



Another look at the duality of the dual-process motivational model. On the role of axiological and moral origins of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation



Piotr Radkiewicz

Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Jaracza 1 str., 00-378 Warsaw, Poland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 January 2016

Received in revised form 22 April 2016

Accepted 23 April 2016

Available online 7 May 2016

Keywords:

Right-wing authoritarianism

Social dominance orientation

Social worldview beliefs

Moral intuitions

Preferences for values

ABSTRACT

The current study postulates a more holistic view on the Dual-Process Motivational model (DPM). More specifically, it questions placing specific social worldview beliefs (Dangerous World and Competitive Jungle) at the very heart of the process which produces right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and social dominance orientation (SDO). The sample was comprised of 750 adult respondents representative of the population of Poland. Data were collected with computer-assisted questionnaires and analyzed using hierarchical regression analyses. The results show that the complexity of social phenomena related to DPM can primarily be seen as direct consequences of the fundamental duality of moral intuitions and preferences for values. High RWA is primarily an expression of the ethics of community and preference for conservation values; high SDO is primarily an expression of rejection of the ethics of autonomy and is related to preference for self-enhancement values. Both, moral intuitions and preferences for values, cannot be reduced to the components of RWA and SDO. The role of social worldview beliefs in the Dual Process should be examined in relation to the ethical and axiological duality underlying RWA and SDO.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

1.1. The duality of socio-political ideologies according to the dual-process model

Based on research findings and a review of literature, one may formulate a general conclusion that socio-cultural attitudes and values form two superordinate and roughly orthogonal dimensions. The first includes such features as conservatism, traditionalism and collectivism at one end of the dimension, and freedom, openness and individualism at the other extreme. The second dimension spreads from economic conservatism and social dominance to social prosperity, egalitarianism, and humanitarianism.

The idea of bi-dimensionality of socio-political attitudes was a foundation of the Dual-Process Motivational (DPM) model (Duckitt, Birum, Wagner, & du Plessis, 2002; Duckitt & Sibley, 2010), in which the first dimension is represented by right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), and the second by social dominance orientation (SDO). In Duckitt's model, RWA and SDO are associated with other motivational goals. High RWA expresses need for social control and security, and is activated by the

perception of a dangerous and threatening social world, whereas high SDO expresses need for power, competition and dominance, and is activated by the perception of the social world as a Competitive Jungle ruled by the principles of self-interest, competition, ruthless struggle for power and money, etc. Although RWA and SDO were originally meant by their proponents as personality dispositions (see: Altemeyer, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), in Duckitt's approach both refer to social attitudes and ideological beliefs, not to personality dispositions. The personality factor underlying RWA is social conformity, while for SDO it is tough-mindedness. They influence perceptual schemas of a Dangerous World and competitive social jungle, respectively.

A major premise for formulating the DPM model was explanation of a great diversity of inter-group prejudices and social discrimination. The duality of socio-political attitudes expressed by RWA and SDO was embedded in personality dispositions and stable cognitive beliefs about the social world. Although in terms of the DPM model RWA and SDO express two ideological visions of the social world (liberal vs anti-liberal and egalitarian vs anti-egalitarian, respectively), their origin was conceptualized in isolation from the fundamental duality of axiological preferences and moral concerns underlying socio-political ideologies. Even if such and no other conceptualization is clear on the ground of adopted theoretical framework, a fully justified question appears: Is the DPM model that approach to the duality of human motivation

E-mail address: Piotr.Radkiewicz@psych.pan.pl.

which most satisfactorily explain anti-liberal and anti-egalitarian ideologies like RWA and SDO, respectively?

1.2. *The duality of human values and its relationships with RWA and SDO*

Permanent preferences of certain values over others can be seen as a characteristic of someone's personality (cf. Schmitt, Schwartz, Steyer, & Schmitt, 1993). In the most influential current theory of personal values, Schwartz (e.g. 2006, 2012) identified ten types of values that could be ordered on two higher-order dimensions: openness to change vs conservation and self-enhancement vs Self-transcendence. As the previous empirical findings show (e.g. McFarland, 2010), clear links between personal values and RWA and SDO exist. People with high RWA put particular emphasis on the motivational goals characteristic of conservation (conformism, tradition, safety) and tend to disfavor motivational goals of openness to change (self-direction, stimulation). On the other hand, people with high SDO tend to disfavor self-transcendence (benevolence, universalism) and put emphasis on self-enhancement (power, achievements).

1.3. *The duality of codes of ethics and its relationships with RWA and SDO*

According to the Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) there are six modular foundations underlying human moral reasoning: Care, Fairness, Liberty, Loyalty, Authority, and Sanctity (Haidt, 2012). As Haidt, Graham and colleagues argue (e.g. Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Graham et al., 2011; Haidt & Graham, 2007), the moral intuitions of Harm/care and Fairness/reciprocity on the one hand, and Ingroup/loyalty and Authority/respect on the other, make up what Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, and Park (1997) called ethics of autonomy and ethics of community, respectively. The ethics of autonomy functions to protect individuals, using concepts such as harm and suffering, rights and justice, freedom and autonomy. In most cultures, however, people believe that there are collective entities worth protecting besides individuals. Therefore, the ethics of community functions to protect groups, institutions, and other collective entities using concepts such as duty, respect, honor, loyalty, and tradition.

Based on the MFT, Graham et al. (2009) showed a consistent pattern of relationships between moral intuitions and socio-political ideologies. Liberals consistently showed greater endorsement and use of the ethics of autonomy foundations (harm/care and fairness/reciprocity) compared to ethics of community foundations (ingroup/loyalty and authority/respect), whereas conservatives endorsed and used all the foundations more equally. Although other researchers showed that moral foundations underlying liberalism and conservatism were not so different as suggested by Haidt and colleagues (e.g. Schein & Gray, 2015), research based on MFT seem to provide important premises for the DPM model. Since both RWA's and SDO's ideological contents are embedded in conservative ideology and reject liberalism, it is reasonable to expect their relationships with moral intuitions to be similar. Indeed, Kugler, Jost, and Noorbaloochi (2014) showed RWA to be positively related to ingroup/loyalty and authority/respect, whereas SDO turned out to be negatively related to harm/care and fairness/reciprocity.

1.4. *Aims and hypotheses*

Empirical findings based on the DPM model argue for two distinct ideological dimensions, best captured by the constructs of RWA and SDO, expressing two distinct sets of motivational goals. The DPM model evidences that motivational goals underlying RWA and SDO directly originate from socialized worldview beliefs. Their role is of a key importance. The Dangerous World belief makes the value or motivational goals of establishing and maintaining collective or societal security, order, cohesion, and stability over others chronically salient for individuals, which are then expressed attitudinally in high RWA. The

second worldview belief, Competitive Jungle Worldview, makes the value or motivational goals of power, dominance, and superiority over others chronically salient for individuals, which are then expressed attitudinally in high SDO. Both beliefs derive from individuals' personalities, and from their exposure to, and socialization in, social environments.

In other words, according to the DPM model the whole "duality" of human values and moral judgments expressed in RWA and SDO originates from some specific worldview beliefs. Although such a conceptualization can be justified by the given theoretical standpoint, it is difficult to be considered sufficient in terms of the fundamental duality of human values and morality. As to the first domain, it may be expected that independently of worldview beliefs: (1) RWA is an expression of the strong preference for conservation values over openness to change values; while (2) SDO is an expression of the preference for self-enhancement values over self-transcendence values.

On the other hand, the analysis of contents and functions as well as the results of Kugler et al.'s (2014) research clearly suggest a "moral duality" corresponding to the DPM model. It may be expected that independently of worldview beliefs: (3) RWA is an expression of the virtues of the ethics of community; while (4) SDO is an expression of the sins of the ethics of autonomy.

Moreover, axiological as well as moral duality do not overlap. For example, an individual's preference for openness to change (personal autonomy) does not necessarily determine rejection of the ethics of community, and the preference for self-enhancement values does not necessarily imply rejection of the ethics of autonomy. Instead, their interactive effects increasing the motivational power of RWA or SDO can be inferred. Specifically, one should rather expect: (5) the highest level of RWA when the strong preference for conservation values coincides with the high ethics of community; and (6) the highest level of SDO when the strong preference for self-enhancement values coincides with the low ethics of autonomy.

To sum up, the above argumentation claims that worldview beliefs pointed out in the DPM model are only specific cognitive representations of the duality of human values and moral judgments influencing RWA and SDO. In such a form the actual motivational duality seems to be excessively reduced. The study presented below was designed to remove these doubts.

2. *Methods and materials*

2.1. *Participants*

The sample consisted of 750 adult Poles: 52.7% females and 47.3% males. It included 20.4% of respondents in the 18 to 30 age bracket, 27.9 aged 31–44, 25.3% aged 45–60, and 26.4% above 60. Primary and lower education was held by 9.5% of respondents, vocational – 35.7%, secondary and post-secondary – 34.2%, and 20.6% of the respondents had higher education.

2.2. *Procedure*

A survey study was conducted. Respondents were selected to the random-quota sample based on a two-stage procedure: 1) random sampling of urban and rural areas, and then 2) random selection of respondents (quotas defined by the combinations of three criteria: sex, age, and education). Interviews were conducted in respondents' homes by trained interviewers using a computerized questionnaire format.

2.3. *Measures*

2.3.1. *Bi-dimensional preferences for values*

In Schwartz's model a variety of personal values express the diversity of human motives. The higher-order dimensions show how that diversity can be structuralized, but they are recognized rather as general labels describing groups of values than as independent constructs

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/889705>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/889705>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)