a broad left-right dimension, with left-wing and right-wing parties being about equally strong. In this case, political attitudes would be strongly ideologized along a broad left-right dimension, which would result in RWA and SDO influencing each other because both of them refer to the political right. In countries in which either socialist left-wing or liberal or conservative right-wing parties have dominated politics over a long period of time, as is respectively the case in former communist countries and countries like the United States, this left-right dimension would be less important. In this case, political attitudes would not (or at least to a lesser extent) be ideologized along a left-right dimension. In this respect, Boski (1993) has shown that, after the fall of communism, the complicated political spectrum that emerged in Poland could not be grasped in terms of a single left-right dimension. Rather, it should be represented by two independent dimensions. Hence, it can be expected that the political context sustains an independent configuration of RWA and SDO related beliefs.

The results in the Belgian samples also suggest that the degree to which RWA and SDO are related fluctuates within a given culture. Results support Duckitt's (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002) hypothesis that these differences stem from differences in political interest and political involvement, with the politically interested and involved showing more attitude constraint and experiencing more similarity between the beliefs encompassed in the RWA and SDO scales. Thus, whereas in Western Europe the left-right dimension seems to break up at least to some extent into the relatively unrelated dimensions of RWA/Cultural Conservatism and SDO/Economic Conservatism in the general population, the politically interested and involved primarily represent RWA and SDO related topics according to a unidimensional left-right dimension (cf. Middendorp, 1978). Because political socialization is thought to take place during late adolescence, a higher attitude level of constraint was expected in the adult samples than in the student samples. However, no such difference was found. Nevertheless, further analyses in the adult sample, in which subgroups with a different educational background were compared, suggested that such differences do occur. In the subgroup of adults with a university degree (see samples 3 and 5), the correlation between RWA and SDO was about equally high as in the political activist sample. This suggests that, in line with the ideas of Duckitt (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002), the level of attitude constraint is determined both by the level of political socialization and involvement.

Although the left-right dimension is less important in the United States, previous research (e.g., Converse, 1964; Zaller, 1992) has shown that the left-right dimension gains importance among the higher educated and the politically involved and that this translates itself in a higher correlation between RWA and SDO (see Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt et al., 2002). In contrast to these findings, no evidence for a linear impact of level of education on the magnitude of the RWA-SDO relation was obtained in the Polish sample. A possible explanation for this might be found in the fact that most of the people in the Polish sample were socialized during the communist era. In this era, people learned to comply with the official doctrine, and little or no alternative ideas and ideologies were available. Hence, people living under such a regime did not develop the integrative thinking necessary to attain ideological attitude constraint. This possible explanation is in line with research that has shown that the politically interested and involved do not show attitude constraint in countries characterized by a profound political and economic reform after the fall of a totalitarian regime (Chen, 1999; Miller, Hesli, & Reisinger, 1995). Most likely, however, attitude constraint will develop among the generations that will be socialized in contemporary Polish democracy. In order to explore the plausibility of this reasoning, the Polish samples were split into three groups according to age: a group of subjects that was politically socialized under the communist regime (aged over 26 years at that time; Group 1, $N = 145$), a group of subjects that was in late adolescence at that time (aged under 26 years; Group 2, $N = 50$), and a group of people that was largely socialized in contemporary Polish democracy (under 18 years when the Berlin wall fell; Group 3, $N = 23$). The correlations between RWA and SDO shifted from -0.09 (*n.s.*) in Group 1 over $.11$ (*n.s.*) in Group 2 to $.24$ (*n.s.*) in Group 3. Although these differences are obviously not significant, they suggest that the ideological belief structure slowly shifts towards the structure that is found in the West. This is clearly a question that requires further investigation.

The Stability of the External Relations

In line with previous research (e.g., Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002), although both RWA and SDO have a strong positive effect on racism in the Belgian samples, they have a differential effect on the other sociopolitical attitudes. Whereas RWA mainly has an effect on Cultural Conservatism, SDO is primarily related to Economic Conservatism. In addition and also in line with previous research (e.g., Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002), RWA and SDO are affected by different sets of value orientations. Whereas RWA is affected by Openness to Change vs. Conservation, SDO is mainly affected by Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence. The results of the Belgian samples show that the differential relations of RWA and SDO are highly stable. Hence, these results lend considerable support for the conceptual distinction between RWA and SDO. Nevertheless, some important intracultural differences also appeared. In particular, the correlation between RWA and SDO

was substantially stronger in the political activist sample, leading to a higher similarity of the relations with the sociopolitical attitudes.

Although the differential relations of RWA and SDO were substantiated in the Polish sample, some important cross-cultural differences were also noted. These differences can be attributed to differences in sociopolitical context and history. Most notably, whereas RWA and Economic Conservatism seem to be either unrelated or positively related in Western Europe (depending on political interest and political involvement), both constructs are negatively related in Eastern Europe. This suggests that East European authoritarians prefer left-wing economical principles. This finding is in line with previous research that reported strong relationships between RWA and support for communism in the former Soviet Union (Altemeyer, 1996; Krauss, 2002; McFarland, 2000), Poland, and the Ukraine (Van Hiel & Kossowska, 2003). In a similar vein, Cultural and Economic Conservatism tend to be either unrelated or positively related in Western Europe (depending on political interest and involvement), whereas both constructs are negatively related in Eastern Europe. These findings suggest that, in contrast to Western Europe and the United States, in Eastern Europe the desire to preserve one's culture goes hand in hand with support for communists' economical principles. This finding corroborates Altemeyer (1996), who has argued that, although conventionalism is characteristic of authoritarianism, what is conventional depends on the culture of reference. The cultural dependency of authoritarian contents also becomes clear when the Polish sample is split into three different age groups. The correlations between RWA and Economic Conservatism and between Cultural Conservatism and Economic Conservatism shift from -0.46 ($p < .0001$) over -0.42 ($p < .01$) to -0.06 (*n.s.*), and from -0.44 ($p < .0001$) over -0.34 ($p < .01$) to -0.25 (*n.s.*) in Group 1, 2, and 3, respectively. These results corroborate the hypothesis that the negative relations between RWA and Economic Conservatism and between Cultural and Economic Conservatism are slowly disappearing and support the idea that the ideological belief and attitude structure slowly shifts towards the structure that is found in the West.

Finally, another marked cross-cultural inconsistency is that, whereas RWA and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence are either unrelated or positively related in Western Europe and the United States, both constructs are negatively related in Eastern Europe. This suggests that East European authoritarians take a special interest in social status, prestige, and control over people and resources. Thus, although East European authoritarians support left-wing economical principles, they do not seem to be interested in the true aims of left-wing economical principles (i.e., creating equality). Hence, they appear to support these principles only because they are part of their cultural tradition (cf. Altemeyer, 1996).

The Differential Genesis of RWA and SDO

The differential relations of RWA and SDO with the values orientations obtained in the present study suggest a different genesis. In order to further inves-

tigate this, mediation analyses were conducted in which value orientations and ideological attitudes were used as independent and dependent variables and RWA and SDO acted as mediators. The results of these analyses provide evidence for this different genesis. In general, the effects of Openness to Change vs. Conservation on the ideological variables were mediated by RWA (but not by SDO) whereas the effects of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence were fully mediated by SDO (but not by RWA). Nevertheless, a few exceptions occurred in the political activist sample and the Polish sample. In the political activist sample, Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence also had an effect on Cultural Conservatism (which was mediated by both RWA and SDO), and Openness to Change vs. Conservation instead of Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence had an effect on Economic Conservatism (an effect that was primarily mediated by RWA). These effects can be explained by the higher level of attitude constraint in this sample and do not contradict the supposedly different genesis of RWA and SDO. Rather, in line with Duckitt's (2001; Duckitt et al., 2002) reasoning, these findings suggest that, in a culture in which the left-right dimension is highly important, RWA and SDO start influencing each other as political interest and involvement grow stronger. From then on, the differential relationships remain important, but are complicated by additional paths. In the Polish sample, Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence only had a marginal effect on SDO and, hence, SDO did not mediate the relation between Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence and Economic Conservatism. Although this finding does not undermine the supposedly differential genesis of RWA and SDO (RWA and SDO still relate differentially to the value dimensions), it does suggest that this genesis is at least partly dependent on the sociopolitical context. In spite of this, in general, the proposed integrated model is well supported. Not only does this integrative model have theoretical significance, it also has practical relevance. It shows that educational programs that try to tackle the societal problem of prejudice by promoting certain values will never be entirely successful unless they focus simultaneously on the promotion of Openness to Change and Self-Transcendence values.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Correspondence may be addressed to Bart Duriez (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Department of Psychology, Tiensestraat 102, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium). E-mail: Bart.Duriez@psy.kuleuven.ac.be

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality". In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47–92. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bieri, J. (1966). Cognitive complexity and personality development. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.), *Experience, structure and adaptability* (pp. 13–37). New York: Springer.
- Billiet, J., & De Witte, H. (1991). *Naar racisme neigende houdingen in Vlaanderen: Typologie en maatschappelijke achtergrond* [Attitudes that tend towards racism in Flanders: Typology and societal background]. Leuven: Sociologisch Onderzoeksinstituut.
- Boski, P. (1993). Sociopolitical value orientations among Poles in Presidential '90 and Parliamentary '91 elections. *Polish Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 151–1701.
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H. C. Triandis & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. 2: Methodology* (pp. 389–444). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chen, J. (1999). Comparing mass and elite subjective orientations in urban China. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 63, 193–219.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. E. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 206–261). New York: Free Press.
- De Witte, H. (1990). *Conformisme, radicalisme en machteloosheid: Een onderzoek naar de sociaal-culturele en sociaal-economische opvattingen van arbeiders in Vlaanderen* [Conformism, radicalism and powerlessness: Flemish workers' cultural and economical opinions]. Leuven: HIVA.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York: Praeger.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 41–113. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological basis of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 75–93.
- Duriez, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2000). The relation between religion and racism: The role of Post-Critical Belief. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 3, 85–102.
- Duriez, B., Luyten, P., Snauwaert, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2002). The relative importance of religiosity and value orientations in predicting political attitudes. Empirical evidence for the continuing importance of religion in Flanders (Belgium). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 5, 35–54.
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The March of Modern Fascism. A comparison of Social Dominance Orientation and Authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1199–1213.
- Federico, C. M., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Racism, ideology, and affirmative action revisited: The antecedents and consequences of "principled objections" to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 488–502.
- Fransella, F., & Bannister, D. (1977). *A manual for Repertory Grid Technique*. London: Academic Press.
- Guimond, S., Dambrun, M., Michinov, N., & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 697–721.
- Hambleton, R. K. (1994). Guidelines for adapting educational and psychological tests: A progress report. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 10, 229–244.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: Structural Equation Modeling with the SIMPLIS Command Language*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.
- Krauss, S. W. (2002). Romanian authoritarianism 10 years after communism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1255–1264.
- Lippa, R., & Arad, S. (1999). Gender, personality, and prejudice: The display of authoritarianism and social dominance in interviews with college men and women. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 463–493.

- McFarland, S. G. (1998). *Toward a typology of prejudiced persons*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Canada, July 1998.
- McFarland, S. G. (1999). *Personality, values, and latent prejudice: A test of a causal model*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Society for Political Psychology, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, July 1999.
- McFarland, S. G. (2000). *Authoritarismus und die Entwicklung eines demokratischen Bewusstseins in Russland* [Authoritarianism and the development of a democratic consciousness in Russia]. In S. Rippl, C. Seipel, & A. Kindervater (Eds.), *Kontroversen und Ansätze der aktuellen Autoritarismus-forschung* [Controversies and approaches in contemporary authoritarianism research] (pp. 173–197). Opladen, Germany: Leske Bundrich.
- McFarland, S. G., & Adelson, S. (1996). *An omnibus study of personality, values, and prejudice*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Society for Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia, July 1996.
- McFarland, S. G., & Sparks, C. (1985). Age, education, and the internal consistency of personality scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1692–1702.
- Meloan, J. D. (1991). *Inventarisatie van Nederlandse F-schalen 1959–1990* [Inventarisation of Dutch F-scales]. In P. Scheepers & R. Eisinga (Eds.), *Onderdanig en Intolerant. Lacunes en controverses in autoritarisme-studies* [Submissive and intolerant. Lacunae and controversies in authoritarianism studies] (pp. 186–222). Nijmegen, the Netherlands: ITS.
- Middendorp, C. (1978). *Progressiveness and conservatism. The fundamental dimensions of ideological controversy and their relationship to social class*. Den Haag/Paris/New York: Mouton.
- Miller, A. H., Hesli, V. L., & Reisinger, W. M. (1995). Comparing citizen and elite belief systems in post-Soviet Russia and Ukraine. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 1–40.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741–763.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The big five personality factors and personal values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 789–801.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366–385.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1–65. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Huismans, S. (1995). Value priorities and religiosity in four western religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 88–107.
- Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., & Tetlock, P. E. (1991). *Reasoning and choice: Explorations in political psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tacq, J. (1997). *Multivariate analysis techniques in social science research. From problem to analysis*. London: Sage.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). A integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Van Hiel, A., & Duriez, B. (2002). *Een meetinstrument voor individuele verschillen in Sociale Dominantie Oriëntatie* [A measurement instrument for individual differences in Social Dominance Orientation]. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Psychologie en haar Grensgebieden*, 57, 114–146.
- Van Hiel, A., & Kossowska, M. (2003). Contemporary attitudes and their ideological representation in Flanders (Belgium), Poland and the Ukraine. *Paper submitted for publication*.
- Van Hiel, A., Kossowska, M., & Mervielde, I. (2000). The relationship between Openness to Experience and political ideology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 741–751.

- Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Explaining conservative beliefs and political preferences: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 965–976.
- Van Hiel, A., Pandelaere, M., & Duriez, B. (2004). The impact of need for closure on conservative beliefs and racism: Differential mediation by authoritarian submission and authoritarian dominance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 824–837.
- Whitley, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 126–134.
- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Copyright of Political Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.