

Winter 4-30-2014

Examining the underlying complexity of free market beliefs

Chad R. Buckland

King's University College, cbuckland@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK_uht



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buckland, Chad R., "Examining the underlying complexity of free market beliefs" (2014). *Undergraduate Honors Theses*. 11.
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK_uht/11

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca, wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

Examining the Underlying Complexity of Free Market Beliefs

Chad R. Buckland

Honours Thesis

Department of Psychology

King's University College at *The University of* Western Ontario

London, CANADA

April 2014

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Chris Roney

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the different underlying motivations, beliefs and personality factors that influence endorsement of a free-market economy. A questionnaire was designed using unexplored dimensions of free-market beliefs and existing measures (Free-market Ideology, Fair Market Ideology) and other measures of political orientations (Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation) to explore different predictors of these beliefs. Three hundred and twenty participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) who proceeded to complete the questionnaires online. Results indicated that belief in a free-market system can be differentiated into five factors, and these factors are predicted by a myriad of political, personal, religious, and autonomy beliefs. These results support multiple dimensions underlying free-market attitudes and raise questions regarding this as a “conservative” domain.

Examining the Underlying Complexity of Free Market Beliefs

Political partisanship in the United States and Canada has led to a gradual decline in civilized political discourse in both countries. This inability to reach consensus frequently revolves around budgetary matters and the economy. As politicians become further entrenched in their party's policies regarding monetary issues, rather than examining the realities of the North American economy, parties appear increasingly homogenous in their views. This inability to compromise has led to a similar homogeneity in political discourse in the media, and as a result, in the lives of both Canadians and Americans. Although unproductive partisan political discussion affects all realms of political discourse, it is often particularly vitriolic when regarding the economy and the financial markets. This combative discourse is occasionally reflected physically in the public sphere, as seen with recent occupy Wall Street demonstrations and police interactions. Both the political right and left appear firmly entrenched in their respective policy toward regulating the free market system.

Although these entrenched positions may make political attitudes seem relatively simple, work by psychologists suggests that there may be substantial complexity underlying people's beliefs. Research conducted by Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, and Sulloway (2003) indicates that individuals base their personal political belief systems around existential needs and ideological rationalizations. Individuals varying in personality and ideological rationalizations can still hold similar political beliefs, suggesting that specific political beliefs can exist for a variety of reasons. Similarly, Cornelis and Van Hiel (2006) argue that political beliefs should not be attributed to a singular individual orientation, and should instead be considered as stemming from attitudinal ideologies such as right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. In turn, a broad range of socio-cognitive needs, motives, values and worldviews may be related

to these distinct ideologies, and independently predict such belief systems. Research into free market attitudes has found that similar ideological attitudes and their related cognitions form a complex array of interconnected belief systems between other social aspects of conservatism (Cornelis & Van Hiel, 2006).

The current study's purpose is to investigate the different underlying motivations, beliefs and personality factors that influence endorsement of a free-market economy. This is an important consideration due to the reciprocal relationship between the political systems people espouse, and the underlying beliefs that influence these systems (Jost & Thompson, 2000). In order to understand these interconnected belief systems, it is important to understand the complexity of their associated ideologies. Hopefully, this research can also help us to understand how and why free-market attitudes relate to other facets of conservatism, because there is often no obvious reason for the beliefs to be related, and sometimes they may even seem contradictory (for example, pro free-market attitudes and anti-immigration attitudes are both associated with conservatism). This research aims to do this by examining free-market attitudes as a potentially diverse set of beliefs, rather than as a singular dimension.

Free-market beliefs are rooted in the suppositions of the 18th century philosopher Adam Smith, and his appraisal of the nature of human economic systems and their basis in self-interest. In his book *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Smith (1776/1986) discussed how rational self-interest and competition can lead to economic prosperity through the creation of a free-market economy. This economic philosophy is often referred to as “laissez faire” (leave alone) economics, although there is evidence that Smith's ideas may have been misinterpreted, and that *The Wealth of Nations* contained support for proportionate taxation and regulation of the markets (Smith, 1986). Recent research has led to the development of measures

used to determine an individual's endorsement of this belief system, referred to as Free-market Ideology (FMI), and these studies have contributed valuable insight into the underlying complexity behind such endorsement (Roney & Alexander, 2000; Roney, 2008). These measures have also been found to correlate with a range of conservative beliefs and attitudes, including right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, support for repressive government, negative perceptions of immigration, and measures of modern prejudice (Barreca, 2003; Roney, 2008; Roney & Alexander, 2000).

Espousing the virtues of free markets has become a cornerstone of the political right, but recent research has indicated that these individuals may not all believe in free markets for the same reasons. While conservative economic beliefs are often portrayed as homogenous by the media, the factors underlying these beliefs often differ. Recent research has pointed to a connection between belief in a free market system (what Roney and Alexander call Free-market Ideology – FMI), social dominance orientation (SDO), and right wing authoritarianism (RWA) (Roney, 2009). Importantly, RWA and SDO were found to relate independently to FMI, suggesting two different paths linking free-market beliefs to aspects of social conservatism. This research also revealed another factor reflecting pro free-market attitudes that are unrelated to social conservatism (Roney, 2009). Research conducted by Jost, Blount, Pfeffer, and Hunyady (2003) has indicated that endorsing the free-market system may be the result of individuals' beliefs that the economic systems we participate in are inherently fair. Religiosity, beliefs surrounding fate, and ideas regarding social justice may also play a key role in predicting belief in a free market system (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Kay, Callan, Gaucher, Laurin, Napier, 2008).

These findings are consistent with other research showing that elements of social and

general conservatism correlate with conservative economic beliefs despite the apparent lack of obvious relevance between certain constructs and fiscal concerns, as mentioned above (Altemeyer, 2004; Cornelis & Van Hiel, 2006; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Pratto, Sidianus, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Some insight into the reasons for the link between free-market beliefs and other aspects of conservatism are suggested by the fact that free-market ideology was independently predicted by the constructs of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation, two aspects of social conservatism that will be discussed in detail below (Camman 2009; Roney, 2008). This suggests at least two different links between social conservatism and FMI. Furthermore, this research on FMI revealed a factor that represents conservative economic belief coupled with more liberal social beliefs, suggesting that some pro free-market beliefs do not correlate with other aspects of conservatism. These findings suggest that free-market attitudes may not be as homogenous as previous research has suggested, and differences in the social-cognitive underpinnings behind these ideologies may indicate a greater underlying complexity behind these ideologies than previously thought. To gain possible insight into the different facets of free-market attitudes, the distinct constructs that have been found to independently predict FMI will be considered next.

Right wing authoritarianism, which involves belief in authority, conformity, security, order and structure, has a long history in psychological research (Altemeyer, 1981). Initial research on authoritarianism, conducted by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) into the origins of fascism and Nazism, was later refined by the work of Altemeyer (1981) who defined right-wing authoritarianism as a personality trait. Research has indicated that this psychological construct correlates with traditional conservative beliefs and associated political attitudes (Altemeyer, 1988; Jost, Glaser, et al. 2003). Right-wing authoritarianism has been

linked to the co-varying attitudes of submission to perceived authority, authority-sanctioned aggressiveness toward other groups and perceptions of conventions endorsed by this authority (Altemeyer, 1981/1988). It is the trait of conventionality that Altemeyer (1988) proposed was actually behind belief in FMI, as the free market system has historical relevance and has been in place for a substantial period of time. It has also been proposed that there is a punitive aspect to RWA that leads these individuals to espouse the virtues of a free market system, as it allows for the maintenance of disadvantaged positions and a lack of government support for perceived outgroups (Roney, 2009). These suppositions provide possible insight into why individuals who are high in their desire for conformity, security, order and structure support a free market system with no government oversight (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008).

The current study examined different aspects of free-market attitudes by developing new questions designed to reflect a variety of possible dimensions. For example, based on the correlation with RWA, items have been designed to capture traditionalist views of free market systems that justify its continued acceptance based on its historical significance and entrenched position in the North American economy (i.e., it is now part of our cultural “tradition”). Additionally, the new questionnaire includes items regarding individuals’ view on socialism, a political system viewed by some as antithetical to the North American tradition of capitalism. It is believed that these items will reflect the cognitive underpinning of conventionality proposed by Altemeyer (1988). In addition to these traditionalism-based items, punitiveness items have been added to the new questionnaire as well. These items attempt to capture the punitive elements of RWA related to sanctioned aggression toward other groups, in this case by highlighting an absence of government interference to help people who are economically disadvantaged (Altemeyer, 1988; Roney, 2009). It is hypothesized that conventionality and

punitiveness may represent two independent facets of free-market attitudes. Consequently, these findings may help support Altemeyer's argument that RWA is comprised of three co-varying attitudes (Altemeyer, 1988); however, it may also indicate that the punitive aspect of RWA represents an independent pathway toward endorsing FMI.

Social dominance orientation (Pratto et al., 1994), the belief in social hierarchy and that some individuals are more deserving of resources than others, is another factor that correlates highly with belief in a free-market economy independently from right-wing authoritarianism. The relationship between SDO and FMI seems intuitive due to the inherent assumption associated with SDO that there is legitimate inequality between groups, and a free market system allows for this inequality to exist (Pratto et al., 1994). These groups are differentiated through gender, ethnicity, class, and other social constructs (Sidianus & Pratto, 1999). The hierarchical belief system associated with SDO is not dictated by the individual's position within the social hierarchy, but these beliefs are more prevalent amongst high-status groups (Pratto, Sidianus, Levin, & Pratto, 1996). Although support for social dominance is more frequently found amongst high-status groups, it is also found in some members of low-status groups that support the systems that may contribute to their disadvantaged position (Jost & Thompson, 2000). Additionally, individuals' SDO scores have been found to remain relatively stable over time (Pratto, Sidianus, & Levin, 2006). Altemeyer (2004) has argued that while RWA is often a product of upbringing, SDO should be conceptualized as a combination of genetic, situational and socio-cultural factors.

Recent research into the connection between SDO and FMI has examined the role of the belief system of meritocracy. Meritocracy is the belief that resource allocation is based on the worthiness of the recipient, and a preference for this principle indicates an endorsement of

resource allocation rooted in distributive justice principles (Davey, Bobocel, Son Hing, & Zanna, 1999). Research conducted by Mitchell, Tetlock, Newman, and Lerner (2003) has suggested that individuals are willing to accept situations of economic inequality if they are a result of distribution based on merit. This may help to explain why individuals in disadvantaged groups still measure high in SDO if they assume that the process leading to this situation was fair. It was also found that an individual's perception that meritocracy exists has been shown to significantly mediate the relationship between SDO and FMI (Davelaar, 2012). The current study has added items to the new FMI questionnaire that relate to free-markets providing competition that allows the "better" groups to do better, based on a SDO model. It was hypothesized that these new items would constitute a distinct factor that will predict belief in both SDO and FMI. In addition to these new items, a shortened version of the distributive justice beliefs scale by Lucas, Zdhanova and Alexander (2011) has been included. It was hypothesized that this scale would correlate with SDO, FMI, and the competition based items created for the new questionnaire.

Research expanding on the connection between meritocracy and SDO has explored the relationship between SDO and system justification (Kay, Gaucher, Peach, Laurin, Friesen, Zanna, & Spencer, 2009). System justification is an ideology that is associated with a willingness to maintain situations of social inequality, and may provide an explanation for the link between SDO and prejudice (Kay et al. 2009). This illustrates a dilemma regarding the SDO link with FMI; theoretically, free markets should be dynamic and allow for change in economic circumstances, something that should not be appealing if the true basis for one's attitudes is maintaining one's own positive status. These considerations led to the creation of items for the current study that emphasize the free-market systems potential for economic change. It is believed that these items will be negatively correlated with measures of SDO, indicating that

certain individuals who espouse FMI do so based on system justification and protection of people's advantaged position, rather than the free market's potential for competition.

In addition to the relationship between RWA, SDO, and FMI discussed above, a second factor involving conservative economic beliefs coupled with liberal social beliefs (support for welfare) has been explored, and has also been shown to independently predict the endorsement of a free-market economy (Roney, 2009). In order to further explore the implications of this factor, the new questionnaire contains items that measure belief in the free-market system based on pure economics (the belief that the free-market system is economically superior to other economic systems). It was hypothesized that individuals who score highly on measures of FMI, but not on measures of SDO and RWA, would also score highly on these measures of pure economics. The study of this group may be particularly important with respect to questions regarding the placement of free-market attitudes with conservatism, as this group may be argued to not be politically conservative, even though they are pro free-market.

Previous research has also examined free-market attitudes emphasizing free markets as a fair system for the distribution of wealth, termed "fair market ideology" (Jost, Blount, Pfeffer, & Hunyady 2003). This research has indicated that despite individuals' endorsement of the free market's fairness, this endorsement of a fair-market is also associated with self-deception, economic system justification, opposition to equality, power distance orientation, belief in a just world, political conservatism, right-wing authoritarianism, and scandal minimization. The current study has included items from the fair-market questionnaire in order to understand the relationship between this measure and the new dimensions being studied. It was expected that these items would correlate with the SDO-related items, but not the RWA-based items.

To further explore the nature of the different dimensions of FMI, several additional

individual difference measures have been included in this study. These include measures of locus of control, a multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality, and items that were developed to measure an individual's mistrust of government and politicians. These measures are largely exploratory and have been included due to recent research and observations of media coverage of political events. Measures of religiosity and spirituality have been included based on recent research that the moral foundations of conservative belief include facets of sanctity and purity (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). Additionally, recent research has indicated that individuals who support governmental and religious systems can be partially explained through these individuals' perceptions of personal control and perceptions of a controlling God (Kay et al., 2008). In order to gauge individuals' perceptions of personal control, items from the James (1963) internal-external locus of control scale will also be included in the current study. It was believed that these items would correlate with RWA, FMI, and the newly created traditionalist view items. The mistrust of government items have been added based on the observation that political discourse in the media frequently centers on suspicions about government corruption and allegations of corruption motivated by self-interest.

In summary, adherence to a given political ideology is related to an individual's underlying psychological beliefs, motives and needs. These underlying cognitions form an interrelated system of beliefs, leading individuals to generate different cognitive pathways to similar political belief systems. These different pathways may lead to a similar political ideology based on the most salient aspects of that ideology, or simply result from a lack of political options. The current study seeks to gain an understanding of the different pathways that lead to belief in a free-market system. In order to clearly organize the various hypotheses, a table detailing the predicted underlying cognitions and their attitudinal correlates has been included

(see Table 1). Whether this belief stems from the cognitive underpinnings of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, or simply the conviction that a free-market system is the most viable economic choice, it is important to understand that individuals who endorse free-market ideology do not represent a homogenous group. By furthering our understanding of the psychological underpinnings behind this belief system, we can begin to reconcile the political disagreements amongst different groups, and move toward a more productive and rational political discourse within governmental systems and our daily lives.

Table 1

Free-Market Dimension	Hypothesized Correlates
Traditionalism	RWA, religiosity, and negatively with locus of control
View of Socialism	RWA and traditionalism
Punitiveness	RWA, religiosity, and distributive justice
Emphasizing Competition	SDO and distributive justice
Emphasizing Change	negatively with SDO
Economic Efficiency	FMI Factor 2
Mistrust of Government/Politicians	Exploratory
Fair Market Items	SDO, RWA, distributive justice, and traditionalism
Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs	Negatively with SDO and RWA

Method

Participants

This study consisted of participants recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk program (MTurk), an online crowd-sourcing marketplace. Research has found that sample populations taken from MTurk are generally representative of the North American population (Berinsky, Huber & Lenz 2012). Recruitment was accomplished through an e-poster (see Appendix A) that was put up on the MTurk's Human Intelligence Task (HIT) page. This poster requested the input of individuals interested in participating in a questionnaire regarding political and economic beliefs, and indicated the length of the study and reimbursement of three dollars that individuals would receive for their participation. The poster also requested North American participants fluent in English. Due to the sign up method, participants were chosen using convenience sampling.

In total, 320 participants were recruited; however, eight participants had to be removed due to errors in their questionnaire data. Demographic information revealed that 284 participants currently reside in the United States, two in Canada, one in Mexico, nine in North America (unspecified), and 16 in India. Additionally, participants reported their nationality, with 253 self-reporting American nationality, one British, two Canadian, two English, 26 Indian, one Mexican-American, one Polish, one Vietnamese, and 25 participants that did not report their nationality. There are 198 male participants accounting for 63.6 percent of all participants. Male participants' ages range between 18 and 56 years ($M = 29.32$, $SD = 7.84$). There are 114 female participants accounting for 36.5 percent of all participants. Female participants' ages range between 21 and 67 years ($M = 34$, $SD = 10.18$). These demographics differ from research conducted by Berinsky, et al. (2012) in that they had found that MTurk samples typically contained larger female

populations, and this difference from the current study may be due to the nature of the topic presented (economics and politics) in the online poster, which are typically associated with male gender norms. Participants then completed an informed consent form by clicking on a statement agreeing to participate in the study and ensuring that they were aware of what the study entailed. After completing the informed consent page and receiving instructions on filling out the questionnaires, participants proceeded to complete each of the questionnaires and were then given an online debriefing form detailing the purpose of the study and suggested readings for interested participants.

Materials

The materials used in this study include measures concerning attitudes relating to free-market capitalism, and several assessing other political and psychological constructs (right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, locus of control, distributive and procedural justice, and religiousness/spirituality). The free-market attitude measures were used to investigate different aspects of these attitudes, and the dimensions that were discovered were used as the primary criterion variables in the analysis.

All of the questionnaires described below were presented via computer using a web site called “Survey Monkey”. All items were responded to using a seven-point Likert-type response format with endpoints labeled “Strongly agree” and “Strongly disagree”. All of the items associated with a given questionnaire were presented on the same screen, with the scale below each. Participants indicated their response by clicking on the number on the scale.

The first questionnaire contained a measure of free market beliefs (see Appendix B). This questionnaire included six items from an existing measure of fair-market ideology (Jost et al, 2003), and 14 items used in previous research by Roney (2009), with seven items measuring

free-market ideology and seven measuring pro free-market, pro-government support for individuals in need. Jost's fair-market questionnaire has been found to have good internal consistency with alphas ranging from (α) = .83 to .89 (Jost et al., 2003). Items associated with two free-market attitude dimensions found by Roney (2009) have also demonstrated acceptable internal reliability (alpha (α) = .84 for pro free-market/pro social programs, and alpha (α) = .78 for free-market ideology)

Also included in this questionnaire are items regarding seven new factors proposed as possible aspects of free-market beliefs. These seven new dimensions exploring belief in a free-market economy include items designed to measure belief in the economic efficiency of free-markets, potential for individuals to change their economic standing, free-market capitalism as a “traditional” aspect of our culture, attitudes toward socialism in general, emphasizing competition, punitiveness toward people viewed as less deserving, and mistrust of government/politicians. Appendix B indicates which items were developed to reflect each hypothesized dimension.

Participants also completed established measures related to political attitudes, Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). The right-wing authoritarianism scale was created by Altemeyer (1981). This measure consists of 24 items, such as “Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down”. This scale has been found to have good internal consistency with alphas ranging from (α) = .85 to .94 (Fodor, Wick, Hartsen & Preve, 2008). Additionally, a 16-item social dominance orientation scale will be included, and has also been found to be internally consistent with a median Cronbach's Alpha (α) = .83 (Pratto et al., 2006). A sample SDO item is “It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.”

These two scales will also function as criterion variables in this study.

Three shortened questionnaires regarding a variety of spiritual and social beliefs have been included. These tests are the shortened seven-item version of the James' internal-external locus of control scale ($\alpha = .71$) (Lumpkin, 1988), a shortened distributive (4 items, alphas ranging from $\alpha = .75$ to $.92$) and procedural (3 items, $\alpha = .92$) justice scale (Gau, 2011; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), and a multidimensional (3 dimensions were included: Personal Spirituality ($\alpha = .75$), Punishing God ($\alpha = .63$), and Forgiveness ($\alpha = .85$)) measure of religiousness/spirituality by Masters et al. (2009) was included. A sample internal-external locus of control item is "Some people seem born to fail while others seem born for success no matter what they do." A sample distributive and procedural justice item is "Other people usually use fair procedures in dealing with others." A sample religiousness/spirituality item is "I try hard to carry my religious beliefs over into all my other dealings in life." These measures also served as additional predictor variables.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk through the use of an online poster. After filling out the consent form and receiving instructions on filling out the questionnaires online, participants proceeded to complete each of the questionnaires. The first questionnaire contained a measure of free market beliefs combined with new FMI items. Participants were also asked to complete a right-wing authoritarianism scale, social dominance orientation scale, an internal-external locus of control scale, a distributive and procedural justice scale and a multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality. These questionnaires were presented in a random sequence to minimize order effects. After completing the questionnaires, participants were sent a debriefing form and contact information should they have any additional

questions or concerns. Participants were also given a human intelligence task (HIT) code, which they then used to receive their reimbursement through the Mechanical Turk's payment protocols.

Results

A Factor Analysis was conducted to determine if the new free-market belief items represent the distinct factors hypothesized. All of the free-market attitude items were included except for those from Jost's fair market ideology questionnaire, since that measure has been previously validated and will be examined as a possible predictor of the factors revealed from the new measure. This analysis indicated that, after orthogonal varimax rotation, five separate factors existed amongst the newly created items. The first factor (26.6% of the variance explained on the rotated factor analysis) included a majority of items from items designed to emphasize the punitive nature of the free market system, followed by free-market ideology items, emphasizing competition items, mistrust in government items, and items created to emphasize the economic efficiency of free markets. This factor seemed to best reflect the belief system labeled free-market ideology by Roney and Alexander (2002), and indicates that, contrary to the hypothesis, the newly created items designed to emphasize punitiveness, competition, and economic efficiency do not represent distinct factors, but are instead components of free-market ideology. Although this factor also contained mistrust of government items, as described below, the majority of these items loaded even more strongly on their own separate factor. In order to eliminate any possible contamination of this measure by the new elements not previously studied (punitiveness, competition, economic efficiency), only the original seven items ($\alpha = .91$) used by Roney and Alexander (2002) were used to construct a measure for further analyses.

The second factor (11% of variance explained on the rotated factor analysis) appears to be defined by items that were designed to measure respondents' mistrust of government.

Although some mistrust items also loaded high on factor 1, the majority of items loaded most highly on this second factor. A third factor (8% variance explained on the rotated factor analysis) had only items designed to emphasize the market's potential as an agent of economic change loading highly on it. A fourth dimension (7.4% variance explained on the rotated factor analysis) was defined primarily by high-loading items that emphasized free markets as a traditional element in western economies. Lastly, a fifth factor (4.6% variance explained on the rotated factor analysis) had items from Roney's (2008) pro-welfare free market beliefs load highly on it.

Reliability analyses were then conducted on the original FMI items and the composite variables calculated for the four additional factors described above (see Table 2), as well as the other, previously designed, measures (see Table 3) included with the new questionnaire (Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, James' Locus of Control, Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality, Distributive and Procedural Justice, and Fair-market Ideology scale). Descriptive statistics for the new composite free-market attitude variables are presented in Table 4, and for the other measures in Table 5. Correlations among the composite free-market variables are presented in Table 6 and for the previously established measures in Table 7.

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha for Free-market Ideology (FMI), Mistrust of Government (MoG), Emphasizing Free-market Change (EFMC), Emphasizing Free-market Traditions (EFMT), and Pro-Welfare Free-market Beliefs (PWFMB) scales

<u>FMI</u>	<u>MoG</u>	<u>EFMC</u>	<u>EFMT</u>	<u>PWFMB</u>
0.91 (7 items)	0.86 (3 items)	0.84 (5 items)	0.82 (5 items)	0.71 (4 items)

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha for Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), James' Locus of Control (JLoC), Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMRS), Distributive Justice (DJ), Procedural Justice (PJ), and Fair-market Ideology (FairMI) scales

<u>RWA</u>	<u>SDOJ</u>	<u>LoC</u>	<u>BMMRS</u>	<u>DJ</u>	<u>PJ</u>	<u>FairMI</u>
0.93	0.96	0.80	0.93	0.88	0.84	0.77

Table 4

Mean Scores for Free-market Ideology (FMI), Mistrust of Government (MoG), Emphasizing Free-market Change (EFMC), Emphasizing Free-market Traditions (EFMT), and Pro-Welfare Free-market Beliefs (PWFMB) scales

<u>FMI</u>	<u>MoG</u>	<u>EFMC</u>	<u>EFMT</u>	<u>PWFMB</u>
3.93 (1.43)	4.35 (1.46)	4.95 (1.06)	4.36 (1.17)	5.24 (1.03)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Table 5

Mean Scores for Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), James' Locus of Control (JLoC), Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMRS), Distributive Justice (DJ), Procedural Justice (PJ), and Fair-market Ideology (FairMI) scales

<u>RWA</u>	<u>SDO</u>	<u>LoC</u>	<u>BMMRS</u>	<u>DJ</u>	<u>PJ</u>	<u>FairMI</u>
3.57(1.10)	2.48(1.29)	4.16(1.08)	3.46(1.75)	4.45(1.22)	4.3 (1.19)	3.85(1.09)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations

Table 6

Correlations among Fair-market Ideology (FairMI), Free-market Ideology (FMI), Mistrust of Government (MoG), Emphasizing Free-market Change (EFMC), Emphasizing Free-market Traditions (EFMT), and Pro-Welfare Free-market Beliefs (PWFMB) scales

	FairMI	FMI	MoG	EFMC	EFMT	PWFMB
FairMI	1					
FMI	0.80**	1				
MoG	0.57**	0.79**	1			
EFMC	0.49**	0.53**	0.47**	1		
EFMT	0.38**	0.34**	0.33**	0.42**	1	
PWFMB	-0.30**	-0.36**	-0.22**	<i>ns</i>	-0.18**	1

Note. * $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Table 7

Correlations among Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), James' Locus of Control (JLoC), Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMRS), Distributive Justice (DJ), Procedural Justice (PJ), and Fair-market Ideology (FairMI) scales

	SDO	RWA	BMMRS	LoC	DJ	PJ	FairMI
SDO	1						
RWA	0.46**	1					
BMMRS	0.08	0.52**	1				
LoC	0.10	-0.49	0.11	1			
DJ	0.28**	0.36**	0.21**	-0.11	1		
PJ	0.15*	0.21**	0.17**	-0.10	0.76**	1	
FairMI	0.46**	0.59**	0.25**	-0.10	0.50**	0.44**	1

Note. * $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Free-market Ideology

In order to confirm previous findings that free-market ideology (FMI) was independently predicted by right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation, a series of regression analyses were conducted using FMI as the dependent variable, and RWA and SDO as the independent variables both individually and when entered simultaneously. The analysis confirmed that both RWA and SDO are significant independent predictors of FMI (see Table 8).

Table 8

Regressions for free-market composite variables, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), and SDO and RWA entered simultaneously as predictor variables

Free Market Dimension	Variable		
	RWA	SDO	RWA/SDO
Free Market Ideology	$\beta = .61, p < .001$	$\beta = .58, p < .001$	RWA: $\beta = .44, p < .001$ SDO: $\beta = .37, p < .001$
Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs	$\beta = -.17, p < .05$	$\beta = -.45, p < .001$	RWA: $\beta = .04, ns$ SDO: $\beta = -.46, p < .001$
Mistrust of Government/Politicians	$\beta = .39, p < .001$	$\beta = .37, p < .001$	RWA: $\beta = .28, p < .001$ SDO: $\beta = .25, p < .001$
Emphasizing Change	$\beta = .33, p < .001$	$\beta = .17, p < .05$	RWA: $\beta = .31, p < .001$ SDO: $\beta = .05, ns$
Traditionalism	$\beta = .25, p < .001$	$\beta = .08, ns$	-

A series of regression analyses were then conducted using the previously developed measures (Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, James' Locus of Control, Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality, Distributive and Procedural Justice, and Fair-market Ideology scale) entered independently as predictor variables and FMI as the criterion variable (see Table 9). This analysis indicated that religiosity, distributive justice, and fair-market ideology all significantly predicted FMI. Procedural justice also significantly predicted FMI; however, for all regression analyses conducted in this study, when distributive and procedural justice measures were entered simultaneously only distributive justice remained a significant predictor of FMI.

Table 9

Regressions for free-market composite criterion variables with Religiosity, Locus of Control, Distributive Justice, and Fair-market Ideology entered simultaneously as predictor variables

Free-market Dimension	Variable			
	Religiosity	Locus of Control	Distributive Justice	Fair-market Ideology
Free-market Ideology	$\beta = .30, p < .001$	$\beta = -.02, ns$	$\beta = .46, p < .001$	$\beta = .81, p < .001$
Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs	$\beta = .11, p = .05$	$\beta = .25, p < .001$	$\beta = -.01, ns$	$\beta = -.30, p < .001$
Mistrust of Government/Politicians	$\beta = .18, p < .05$	$\beta = .02, ns$	$\beta = .30, p < .001$	$\beta = .57, p < .001$
Emphasizing Change	$\beta = .18, p = .001$	$\beta = .08, ns$	$\beta = .33, p < .001$	$\beta = .49, p < .001$
Traditionalism	$\beta = -.04, ns$	$\beta = -.28, p < .001$	$\beta = .17, p < .05$	$\beta = .38, p < .001$

An additional regression analysis was then conducted with all aforementioned independently significant predictors simultaneously entered as predictor variables and FMI as the criterion (see Table 10). The findings indicated that only RWA and SDO maintain their significance. Additionally, due to the high correlation between FMI, the mistrust of government and emphasizing change composite variables a regression analysis was run with mistrust of government and emphasizing change added to the previously mentioned predictor variables. Emphasizing change ($\beta = .17, p < .001$) and mistrust of government ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) were found to significantly predict FMI, alongside SDO ($\beta = .35, p < .001$), RWA ($\beta = .18, p < .001$), and religiosity ($\beta = .08, p < .05$).

Table 10

Regressions for free-market composite criterion variables with Religiosity, Locus of Control,

Distributive Justice, RWA, and SDO entered simultaneously as predictor variables

Free Market Dimension	Variable				
	Religiosity	Locus of Control	Distributive Justice	RWA	SDO
Free Market Ideology	$\beta = .08, ns$	<i>not used</i>	$\beta = .08, ns$	$\beta = .35, p < .001$	$\beta = .37, p < .001$
Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs	$\beta = .14, p < .05$	$\beta = .29, p < .001$	<i>not used</i>	$\beta = -.21, ns$	$\beta = -.47, p < .001$
Mistrust of Government/Politicians	$\beta = -.01, ns$	<i>not used</i>	$\beta = .14, ns$	$\beta = .24, p < .05$	$\beta = .22, p < .001$
Emphasizing Change	$\beta = .01, ns$	<i>not used</i>	$\beta = .23, p < .05$	$\beta = .23, p < .05$	$\beta = .02, ns$
Traditionalism	<i>not used</i>	$\beta = -.23, p < .001$	$\beta = .11, ns$	$\beta = .20, p < .05$	<i>not used</i>

Jost's Fair-market Ideology

The one existing measure of free-market attitudes by Jost (2003), emphasizes a belief in the fairness of these markets. When this fair-market ideology measure was entered into a series of regression analyses with the aforementioned free-market dimensions it was found to significantly predict a range of free market dimensions, including FMI, and the mistrust of government, emphasizing change, and traditionalism composite variables (see Table 9). However, pro-welfare free-market beliefs were negatively predicted by fair-market ideology. Based on the significant correlations between fair-market ideology (see Table 6), FMI, and the free-market composite variables, a regression analysis was run using fair-market ideology as the criterion variable and FMI, and the composites as predictor variables, added simultaneously as predictors (see Table 11). This analysis indicated that FMI and the traditionalism composite variable significantly predicted fair-market ideology, and the mistrust of government composite variable negatively predicted fair-market ideology. Due to measurement choices, fair-market ideology has been omitted from the majority of aforementioned regression analysis, as it has been created as its own measure of free-market beliefs, and the extremely high correlation and beta with FMI suggests that it is primarily redundant with that factor.

Table 11

Regressions for Fair-market Ideology as the criterion variables and FMI, Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs, Mistrust of Government/Politicians, Emphasizing Change, and Traditionalism composites as predictor variables

	Free Market Dimension				
	Free-market Ideology	Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs	Mistrust of Government/Politicians	Emphasizing Change	Traditionalism
Fair-market Ideology	$\beta = .87$, ns $p < .001$	$\beta = -.02$, ns	$\beta = -.20$, $p < .001$	$\beta = .07$, ns	$\beta = .12$, $p < .05$

Pro-welfare Free-market Beliefs

In order to confirm previous findings that pro-welfare free-market beliefs were not positively related to right-wing authoritarianism or social dominance orientation as FMI is, a series of regression analyses were conducted using the pro-welfare free-market beliefs composite as the criterion variable, and RWA and SDO as the predictor variables both individually and when entered simultaneously. The analysis indicated that both RWA and SDO were significantly negatively predicting pro-welfare free-market beliefs when entered individually (see Table 8), and that only SDO was a significant negative predictor when both variables were entered simultaneously. These findings support previous findings by Roney (2008), that these pro free-market individuals do not show the same pattern of beliefs as those supporting FMI.

A series of regression analyses were then conducted using the other measures included with the new questionnaire entered independently as predictor variables and the pro-welfare free-market beliefs composite as the criterion variable (see Table 9). This analysis indicated that religiosity and locus of control significantly predicted pro-welfare free-market beliefs. Conversely, fair-market ideology was found to negatively predict pro-welfare free-market beliefs.

A final regression analysis was then conducted with all aforementioned independently significant predictors used as predictor variables and the pro-welfare free-market beliefs composite as the criterion variable (see Table 10). The findings indicate that only locus of control and religiosity maintained their independent significance, while SDO was found to significantly negatively predict pro-welfare free-market beliefs.

Mistrust of Government

A series of regression analyses were conducted using the mistrust of government composite variable as the dependent variable, and RWA and SDO as the independent variables both individually and when entered simultaneously. These analyses were conducted for the dimensions of free-market beliefs to test Jost's (Jost, Glaser, et al. 2003) assertion that RWA and SDO provide the foundations for conservative beliefs. The analysis confirmed that both RWA and SDO are significant independent predictors of mistrust of government (see Table 8). A series of regression analyses were then run using the other measures entered independently as predictor variables and mistrust of government as the criterion variable (see Table 9). This analysis indicated that religiosity, distributive justice, and fair-market ideology all significantly predicted mistrust of government.

An additional regression analysis was then run with all aforementioned independently significant predictors used as predictor variables and the mistrust of government composite as the criterion variable (see Table 10). The findings indicate that only RWA and SDO maintain their independent significance, indicating that the significant results found when religiosity and distributive justice were entered individually can be accounted for by their overlap with RWA and SDO. Due to the very high correlation between mistrust of government and FMI an additional regression analysis was run with FMI added to the previously mentioned predictor variables. FMI was found to independently predict mistrust of government ($\beta = .930, p < .001$), with SDO now negatively predicting mistrust for government ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$) and RWA no longer a significant predictor. It appears that free-market Ideology is responsible for the links between anti-government attitudes and the other variables. Additionally, due to the high correlation between the mistrust of government and emphasizing change composite variables a regression analysis was run with emphasizing change added to the previously mentioned

predictor variables (without FMI). Emphasizing change was found to significantly predict mistrust of government ($\beta = .37, p < .001$), alongside SDO ($\beta = .22, p < .001$) and RWA ($\beta = .15, p < .05$).

Emphasizing Change

In order to test the hypothesis that SDO would negatively predict emphasizing the free markets as agents of economic change, a series of regression analyses were conducted using the emphasizing change composite variable as a criterion variable, and RWA and SDO as predictor variables both individually and when entered simultaneously. The analysis confirmed that both RWA and SDO are significant predictors of emphasizing change when entered individually (see Table 8), which did not support the hypothesis; however, when entered simultaneously, only RWA was found to significantly predict emphasizing change. A series of regression analyses were then run using the other measures entered separately as predictor variables and the emphasizing change composite as the criterion variable (see Table 9). This analysis indicated that religiosity and distributive justice significantly predicted emphasizing change.

A regression analysis was then conducted with all aforementioned independently significant predictors used as simultaneously entered predictor variables and the emphasizing change composite as the criterion variable. The findings indicate that only RWA and distributive justice maintain their independent significance. Due to the high correlation between the emphasizing change and mistrust of government composite variables a final regression analysis was run with mistrust of government added to the previously mentioned predictor variables. FMI ($\beta = .33, p < .001$) and mistrust of government ($\beta = .20, p < .05$) were found to independently predict emphasizing change, and RWA and distributive justice were no longer significant predictors.

Traditionalism

In order to confirm the hypothesis that RWA, religiosity and locus of control would predict traditionalist beliefs about the free markets, a series of regression analyses were conducted using the traditionalism composite variable as a criterion variable, and RWA and SDO as predictor variables both individually and when entered simultaneously. The analysis confirmed that only RWA predicted traditionalism (see Table 8), which supported the hypothesis. A series of regression analyses were then run using the other established measures entered individually as predictor variables and the traditionalism composite as the criterion variable (see Table 9). This analysis indicated that only locus of control and distributive justice significantly predicted emphasizing change, but religiosity was not found to be a significant predictor, contrary to hypotheses.

A final regression analysis was then conducted with all aforementioned independently significant predictors used as predictor variables and the traditionalism composite as the criterion variable. The findings indicate that only RWA and locus of control maintain their independent significance.

Discussion

The initial factor analysis conducted in this study indicated that the largest factor seems to correspond to Roney and Alexander's (2008) free-market Ideology dimension. Examining the highly loading items on this factor indicates that individuals who are characterized as free-market ideologues support free-markets in totality, as well as a number of other beliefs that may help to explain their complete and seemingly unqualified support. Punitiveness items such as "Those individuals who cannot compete in a free-market economy should not be coddled, but left to their own devices.", as well as previously established FMI items, were among the highest

loading items on this factor, suggesting that belief in the punitive nature of free-market capitalism appears to be an important aspect of FMI. This may help to explain the connection between FMI and RWA, as research by Roney (2009) has indicated that individuals may espouse the virtues of a free market system because it allows for the maintenance of disadvantaged positions and a lack of government support for perceived outgroups. Mistrust in government also appears to be closely linked with FMI, since, even though it emerged as the second independent factor, many of these items also loaded highly on factor 1, and the correlations between the computed measures was very high. Mistrust in government may play an important role in predicting belief in a free-market system as a facet of FMI, as well as representing an independent pathway to espousing the benefits of a free-market system. One possibility is that, given the link to punitiveness in FMI individuals, but not individuals whose primary concern is a mistrust in government, it may be government's role in helping "those who can't compete" that leads to mistrust or dislike of government for free-market ideologues, while this may not necessarily be the case for individuals who are primarily concerned with the government's trustworthiness. Further research into the relationship between FMI and mistrust of government may be warranted given these findings.

The hypothesis that Free-Market Ideology (FMI) would be independently predicted by both Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) was supported. Additionally, Religiosity, Distributive Justice and Jost's Fair Market items also predicted FMI. These findings are similar to those found in previous research on free-markets by Roney (2008) and Jost (2003). These results support the idea that Free-market ideology is comprised of a multitude of conservative beliefs.

The hypothesis that another factor, belief in a free-market system coupled with support for government programs helping individuals in need, exists separately from FMI, and also from RWA and SDO was fully supported; this factor was revealed in the factor analysis, and RWA and SDO were found to be significant negative predictors of these pro-welfare free-market beliefs. This dimension of free-market beliefs may be described as a belief that governments should enforce social programs while encouraging free-market capitalism. In other words, there are limits to the free market, and helping people in need is one exception, an exception that is notably not represented in FMI. This supports previous research by Roney (2008) that belief in a free-market system is not necessarily linked to other socially conservative beliefs, and refutes the supposition that free-market beliefs are predicted solely by other conservative beliefs and attitudes.

Although both SDO and RWA were found to negatively predict pro-welfare free-market beliefs, when entered simultaneously only SDO was found to significantly negatively predict this dimension of free-market beliefs, suggesting that the overlap between these correlated attitudes accounted for the original significant finding for RWA. This finding indicates that people represented by this factor most notably are against notions of social inequality (part of SDO beliefs). This supposition somewhat supported by the finding that locus of control significantly predicts pro-welfare free-market beliefs while distributive justice does not, as individuals who hold these beliefs may view individuals as having a degree of agency over their situation, but understand that obstacles outside of their control, like low socio-economic status, must be addressed in order for individuals to properly wield this agency.

As discussed above, general mistrust of government appears to provide a distinct dimension of free-market beliefs; it was also found to be independently predicted by RWA and

SDO. Additionally, when entered individually, mistrust of government was found to be predicted by Religiosity and Distributive Justice; however, when all of these measures were input simultaneously in a regression analysis, only RWA and SDO were found to significantly predict mistrust in government. This dimension is closely linked with FMI, but may include individuals who view government non-interference as being of paramount importance; in other words, these individuals have a negative view of government more than a positive view of free markets. Interestingly, when FMI was added as a predictor variable with the aforementioned measures, only FMI was found to significantly predict mistrust of government, as RWA was no longer a significant predictor and SDO negatively predicted mistrust of government. The significant correlation between a mistrust of government and FMI requires further explanation, and these puzzling findings warrant further research into the co-varying attitudes that comprise SDO and RWA.

A dimension emphasizing free markets as agents of economic change was found to be predicted by RWA and, contrary to the hypothesis, positively by SDO; however, when a regression analysis was run with both SDO and RWA simultaneously entered as predictors, RWA was found to be the only factor to significantly predict a belief in a changing free-market system. These results appeared to indicate that individuals who believe that the free-market should provide opportunity for economic change do so because this change has traditionally been a part of the free-market system; for example, the idea that anyone can get ahead with hard work in market capitalism is likely part of the “Western” tradition that free-markets are part of. Distributive justice and religiosity were also found to predict the emphasizing change composite variable, which raises questions about the perceptions individuals who hold these beliefs have about the inherent “fairness” of the world. However, when FMI and the mistrust of government

composite variable were added as predictor variables with the other belief systems included in the analysis, only FMI and mistrust of government were found to significantly predict belief in the free markets as agents of economic change. Due to the exploratory nature of this aspect of free-market beliefs, future research that expands upon the items used in this questionnaire is warranted. Emphasizing that free-market systems allow anyone to achieve success is central to the narrative surrounding free-market beliefs; therefore, closely examining the belief that a free-market system should allow for economic change may provide insight into the meritocratic nature of free-market beliefs.

A new free-market dimension emphasizing the position of the free-market as a traditional economic system was found to be significantly predicted by RWA but not SDO. This finding supports the hypothesis that a subset of FMI believers (those high in RWA) may believe in a free-market system because it adheres to previously established cultural conventions, a supposition originally put forth by Altemeyer (1988). Supporting the original hypothesis, locus of control was found to significantly negatively predict belief in free-markets as reflecting our traditional economic system. These findings suggest that supporting free-markets because they are a part of Western, or possibly especially North American economic traditions may de-emphasize individual control as part of the free market rationale. Consequently, individuals who believe in a traditional economic systems may do so because they prefer established systems as methods of economic control rather than the agency of individuals. Contrary to the original hypothesis, religiosity was not found to significantly predict traditionalist views of a free-market system. This may indicate that individuals who believe in this dimension of free-markets do so because they are invested in previously established western systems rather than adhering to traditional belief systems in all aspects of their lives.

Jost's (2003) Fair-market Ideology was found to be significantly correlated with the majority of free-market dimensions, and does appear to be a significant predictor of certain facets of free-market beliefs. However, pro-welfare free-market beliefs were found to be negatively correlated with fair-market items, which indicates that Jost's measure may not encapsulate certain aspects of free-market beliefs. Additionally, a regression analysis using the free-market composites as predictor variables and fair-market items as the criterion variable indicated that only FMI and the traditionalism composite variable significantly predicted fair-market beliefs, and mistrust of government negatively predicted Jost's measure. While fair-market items may serve as predictors of certain conservative dimensions involving the free market, there are elements of free-market beliefs that fair-market items may not capture. Further research into the relationship between fair-market ideology, mistrust of government and pro-welfare free-market beliefs may help in the creation of a more comprehensive measure of free-market attitudes.

The present study has sought to examine the underlying complexity of free-market beliefs and the homogeneity of conservative views. While factor analysis reveals that a large factor comprised of different conservative social and economic beliefs, consistent with previous research by Roney (2008), other factors also are revealed, suggesting that certain groups who are in favour of free-markets may not adhere to all facets this rigid ideology. Pro-welfare free-market beliefs are perhaps the most noteworthy examples of conservative economic beliefs that defy the supposition that free-market beliefs are coupled with socially conservative views. On the contrary, pro-welfare free-market beliefs appear to be negatively predicted by Jost, Glaser et al.'s (2003) proposed bases for conservatism, including measures of Social Dominance Orientation and Right-wing Authoritarianism. Surprisingly, religiosity was found to significantly predict pro-

welfare free-market beliefs, as religiosity is often associated with socially conservative views. Additionally, locus of control was found to significantly predict pro-welfare free-market beliefs, indicating that this group may believe in the autonomy and agency of the individual. These seemingly disparate predictors of pro-welfare free-market beliefs highlight the complexity of the attitudes of individuals who espouse a free-market system. Not only does this group not adhere to preconceived notions of political conservatives, they may have a great deal in common with the politically “left-leaning” individuals.

It is not only liberal social beliefs that highlight the problematic assumption that the underlying attitudes of fiscally conservative individuals are homogenous. A general mistrust of government appears to provide a distinct dimension of free-market beliefs. This dimension is predicted by FMI, but a mistrust of government may prove of greater importance to these individuals than other traditionally conservative views. It is not inconceivable that a fundamental mistrust of government might be mirrored in some people on the political left, with these individuals espousing a variety of socially liberal views but perceiving governments and politicians as untrustworthy. This dimension of free-market beliefs also raises questions about the nature of these individuals’ mistrust of government. Namely, is it the current government that these individuals mistrust or any form of government, or perhaps the politicians who run for political office? Through the creation of an expanded measure designed to emphasize these possible facets of mistrust of government, further research into the nature and scope of this mistrust of government can be undertaken in order to provide a talking point for political discourse that can be engaged in by both sides of the political spectrum.

The link between RWA, SDO, and free-market attitudes has been explored in previous research (Barreca, 2003; Roney, 2008; Roney & Alexander, 2000). The current study sought to

explore the different facets of these underlying attitudinal predictors of pro free-market beliefs by emphasizing the different dimensions of these constructs themselves. Items designed to emphasize the free-market system as part of Western, or North American, cultural tradition indicate that adherence to these traditional beliefs is predicted by RWA. This finding makes intuitive sense as Altemeyer (1988) presented conventionality as one of the three underlying attitudes that comprise this measure. Conversely, it has been proposed that FMI may be linked to the punitive aspect of RWA. The initial factor analysis conducted in this study seems to support this supposition, as all seven items designed to emphasize the punitive nature of free-markets loaded highly alongside FMI items. It seems plausible that punitiveness and traditionalism may represent independent pathways to supporting a free-market economic system. Further regression analyses using only punitiveness or traditionalist items may help to uncover whether these facets of RWA present two distinct attitudinal foundations for free-market attitudes within conservatism.

Further analysis of the different pathways that lead to conservative economic beliefs may help to provide an empirical backing for a critical appraisal of current partisan political systems. The complexity of political attitudes surrounding free-market beliefs indicates that the current party system in North-American politics is woefully underrepresenting the values and desires of different political groups. Similar research into the complexity of the political left may help to stimulate productive political discourse by providing attitudinal similarities between groups that had previously been characterized as polemically opposed. Furthermore, different statistical analysis, such as cluster analysis, may provide a better understanding of the relationships between different political groups, and help politicians to create political platforms that meet the desires of their target groups. Consequently, political parties may gain insight into the underlying

attitudes and beliefs of their constituents and come to recognize that extreme views on either side of the political spectrum may encourage voter apathy. By providing a deeper understanding of the complexity underlying both conservative and liberal attitudes, the current trends of increased voter apathy, vitriolic political discourse, and increasingly polemic party platforms may be reversed, thereby allowing for a political system that recognizes the intricacies of political beliefs and strives to reach compromise rather than grinding to a halt in the face of disagreement.

References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(4), 421-448. doi:10.3200/SOCP.144.4.421-448
- Barreca, K.A. (2003). *Political attitudes: The relation between free-market ideology and support for Hobbe's philosophy of the role of government*. Unpublished honours thesis, King's University College, London, Ontario, Canada.
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's mechanical turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351-368. doi:10.1093/pan/mpr057
- Camman, C. (2009). *Paths to free-market beliefs: Differing motivations for political ideologies*. Unpublished honours thesis, King's University College, London, Ontario, Canada.
- Cornelis, I., & Van Hiel, A. (2006). The impact of cognitive styles on authoritarianism based conservatism and racism. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 28(1), 37-50. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp2801_4
- Davey, L. M., Bobocel, D. R., Son Hing, L. S., & Zanna, M. P. (1999). Preference for the merit principle scale: An individual difference measure of distributive justice preferences. *Social Justice Research*, 12(3), 223-240. doi:10.1023/A:1022148418210
- Davelaar, R. (2012). *Underlying motivations for political attitudes: Free-market ideology and*

- social conservatism*. Unpublished honours thesis, King's University College, London, Ontario, Canada.
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism. A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*(7), 1199-1213. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00086-1
- Fodor, E. M., Wick, D. P., Hartsen, K. M., & Preve, R. M. (2008). Right-Wing authoritarianism in relation to proposed judicial action, electromyographic response, and affective attitudes toward a schizophrenic mother. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(1), 215-233. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00303.x
- Gau, J. M. (2011). The convergent and discriminant validity of procedural justice and police legitimacy: An empirical test of core theoretical propositions. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*(6), 489-498. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.09.004
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029-1046. doi:10.1037/a0015141
- Jost, J. T., Blount, S., Pfeffer, J., & Hunyady, G. (2003). Fair market ideology: Its cognitive-motivational underpinnings. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 25*, 53-91. doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25002-4
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(3), 339-375. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339
- Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among

- African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36(3), 209-232. doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1403
- Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Napier, J. L., Callan, M. J., & Laurin, K. (2008). God and the government: Testing a compensatory control mechanism for the support of external systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 18-35. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.18
- Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Peach, J. M., Laurin, K., Friesen, J., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(3), 421-434. doi:10.1037/a0015997
- Lucas, T., Zhdanova, L., & Alexander, S. (2011). Procedural and distributive justice beliefs for self and others: Assessment of a four-factor individual differences model. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 32(1), 14-25. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001/a000032
- Lumpkin, J. R. (1988). Establishing the validity of an abbreviated locus of control scale: Is a brief Levenson's scale any better?. *Psychological Reports*, 63(2), 519-523.
- Masters, K. S., Carey, K. B., Maisto, S. A., Caldwell, P. E., Wolfe, T. V., Hackney, H. L., France, C. R., & Himawan, L. (2009). Psychometric examination of the brief multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality among college students. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 19(2), 106-120. doi: 10.1080/10508610802711194
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637.
- Mitchell, G., Tetlock, P. E., Newman, D. G., & Lerner, J. S. (2003). Experiments behind the veil:

- Structural influences on judgments of social justice. *Political Psychology*, 24(3), 519-547. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00339
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 271-320. doi:10.1080/10463280601055772
- Roney, C. & Alexander, B. (2008). The psychology of free-market ideology. Unpublished manuscript.
- Roney, C. (2008). [Measures of social attitudes]. Unpublished raw data.
- Roney, C. (2009). The Psychology of Free-market Ideology; Links between Economic and Social Conservatism. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISPP 32nd Annual Scientific Meeting, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Sibley, C., Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 248-279. doi:10.1177/1088868308319226
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1996). Consensual social dominance orientation and its correlates within the hierarchical structure of American society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3), 385-408. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(96)00025-9
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. (1986). *The wealth of nations: An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of*

nations (A. Skinner, Ed.). New York: Penguin. (Original work published 1776).

Appendix A

Poster

Where do you stand on a variety of political and economic issues? Even if you don't consider yourself extremely political, we would like to know your views. Participants will complete 1 fairly large questionnaire (65 questions) and 5 shorter ones (ranging from 7 to 24 questions) online. Participation should take between 30 to 60 minutes, and you will be paid \$3.00

I am looking for adults (over 18) who live in North America and are fluent English speakers to participate.

To accept this HIT, simply complete the study at the following website:

To complete this HIT, enter the code at the end of the study here: _____

Principal Investigator:

Dr. Chris Roney,
Department of Psychology,
King's University College, University of Western Ontario

Appendix B

New FMI Questionnaire

Following are statements about various political points of view that different people hold. On the rating scale below each question, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree			Neither Agree or Disagree			Strongly Disagree

1. Government regulation can only interfere in the production and efficiency of the economy.
2. If the government gets involved in the Free Market it will undoubtedly end in failure, because politicians lack the expertise required to run an economy.
3. Anyone's fortunes can change in a free market system.
4. Programs aimed at helping balance inequalities have a necessary place in our society.
5. The free market system is a fair system._____
6. Regulation of the free market restricts the most skilled and intelligent traders and bankers.
7. The free market has developed as a result of decades of refinement in North America and abroad.
8. Welfare makes people lazy and hurts the economy in the long run.
9. Socialism may work in other countries, but our system has made our country the great nation that it is.
10. Common or "normal" business practices must be fair, or they would not survive._____
11. Regulation of the free market economy only serves to help those individuals unwilling to help themselves.
12. People born into bad circumstances deserve our help to give them a chance in life.
13. A free market system can lead to great gains and losses for all involved.
14. The free market system should not be subject to change, as it is a product of North American values and traditions.
15. Governments should help individuals in need, but should largely leave economic markets and businesses alone.
16. Acting in response to market forces is not always a fair way to conduct business. (R)_____
17. The Socialist systems in some countries punish those who do well, but countries with a tradition of capitalism encourage success.
18. We should maximize free enterprise and minimize government interference.
19. The Government is unable to balance its own budget, and it should stay out the Free Market.
20. In free market systems, people tend to get the outcomes that they deserve._____
21. A free market is a dynamic system in which fortunes can be made or fall at any moment.
22. A market that governs itself will develop its own regulations to protect the economy.
23. The free market provides equal opportunity for any individual to do well; those that don't succeed should not burden those that do.
24. Governments should not interfere with economic markets, but they do have a responsibility to help individuals in need.
25. Free enterprise can run almost everything, including universities and hospitals, better than government bureaucrats.

26. Profitable businesses tend to be more morally responsible than unprofitable businesses. _____
27. The free market provides a mechanism for economic stability in individual wealth (R).
28. If individuals are unable to compete in a free market system they should not bother participating.
29. Economic markets do not fairly reward people (R). _____
30. Fortunes rise and fall in a free market system and are constantly in a state of flux.
31. The Wealthiest bankers and traders have not earned their position at the top in the free market (R).
32. Free enterprise is the best way to run an economy, but social programs to help needy individuals also have their place.
33. No one benefits from regulating a free market, except for those unskilled and unwilling individuals that burden our economy.
34. The intricacies of the Free Market are understood by government officials and should not be left to the private sector (R).
35. Everybody wins from free trade in the end.
36. The free market system is not reflective of the spirit of competition and freedom that has made our country what it is (R).
37. Socialist countries are sure to achieve to economic success (R).
38. Rules and regulations governing free market transactions can only serve to reward undeserving individuals.
39. The less environmentalists interfere with the free market, the better things will be for the economy, and for the environment as well.
40. Interfering with financial markets in any way may hinder efficiency.
41. Governance over the Free Market should be left to bankers and economists, and kept out of the hands of politicians.
42. Stability and a lack of change in the economy are due in part to the nature of the free market (R).
43. Redistribution of wealth allows those at the bottom to hold everyone else back.
44. Politics has no place in the Free Market; politicians are apt to try and further their own careers at the expense of economic growth.
45. The best government is the one that least interferes with the economy and the markets.
46. By hindering the freedom of market interactions, the economy may prove unable to compete in an international setting.
47. The corruption found in modern government demonstrates why it should have no place in the Free Market setting.
48. Given absolute freedom, the competition in financial markets will prevent stagnation.
49. As long as people have a free choice in the marketplace, business cannot be blamed for consumer's mistakes.
50. A free market system is not the best way to discover the most skilled economic players (R). _____
51. It might sound harsh, but free economic markets allow things to work as Darwin suggested, by removing the weak.
52. The free market, like life in general, ensures that the fittest survive, the weak perish, and the world and economy are better for it.
53. North America would not hold the economic power and influence it does today were it not for the free market.

54. The free market is an agent of economic change.
55. Socialist countries are often plagued by corruption.
56. The development of the free market is not the product of the economic needs and desires of the people in Western societies (R).
57. Innovation is discouraged by the unfettered competition of free markets (R).
58. Free-market capitalism and government controlled social programs are not incompatible ideas
59. The traditions of free enterprise and competition in North American and European societies have resulted in the development of the free market.
60. The people at the top in countries with free markets tend to be the most deserving of their position.
61. Politicians are only good at spending money, not making difficult decisions that benefit the economy in the long run.
62. Those individuals who cannot compete in a free-market economy should not be coddled, but left to their own devices.
63. Even undeserving individuals can make their fortunes in a free market system (R).
64. Over-regulation of the free market threatens the position we have earned in the world's economy.
65. It is essential that an economic market be regulated in order to develop the most productive system (R).
66. Without the free market we would not have enjoyed the comforts and luxuries of economic prosperity in this country.
67. A society that values free market capitalism still has a responsibility to maintain social services for individuals.

Key:

- Economic efficiency/Pure economics: 1, 22, 40, 46, 48, 57, 65
Emphasizing change: 3, 13, 21, 27, 30, 42, 54
Traditionalism/This is how we do things: 7, 14, 36, 53, 56, 59, 66
View of Socialism: 9, 17, 37, 55, 64
SDO/Competition: 6, 31, 38, 50, 52, 60, 63
Noncompassion/Vulnerability: 11, 23, 28, 33, 43, 51, 62
Mistrust of Government/Politicians: 2, 19, 34, 41, 44, 47, 61
FMI Factor 1 items: 8, 18, 25, 35, 39, 45, 49
FMI Factor 2 items: 4, 12, 15, 24, 32, 58, 67
Just Fair Market items: 5, 10, 16, 20, 26, 29