

**The Generally-Desirable and -Undesirable Goals of Conservatives and Liberals:
Toward a More Balanced, Data-Driven Account of Political Goals**

Benjamin M. Wilkowski¹, Emilio Rivera¹, Laverl Z. Williamson², Erika DiMariano¹,
Brian P. Meier³, and Adam Fetterman⁴

¹ University of Wyoming, ² Western Wyoming Community College, ³ Gettysburg College,

⁴ University of Houston

Word Count = 4,584

Note: Correspondence can be directed to Benjamin Wilkowski (bwilkows@uwyo.edu). The authors acknowledge funding from Basic Research Grants from the University of Wyoming College of Arts and Sciences and from Gettysburg College. Data, Analytic Code, Verbatim Method files, and Supplement are available at https://osf.io/3xrv5/?view_only=4b91c415e799417eae9e556427af97e. We would like to thank Melissa Villalva, Aaron Moss, Leib Litman, and Cheskie Rosenzweig for their help in collecting Study 4-5 data.

Abstract

What goals drive a person toward political conservatism vs. liberalism? Past theories have answered this question differently, seeming to portray either liberals or conservatives in more positive lights. Debates and allegations of bias have ensued. We propose that a recent, empirically-derived taxonomy of goal-contents (the PINT Taxonomy) can provide new insights. We hypothesized that Tradition and Inclusiveness represent the generally-desirable “values” of conservatives and liberals (respectively); while Elitism and Rebellion represent the generally-undesirable “vices” of conservatives and liberals (respectively). The results of five studies (total $n = 1588$) supported this view. All four goals were uniquely related to political ideology. However, an ideological asymmetry in prejudice was observed for the values, but not for the vices. Tradition, Elitism, and Rebellion were all related to different forms of prejudice, but Inclusiveness was not. Thus, the results support a more balanced account of political goals, while still noting that some asymmetries exist.

(Abstract = 150 words)

Keywords: Political Ideology, Goals, Values, Prejudice, Morality

**The Generally-Desirable and -Undesirable Goals of Conservatives and Liberals:
Toward a More Balanced, Data-Driven Account of Political Goals**

What goals drive people to be conservative or liberal? Past theories offer very different answers to this question, pointing to goals that seem to portray liberals (Janoff-Bulman & Carnes, 2013; Jost, 2019) vs. conservatives (e.g., Conway et al., 2018; Graham et al., 2017) in a more positive light. We propose that a recent, empirically-derived taxonomy of higher-order goal-content (the PINT Taxonomy; Wilkowski et al., 2020; 2021) provides new insights. It suggests a more balanced account, in which generally-desirable goals (“values”) and generally-undesirable goals (“vices”) are associated with both conservatism and liberalism. Nonetheless, it also suggests that some ideological asymmetries in prejudice exist (as discussed more detail below).

Previous Theories and Debates

Early theories (Altemeyer, 1981; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Pratto et al., 1994) emphasized the seemingly undesirable goals of conservatives – namely, goals to support and justify longstanding social inequalities. Duckitt (2001) argued that Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) embodies a goal to support hierarchy and inequality; while Right-Wing-Authoritarianism (RWA) embodies a goal to preserve long-standing conventions. Such theories place prejudice at the very heart of conservatism, as conservatives are thought to be motivated to keep historically disadvantaged groups in disadvantaged positions (see Sibley & Duckitt, 2008 for a meta-analysis). Consistent with this, SDO is related to prejudice against Disadvantaged groups (e.g., Black & unemployed people); while RWA is related to prejudice against Unconventional (e.g., protestors, feminists) and Dangerous groups (e.g., criminals) (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007).

By contrast, Moral Foundations Theory (Graham et al., 2017) emphasizes the seemingly desirable goals of conservatives. It proposes that conservatives are motivated by a set of three “*Binding Moral Foundations*” that presumably unite individuals into communities – namely religious *Purity*, respect for *Authority*, and in-group *Loyalty*. It suggests that liberals rely only on the “*Individualizing Moral Foundations*” of *Harm* and *Fairness*, which protect individuals’ rights but fail to bind people into communities.

The Model of Moral Motives (Janoff-Bulman & Carnes, 2013; 2016) emphasizes the seemingly desirable goals of liberals. It specifically suggests that liberals have their own, distinct set of binding moral motives – *Social Justice* motives, focused on the equal distribution of resources. In agreement with Moral Foundations theory, it suggests that conservatives are motivated by *Social Order* motives.

Other researchers emphasize the seemingly undesirable goals of liberals. Conway et al. (2018) constructed a measure of Left-Wing Authoritarianism (LWA), which refers to blind obedience to scientific (rather than religious) authorities. LWA is as strongly related to liberalism as RWA is related to conservatism. In a similar vein, the Ideological Conflict Hypothesis (Brandt et al., 2014) suggests that liberals and conservatives are equally biased against groups who endorse opposing ideologies. Thus, conservatives may be biased against Black people and Gay men (i.e., predominantly liberal groups); but liberals are biased against the Elderly and the Military (i.e., predominantly conservative groups).

Not surprisingly, these theorists have been critical of each other. Some argue that psychology is dominated by liberals and skeptical of findings that portray conservatives favorably (Duarte et al., 2015; Inbar & Lammers, 2012; Washburn & Skitka, 2019). By contrast, others have maintained that seemingly negative portrayals of conservatives are in fact

empirically supported (Badaan & Jost, 2020; Kugler et al., 2014; Nilsson & Jost, 2020; Sinn & Hayes, 2016).

A Bottom-Up, Empirical Approach

These debates suggest that a bottom-up, empirical approach would be useful. Previous research use a top-down approach, in which researchers first propose a theory and then use it to guide research. Researchers' pre-existing beliefs could bias many steps of this process. A bottom-up approach should be less prone to bias. It starts with data that participants provide and then tries to explain it. The Lexical Approach of trait researchers (John et al., 2008) is a prominent example. It proposed that the most important traits will come to be represented in natural language. Building on this, researchers extracted personality-descriptive adjectives, asked large samples to rate how well each adjective described them, and performed factor analyses on the ratings. The result is the widely-accepted "Big Five" taxonomy.

Wilkowski et al. (2020) applied the lexical approach to empirically derive the structure of higher-order goal-content in American English. They extracted over 1,000 English nouns that described common higher-order goals (or "principles") – i.e., superordinate goals that guide the selection of more specific goals and behaviors. They then asked two samples to rate their commitment to approaching or avoiding them and performed principle component analyses (PCAs) on these ratings. Four components replicated: Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity-prevention, and Tradition (the PINT taxonomy).

Two goal-constructs appeared to describe the generally-desirable goals ("values") of conservatives and liberals, respectively. *Tradition* appears to describe a goal to support and participate in the long-standing institutions of the dominant social group (e.g., *church*, *patriotism*), and it seems to capture the values of conservatives. By contrast, *Inclusiveness*

appears to describe a goal to support and establish positive relationships with people of all types (e.g., *diversity, equity*), and it seems to capture the values of liberals. Prominence, however, (e.g., *glory, championship*) seems less relevant to political ideology. These goals can be regarded as “generally desirable values” because the average person reports a commitment to approach (rather than avoid) them (Wilkowski et al., 2020; 2021). Thus, we use the term “generally-desirable” in a purely descriptive sense.

The large Negativity construct can be divided into three facets (Wilkowski et al., 2021). Of these, *Rebellion* represents the “opposite” of Tradition – a goal to oppose and defy the institutions of the dominant social group (e.g., *protest, atheism*). *Elitism* represents the “opposite” of Inclusiveness – a goal to elevate one’s self and one’s group to a dominant social position even without the voluntary consent of others (e.g., *coercion, authoritarianism*). The remaining facet, *Disrepute*, appears to be less relevant to political orientation. These goals can be considered “generally undesirable vices” because the average person reports a commitment to avoid (rather than approach) them. Thus, we also use the term “generally undesirable” in a purely descriptive sense.

The Current Investigation

We broadly propose that Tradition and Inclusiveness represent the generally-desirable values of conservatives and liberals (respectively); while Elitism and Rebellion represent the generally-undesirable vices of conservatives and liberals (respectively). In Studies 1-5, we tested the hypotheses that these four goal-commitments would exhibit *unique* relationships with Political Ideology. In Study 3, we tested the hypothesis that these goals would *uniquely* predict Voting Behavior in the 2020 American National Election. Study 3 also tested the hypothesis that Inclusiveness would predict Normative forms of Collective Action (*Activism*); while Rebellion

would predict Non-Normative forms of Collective Action (*Radicalism*). We made no strong predictions regarding the hypothesized conservative goals and collective action, as collective action is more frequently associated with attempts to *change* the social order.

Finally, Studies 4-5 tested the hypothesis that each goal would be most strongly correlated with constructs from past theories of political ideology and prejudice matched in terms of ideology and general-desirability. These hypotheses generally follow from the above review. For example, Elitism is hypothesized to be related to SDO and prejudice against derogated groups. Rebellion is hypothesized to be related to LWA and prejudice against conservative groups. Inclusiveness is hypothesized to be related to Social-Justice motives and the Individualizing Foundation, but unrelated to prejudice.

However, Tradition represents an important exception to the full equation of generally-desirable values with (seemingly) desirable consequences. We hypothesized that this generally-desirable value is correlated with not just the Binding Moral Foundations and Social Order motives, but also with the seemingly-undesirable constructs of RWA and Prejudice against Unconventional and Dangerous groups. This is because previous research suggests that the Binding Moral Foundations, RWA, and some prejudices (i.e., against Arabs) are all strongly related (Kugler et al., 2014; Sinn & Hayes, 2016). Given this, Tradition may be a goal that the average person finds desirable, but which is nonetheless related to certain, consequential forms of prejudice (e.g., against the LGBT community). If true, this would suggest that an ideological asymmetry in prejudice exists for the values (i.e., Inclusiveness is unrelated to prejudice; but Tradition is); but not for the vices (i.e., both Rebellion & Elitism are related to prejudice).

Studies 1-5

Method

All studies used similar measures and procedures. When possible, we report our results meta-analytically (Cumming, 2014). Because of this, we report all studies together.

Open Science Practices and Sample Size Determination

In all studies, we report all measures relevant to hypotheses, how we determined our sample size, and data exclusions. Verbatim Method files, Data, and Analytic Code are available at https://osf.io/3xrv5/?view_only=4b91c415e799417eaeb9e556427af97e. Each study contained measures to test additional hypotheses unrelated to current concerns. We disclose all such measures fully in the verbatim methods files, but we do not present them in detail here. In each study, we sought to recruit a final, analyzable sample of 250 participants (or greater), as this is the sample size at which correlations stabilize (Schonbrodt & Perugini, 2013). All studies received IRB approval. Studies were not preregistered.

Participants for Studies 3-5 were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (mTurk). To be eligible, mTurk workers were required to live in the United States, have a HIT approval rate of 95% or higher, and have passed CloudResearch's pre-screening procedure. Because mTurk workers sometimes provide low-quality data, we took several recommended precautions to protect against this (Buhrmester et al., 2018; Litman & Robinson, 2020). We excluded participants who failed two or more directed-response attention checks, endorsed two or more low-frequency responses (e.g., "Are you in a gang?"), provided a nonsensical open-ended response, or directly indicated they provided low-quality data. We disclose that another sample was collected with identical measures to Study 4-5, but without these precautions in place. The resulting dataset was highly problematic, as reported in [citation blinded], and thus it is not reported here. This motivated the adoption of the precautions used in Studies 3-5.

Participants

Demographic information for all studies is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Demographic Information for All Studies

Study	Source	n	% Female	% Male	Mean Age (Range)	% White	% Hispanic	% Black	% Asian
Study 1	Student	459	71.5%	28.5%	19.9 (17-49)	82.4%	9.4%	1.3%	2.8%
Study 2	Prolific	261	59.0%	41.0%	33.9 (18-75)	69.7%	8.0%	9.2%	8.8%
Study 3 (T1)	mTurk	331	48.3%	51.1%	41.6 (19-83)	75.2%	5.7%	12.7%	9.4%
Study 3 (T2)	mTurk	299	47.5%	52.2%	42.3 (19-83)	76.3%	6.7%	11.7%	10.7%
Study 4	mTurk	259	54.1%	45.2%	40.9 (18-82)	72.6%	5.0%	9.3%	10.8%
Study 5	mTurk	278	57.2%	42.4%	42.9 (21-80)	74.1%	5.0%	8.6%	7.9%

Notes: Groups that routinely represented <1% of the sample are not listed. T1=Time 1. T2=Time 2.

Study 1: 459 undergraduate psychology students from [institution blinded] completed the focal measures as part of a department-wide, online pre-screening survey for course credit.

Study 2: 261 users of Prolific Academic (Peer et al., 2017) living in the United States completed this study. This study was previously presented as [citation blinded], but the analyses reported here are novel.

Study 3: Data for this study was collected on mTurk in the week before the 2020 American Election (*Time 1*) and the days after the results were called (by the Associated Press; *Time 2*). We aimed to collect data from 250 participants who voted at both timepoints. To be eligible, participants had to be a registered voter. 331 provided usable Time 1 data. Of these, 299 total participants provided usable Time 2 data. Of these, 258 voted.

Study 4: 258 mTurk users provided usable data (see Open Science section for more information).

Study 5: 278 mTurk users provided usable data.

Procedures and Measures

All data collection took place online. Here, we report only essential information about the critical measures. Readers interested in a more detailed presentation (with descriptive statistics, scale validity/reliability) are directed to Supplemental Section 1.

Measures

The PINT Goal-Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020): Participants in all studies were asked to rate their commitment (-4 – *Extremely Strong Committed to Avoiding* to 0 – *No Commitment* to 4 – *Extremely Strong Commitment to*) to items representing Inclusiveness (e.g., *diversity, empathy, interconnectedness*), Tradition (e.g., *blessedness, marriage, patriotism*), and Prominence (e.g., *perfection, popularity, moneymaking*) goals. Consistent with their conceptualization as generally-desirable values, the average participant reported a commitment to approaching these goals in all studies (see Supplemental Table 1).

The Undesirable END of Goal-Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2021): Participants in all studies also rated their commitment to 30 items representing Elitism (e.g., *coercion, vanity, authoritarianism*), Rebellion (e.g., *defiance, protest, wildness*), and Disrepute (e.g., *isolation, delinquency, depression*). Consistent with their conceptualization as generally-undesirable vices, the average participant reported a commitment toward avoiding these goals in all studies (see Supplemental Table 1).

Political Ideology: Participants in all studies were asked to indicate their political ideology using a 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative) scale (see Supplemental Section 1 for additional information on Study 3).

Voting Behavior: At Time 2, Study 3 participants were asked to indicate who they voted for in the Presidential, U.S. Senate, and U.S. House Elections.

Activism and Radicalism (Moskalenko & McCauley, 2009): At both timepoints, Study 3 participants indicated their willingness to engage in Activism (i.e., normative collective actions, such as peaceful protest and petition-signing) and Radicalism (i.e., non-normative collective actions, such as violent protest).

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO-7; Ho et al., 2015): Study 4-5 participants were asked to indicate much they agree with statements supporting group-based dominance and inequality. SDO is a major dimension of ideology containing both cognitive and motivational components (Duckitt, 2001). It is consistently associated with conservatism (Wilson & Sibley, 2013) and prejudice against a variety of outgroups (e.g., “derogated” outgroups; Duckitt & Sibley, 2007).

Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 2006): Study 4-5 participants were also asked to indicate how strongly they agree with items indicative of the tendency to submit to authority figures who advocate conventional views and violence against opposing groups. Like SDO, RWA is a major dimension of political ideology containing both cognitive and motivational components (Duckitt, 2001). It is consistently associated with conservatism (Wilson & Sibley, 2013) and many forms of prejudice (e.g., against “dissident” and “dangerous” groups; Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). Nonetheless, this measure has been criticized (Dunwoody & Funke, 2016; Nilsson & Jost, 2020). Despite these criticisms, this scale continues to be the most widely-used measure of RWA (see Conway et al., 2018, for clear documentation), and we included it for this reason.

Left-Wing Authoritarianism (Conway et al., 2018): Study 4-5 participants were asked to indicate how strongly they agree with items indicative of the tendency to submit to authority figures who advocate for liberal policies and violence against conservative groups. This scale is

related to liberalism. It has been criticized on the same grounds as the RWA scale (Nilsson & Jost, 2020). Nonetheless, no better-validated measure exists that purports to capture left-leaning authoritarianism, and we included it for this reason.

Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism (ASC) (Dunwoody & Funke, 2016): This measure seeks to correct many issues noted with Altemeyer's RWA scale, and was included in Study 4-5 for this reason. It asks participants to indicate how much they agree with 18 items measuring Authoritarian Aggression, Submission, and Conventionalism. All factors are related to conservatism.

Moral Foundation Sacredness Scale (Graham & Haidt, 2012): Study 4-5 participants were asked to indicate how much they would need to be paid to perform actions typically viewed as immoral. The Binding Foundations (i.e., Loyalty, Authority, Purity) are associated with conservatism; while the Individualizing Foundations (i.e., Harm, Fairness) are modestly associated with liberalism.

Moral Motives Scale (Janoff-Bulman & Carnes, 2016): Study 4-5 participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with items indicative of six different moral motives: Social-Justice, Social-Order, Not-Harming, Helping/Fairness, Self-Restraint, and Industriousness. Social-Justice and Social-Order have been linked to liberalism and conservatism (respectively).

Dimensions of Generalized Prejudice: While prejudices against different groups often co-occur, distinctions between prejudices against different "types" of groups can nonetheless be made (Bergh & Brandt, 2021; Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). To measure these, we adopted items from previous investigations that appeared relevant to the American cultural context of 2020. Study 4-5 participants were asked to indicate their feelings toward each group using 100-point

feeling thermometers. We found four factors, which were labeled Prejudice against Disadvantaged groups (e.g., *women, poor people*), Conservative/Privileged groups (e.g., *Republicans, rich people*), Dangerous groups (e.g., *violent criminals, terrorists*), and Unconventional groups (e.g., *feminists, Lesbians/Gays*).

Analytic Strategy

We report 95% confidence intervals for all analyses. Whenever possible, we use mini-meta-analysis techniques (Goh et al., 2016) to summarize zero-order correlations across studies. Multiple regression analyses are summarized using a “mega-analysis” strategy, implemented within Multi-level Modelling. More details regarding the analytic strategy are provided at the end of Supplemental Section 1.

Results

Political Ideology (*All Studies*)

Table 2 summarizes the zero-order and unique relationship between Goal-Commitments and Political Ideology. Supporting our first set hypotheses, summary analyses indicated that Tradition and Elitism were associated with greater Conservatism; while Inclusiveness and Rebellion were associated with greater Liberalism. For Inclusiveness and Tradition, these relationships were robust and replicated across all studies and analyses. For Rebellion and Elitism, hypothesized effects were largely apparent at the zero-order level, but their unique relationships only became clearly apparent in the mega-analysis. (See Supplemental Section 2 for a discussion of hypothesis-irrelevant effects with Prominence and Disrepute.)

Table 2. Relationships between Goal-Commitments and Political Conservatism (vs. Liberalism).

	Inclusiveness		Tradition		Prominence	
	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β
Study 1	-.32 [-.40, -.24]	-.42 [-.50, -.33]	.49 [.42, .56]	.42 [.33, .51]	.22 [.13, .31]	.13 [.04, .22]
Study 2	-.42 [-.51, -.31]	-.27 [-.38, -.15]	.47 [.37, .56]	.25 [.13, .37]	.08 [-.04, .20]	-.03 [-.15, .08]
Study 3 (T1)	-.31 [-.40, -.20]	-.28 [-.39, -.16]	.44 [.35, .52]	.34 [.22, .46]	<i>.10</i> [-.01, .21]	-.04 [-.14, .06]
Study 3 (T2)	-.36 [-.45, -.25]	-.47 [-.59, -.34]	.41 [.31, .50]	.36 [.23, .49]	.06 [-.05, .18]	.01 [-.10, .11]
Study 4	-.34 [-.44, -.23]	-.38 [-.49, -.26]	.42 [.31, .51]	.31 [.17, .45]	.24 [.12, .35]	.17 [.03, .30]
Study 5	-.31 [-.42, -.20]	-.41 [-.53, -.28]	.34 [.24, .44]	.33 [.20, .47]	-.01 [-.13, .11]	-.04 [-.16, .08]
Mini-Meta	-.34 [-.38, -.29]	-	.44 [.40, .48]	-	.14 [.09, .19]	-
Mega	-.33 [-.37, -.28]	-.33 [-.38, -.28]	.42 [.38, .47]	.34 [.28, .39]	.13 [.09, .18]	<i>.04</i> [-.01, .09]
	Rebellion		Elitism		Disrepute	
	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β
Study 1	-.39 [-.46, -.31]	-.18 [-.27, -.09]	.27 [.18, .35]	.03 [-.07, .13]	-.07 [-.16, .03]	-.05 [-.15, .05]
Study 2	-.48 [-.57, -.38]	-.25 [-.38, -.12]	.25 [.14, .36]	.19 [.04, .34]	<i>-.12</i> [-.24, .001]	<i>-.13</i> [-.27, .02]
Study 3 (T1)	-.39 [-.48, -.30]	<i>-.12</i> [-.25, .01]	.27 [.17, .37]	.18 [.04, .31]	<i>-.09</i> [-.20, .01]	-.14 [-.27, -.01]
Study 3 (T2)	-.39 [-.48, -.28]	-.11 [-.25, .03]	.20 [.09, .31]	-.04 [-.18, .10]	-.08 [-.19, .03]	-.09 [-.23, .05]
Study 4	-.30 [-.40, -.18]	-.22 [-.38, -.05]	.24 [.12, .35]	<i>.16</i> [-.01, .33]	.02 [-.11, .14]	.01 [-.15, .18]
Study 5	-.38 [-.47, -.27]	<i>-.14</i> [-.29, .01]	.08 [-.04, .20]	.03 [-.13, .19]	<i>-.11</i> [-.23, .00]	-.12 [-.28, .04]
Mini-Meta	-.39 [-.43, -.34]	-	.23 [.18, .28]	-	-.08 [-.13, -.03]	-
Mega	-.37 [-.42, -.33]	-.17 [-.22, -.11]	.22 [.17, .27]	.12 [.06, .18]	-.07 [-.12, -.02]	-.07 [-.13, -.01]

Note: *r*s indicates zero-order relationships; β s indicates unique relationships, controlling for other goals; Positive values indicate a relationship to Conservatism; while Negative values indicate a relationship to Liberalism. Values in brackets are 95% CIs. **Bold** font indicates $p < .05$. *Italic* font indicates $p < .10$. A mini-meta-analysis was not conducted on regression coefficients because this is not recommended with a small number of studies. Only T1 from Study 2 was entered into summary analyses.

Voting Behavior (Study 3)

Table 3 summarizes the results of logistic regressions examining prospective relationship between T1 Goal-Commitments and T2 Voting Behavior. (Cross-sectional analyses largely replicate these effects; see Supplementary Section 3). Supporting hypotheses, Tradition was consistently associated with more Conservative Voting; and Inclusiveness was consistently associated with more Liberal Voting. In contrast to hypotheses, Rebellion and Elitism were only significantly related to Voting at the zero-order level. Once overlap with the generally-desirable values was controlled for, these relationships were no longer significant. (See Supplemental Section 4 for discussion of additional, unsupported hypothesis.)

Table 3. Prospective Relationship between T1 Goal-Commitments and T2 Conservative (vs. Liberal) Voting Behavior

	<u>Inclusiveness</u>		<u>Tradition</u>		<u>Prominence</u>	
	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>
President	.46 [.33, .62]	.32 [.20, .50]	3.72 [2.55, 5.67]	4.94 [2.78, 9.35]	1.16 [.89, 1.50]	.85 [.58, 1.25]
Senate	.52 [.37, .70]	.31 [.18, .50]	4.06 [2.68, 6.48]	6.11 [3.22, 12.58]	1.11 [.85, 1.47]	.85 [.56, 1.27]
House	.50 [.37, .67]	.30 [.18, .47]	4.03 [2.76, 6.17]	5.73 [3.23, 10.82]	1.18 [.91, 1.52]	.99 [.63, 1.55]
	<u>Rebellion</u>		<u>Elitism</u>		<u>Disrepute</u>	
	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR'</i>
President	.47 [.34, .62]	1.17 [.69, 2.00]	1.70 [1.28, 2.29]	<i>1.64</i> [.97, 2.84]	.78 [.58, 1.04]	.49 [.28, .83]
Senate	.46 [.33, .63]	1.16 [.67, 2.03]	1.59 [1.19, 2.17]	1.54 [.89, 2.73]	.79 [.58, 1.06]	.52 [.29, .90]
House	.46 [.34, .61]	1.23 [.75, 2.04]	1.59 [1.21, 2.10]	1.44 [.87, 2.42]	.75 [.56, .99]	.88 [.28, .82]

Note: OR indicates Odds Ratios for zero-order relationships; OR' indicates Odds Ratios for unique relationships, controlling for other goals; Values in brackets are 95% CIs. ORs > 1 indicate a relationship with Conservative voting; ORs < 1 indicate a relationship with Liberal voting. **Bold** font indicates $p < .05$. *Italic* font indicates $p < .10$.

Collective Action (Study 3)

Table 4 summarizes the prospective relationship between T1 Goal-Commitments and T2 Collective Action (see Supplemental Section 3 for cross-sectional analyses, which largely replicated these). In support of our next set of hypotheses, Inclusiveness was related to Activism (i.e., Normative collective action); while Rebellion was related to Radicalism (i.e., Non-Normative collective action). We made no strong hypotheses regarding Tradition and Elitism, and found no significant, unique relationships of these variables with collective action.

Table 4. Prospective Relationship between T1 Goal-Commitments and T2 Political Behaviors in Study 3.

	<u>Inclusiveness</u>		<u>Tradition</u>		<u>Prominence</u>	
	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β
Activism	.29 [.18, .39]	.24 [.10, .38]	.03 [-.09, .14]	.05 [-.11, .21]	.13 [.02, .25]	.09 [-.03, .22]
Radicalism	.09 [-.03, .20]	.06 [-.08, .20]	-.19 [-.30, -.07]	-.09 [-.25, .07]	.03 [-.08, .15]	.08 [-.05, .21]
	<u>Rebellion</u>		<u>Elitism</u>		<u>Disrepute</u>	
	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β	<i>r</i>	β
Activism	.05 [-.07, .17]	.14 [-.02, .30]	-.14 [-.25, -.02]	-.01 [-.18, .16]	-.15 [-.26, -.04]	-.08 [-.25, .08]
Radicalism	.22 [.11, .33]	.17 [.01, .33]	-.07 [-.19, .04]	-.08 [-.26, .09]	.05 [-.06, .17]	.02 [-.15, .20]

See Table 2 for explanatory notes.

Constructs from Past Theories of Political Ideology (Studies 4-5)

Table 5 summarizes relationship between PINT-Goals and constructs from past theories of political ideology (see Supplemental Section 5 for discussion of more specific sub-scales and

hypothesis-irrelevant constructs). Because hypotheses here referred to goals that would most strongly relate to each construct from past theorizing, we focused only on zero-order correlations, and compared the size of correlations to test hypotheses.

We first hypothesized that Elitism would be more strongly correlated with Social Dominance Orientation (relative to other goals). This hypothesis received partial support. Elitism's correlation with SDO was the most strongly positive in the mini-meta-analysis, and it was significantly stronger than SDO's correlation with Inclusiveness, Rebellion, and Disrepute. However, it was not significantly stronger than SDO's correlation with Tradition or Prominence. Thus, there is a clear degree of overlap between Elitism and SDO, but SDO also has something in common with Tradition and Prominence. In the discussion, we speculate on the conceptual content that may be responsible for each correlation.

We next hypothesized that Tradition would be most strongly related to the Binding Moral Foundations, Moral Motives for Social Order, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (i.e., RWA, ASC). Although RWA is typically presented in a more negative light than morality-based measures, they all share an emphasis on convention, obedience, and religiosity. These hypotheses were all strongly supported. Tradition's correlation with them was significant and significantly stronger than all other goals in all analyses.

Table 5. Relationship between Goal-Commitments and Constructs from Past Theories, Studies 4-5.

	Elitism	Tradition	Inclusiveness	Rebellion	Prominence	Disrepute
SDO, S4	.36a [.25, .46]	.25b [.13, .36]	-.42b [-.51, -.31]	-.05b [-.17, .08]	.27 [.15, .38]	.20b [.08, .31]
SDO, S5	.19a [.08, .30]	.21 [.10, .32]	-.43b [-.52, -.33]	-.18b [-.29, -.07]	.12 [.01, .24]	.06b [-.06, .18]
SDO, Mini-Meta	.27a [.19, .35]	.23 [.15, .31]	-.43b [-.49, -.35]	-.12b [-.20, -.03]	.19 [.11, .27]	.13b [.04, .21]
RWA, S4	.27b [.15, .38]	.57a [.48, .65]	-.33b [-.44, -.22]	-.39b [-.49, -.28]	.22b [.10, .34]	.01b [-.11, .13]
RWA, S5	.24b [.13, .35]	.57a [.49, .64]	-.26b [-.37, -.15]	-.47b [-.56, -.37]	.10b [-.02, .22]	-.03b [-.15, .09]
RWA, Mini-Meta	.25b [.17, .33]	.57a [.51, .62]	-.29b [-.37, -.21]	-.43b [-.50, -.36]	.16b [.07, .24]	-.01b [-.10, .07]
ASC, S4	.24b [.13, .36]	.64a [.56, .70]	-.29b [-.40, -.17]	-.39b [-.49, -.28]	.25b [.13, .36]	-.03b [-.15, .09]
ASC, S5	.28b [.16, .38]	.58a [.50, .66]	-.20b [-.31, -.08]	-.43b [-.52, -.33]	.15b [.03, .26]	-.02b [-.14, .10]
ASC, Mini-Meta	.26b [.18, .34]	.61a [.55, .66]	-.24b [-.32, -.16]	-.41b [-.48, -.34]	.20b [.12, .28]	-.02b [-.11, .06]
Binding MF, S4	-.10b [-.22, .02]	.33a [.21, .43]	-.06b [-.18, .07]	-.38b [-.48, -.27]	-.01b [-.14, .11]	-.21b [-.33, -.10]
Binding MF, S5	.01b [-.10, .13]	.39a [.28, .48]	.04b [-.08, .16]	-.37b [-.47, -.27]	-.07b [-.18, .05]	-.17b [-.28, -.05]
Binding MF, Mini-Meta	-.04b [-.13, .04]	.36a [.29, .43]	-.01b [-.09, .08]	-.37b [-.45, -.30]	-.04b [-.13, .04]	-.19b [-.27, -.11]
Soc. Order MM, S4	.32b [.21, .43]	.57a [.49, .65]	-.14b [-.26, -.02]	-.30b [-.41, -.19]	.37b [.26, .47]	-.01b [-.13, .11]
Soc. Order MM, S5	.21b [.09, .32]	.57a [.49, .65]	-.12b [-.23, .00]	-.41b [-.50, -.31]	.10b [-.02, .21]	-.05b [-.16, .07]
Soc. Order MM, Mini-Meta	.26b [.18, .34]	.57a [.51, .62]	-.13b [-.21, -.05]	-.36b [-.43, -.28]	.23b [.15, .31]	-.03b [-.12, .05]
Ind. F., S4	-.25b [-.36, -.13]	.08 [-.04, .20]	<i>.14a [.01, .25]</i>	-.19b [-.30, -.07]	-.14b [-.26, -.02]	-.23b [-.34, -.11]
Ind. F., S5	-.13b [-.24, -.01]	.12 [.00, .24]	<i>.19a [.08, .30]</i>	-.15b [-.27, -.04]	-.14b [-.26, -.03]	-.18b [-.29, -.06]
Ind. F., Mini-Meta	-.19b [-.27, -.11]	.10 [.02, .18]	<i>.17a [.08, .25]</i>	-.17b [-.25, -.09]	-.14b [-.22, -.06]	-.20b [-.28, -.12]
Not-Harm MM, S4	-.31b [-.41, -.19]	.15b [.02, .26]	.36a [.25, .46]	-.18b [-.29, -.06]	-.08b [-.20, .04]	-.33b [-.43, -.22]
Not-Harm MM, S5	-.22b [-.33, -.10]	.16b [.04, .27]	.33a [.22, .43]	-.12b [-.23, .00]	-.11b [-.23, .00]	-.26b [-.36, -.15]
Not-Harm MM, Mini-Meta	-.26b [-.34, -.18]	.16b [.07, .24]	.34a [.27, .42]	-.15b [-.23, -.06]	-.10 [-.18, -.01]	-.29b [-.37, -.21]
Help/Fair MM, S4	-.34b [-.45, -.23]	.19b [.07, .31]	.39a [.29, .49]	-.23b [-.35, -.11]	-.06b [-.18, .06]	-.42b [-.52, -.31]
Help/Fair MM, S5	-.24b [-.35, -.12]	.26b [.14, .36]	.44a [.34, .53]	-.15b [-.27, -.04]	-.05b [-.17, .07]	-.31b [-.41, -.20]
Help/Fair MM, Mini-Meta	-.29b [-.36, -.21]	.23b [.14, .31]	.42a [.34, .48]	-.19b [-.27, -.11]	-.05b [-.14, .03]	-.36b [-.44, -.29]
Soc. Justice MM, S4	-.18b [-.30, -.06]	-.23b [-.34, -.11]	.43a [.32, .52]	.18b [.06, .30]	-.03b [-.16, .09]	-.07b [-.19, .05]
Soc. Justice MM, S5	-.20b [-.31, -.09]	-.19b [-.30, -.07]	.41a [.31, .51]	.20b [.09, .31]	-.06b [-.17, .06]	-.03b [-.14, .09]
Soc. Justice MM, Mini-Meta	-.19b [-.27, -.11]	-.21b [-.29, -.13]	.42a [.35, .49]	.19b [.11, .27]	-.05b [-.13, .04]	-.05b [-.13, .04]
LWA, S4	.02b [-.10, .15]	-.38b [-.48, -.27]	.16b [.04, .28]	.32a [.21, .43]	.02b [-.10, .15]	.16b [.03, .27]
LWA, S5	.06b [-.06, .17]	-.38 [-.48, -.28]	.14 [.02, .25]	<i>.29a [.18, .40]</i>	.12b [.00, .23]	.11b [-.01, .23]
LWA, Mini-Meta	.04b [-.04, .13]	-.38b [-.45, -.30]	.15b [.07, .23]	.30a [.23, .38]	.07b [-.01, .16]	.13b [.05, .22]

Notes: Subscript “a” indicates the correlation hypothesized to be strongest in each row; Subscript “b” indicates a correlation that was significantly lower than the hypothesized strongest correlation in the same row; **Bold** font indicates a fully supported hypothesis; *Italic* font indicates a partially supported hypothesis. SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; ASC = Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism scale of Authoritarianism; MF = Moral Foundations; MM = Moral Motives; LWA = Left-Wing Authoritarianism; S4 = Study 4; S5 = Study 5.

Building on the Model of Moral Motives and Moral Foundations Theory, we next hypothesized Inclusiveness goals would be most strongly correlated with Social-Justice motives, the Individualizing Foundations, and the conceptually similar moral motives of Not-Harming and Helping/Fairness. All hypotheses involving the Measure of Moral Motives were strongly supported. Inclusiveness’s positive correlations with Social Justice, Helping/Fairness, and Not-Harming Motives were significantly stronger than other goals in all analyses. Nonetheless, the correlation between Inclusiveness and the Individualizing Foundations was more modest in

magnitude and did not significantly exceed the correlation with Tradition. It is likely that this is due to the Moral Foundations Sacredness scale's focus on intuitive/emotional reactions to moral violations; while the Measure of Moral Motives is focused on goal-commitments.

Finally, we hypothesized that Rebellion goals would more strongly correlate with Left-Wing Authoritarianism. This hypothesis was supported in the mini-meta-analysis. Although Inclusiveness was also significantly related to LWA, this effect was significantly smaller than Rebellion's correlation.

Dimensions of Generalized Prejudice

Table 6 summarizes the relationship between goal-commitments and dimensions of generalized prejudice. Here, we first hypothesized that Elitism would be more strongly correlated with Prejudice against Disadvantaged groups (e.g., Black & Physically-Disabled individuals) than other goal-commitments. This hypothesis received relatively strong, but not full, support. This correlation was consistently significant, positive, and significantly stronger than all other focal goal-commitments. Nonetheless, it was similar in magnitude to the correlation with Disrepute. It is possible that this Prejudice measure is contaminated by a general dislike of other people, which is plausibly related to Disrepute. Future research should test this by using items and statistical procedures that better separate general dislike from group-specific prejudice (see Bergh & Brandt, 2021).

We next hypothesized that Tradition would be most strongly correlated with Prejudice against Unconventional groups (e.g., Gay men, Lesbians, Feminists) and Dangerous groups (e.g., Criminals). This hypothesis was ultimately supported. Although Elitism was also significantly correlated with Prejudice against Unconventional Groups, this correlation was weaker than the hypothesized correlation in the mini-meta-analysis.

Table 6. Relationship between Goal-Commitments and Dimensions of Generalized Prejudice, Studies 4-5.

Dimension of Prejudice	Elitism	Tradition	Inclusiveness	Rebellion	Prominence	Disrepute
Disadvantaged, S4	.26a [.14, .37]	-.13b [-.25, -.01]	-.37b [-.47, -.26]	.09b [-.03, .21]	.13b [.01, .25]	.26 [.14, .37]
Disadvantaged, S5	.14a [.03, .26]	-.21b [-.32, -.09]	-.34b [-.44, -.24]	.05 [-.07, .17]	.05 [-.06, .17]	.16 [.04, .27]
Disadvantaged, Mini-Meta	.20a [.12, .28]	-.17b [-.25, -.09]	-.36b [-.43, -.28]	.07b [-.01, .15]	.09b [.01, .17]	.20 [.12, .28]
Unconventional, S4	.21 [.09, .32]	.32a [.20, .42]	-.41b [-.51, -.31]	-.27b [-.38, -.15]	.16b [.04, .28]	.03b [-.09, .15]
Unconventional, S5	.10 [-.02, .21]	.25a [.14, .36]	-.40b [-.50, -.30]	-.32b [-.42, -.21]	.01b [-.11, .12]	-.04b [-.16, .08]
Unconventional, Mini-Meta	.15b [.07, .23]	.29a [.21, .36]	-.41b [-.48, -.34]	-.29b [-.37, -.21]	.08b [.00, .17]	-.01b [-.09, .08]
Dangerous, S4	-.29b [-.39, -.17]	.14a [.01, .25]	-.05b [-.17, .07]	-.33b [-.44, -.22]	-.11b [-.23, .01]	-.33b [-.44, -.22]
Dangerous, S5	-.09b [-.20, .03]	.27a [.16, .38]	-.11b [-.22, .01]	-.38b [-.47, -.27]	.04a [-.08, .15]	-.31b [-.41, -.20]
Dangerous, Mini-Meta	-.18b [-.27, -.10]	.21a [.13, .29]	-.08b [-.16, .01]	-.36b [-.43, -.28]	-.03b [-.12, .05]	-.32b [-.40, -.24]
Conservative, S4	-.12b [-.24, .00]	-.46b [-.55, -.36]	.13 [.01, .25]	.24a [.12, .35]	-.15b [-.27, -.03]	.08b [-.04, .20]
Conservative, S5	-.04b [-.16, .07]	-.47b [-.56, -.37]	.01b [-.11, .13]	.30a [.18, .40]	-.10b [-.22, .02]	.13b [.02, .25]
Conservative, Mini-Meta	-.08b [-.17, .00]	-.46b [-.53, -.39]	.07b [-.01, .15]	.27a [.19, .35]	-.13b [-.21, -.04]	.11b [.03, .19]

Notes: Subscript “a” indicates that the correlation hypothesized to be strongest in a row; Subscript “b” indicates a correlation that was significantly lower than the hypothesized strongest correlation in the same row; **Bold** font indicates a fully supported hypothesis; *Italic* font indicates a partially supported hypothesis. S4 = Study 4; S5 = Study 5.

Finally, we hypothesized that Rebellion would be more strongly related to Prejudice against Conservative/Privileged groups (e.g., Republicans, Rich people). This hypothesis was ultimately supported. Although Inclusiveness was also significantly related to anti-Conservative prejudice in Study 4, this correlation ultimately proved to be unreliable and smaller than Rebellion’s correlation in the mini-meta-analysis.

Discussion

Findings supported our overarching hypotheses: The PINT taxonomy appears to provide a more balanced, empirically-derived description of political goals. An ideological asymmetry in prejudice was observed between the values, such that Tradition but not Inclusiveness was related to prejudice. However, no such asymmetry was observed between the vices, such that both Elitism and Rebellion were related to different forms of prejudice. Nonetheless, some specific hypotheses were not fully supported. We discuss each finding in separate sections below.

A Balanced Account of Political Ideology and Behavior

Most importantly, the results supported a more balanced account of political goals. Generally-desirable values and generally-undesirable vices uniquely contributed to the prediction of political ideology. In fact, the values of Tradition and Inclusiveness exhibited the most robust

relationships with conservatism and liberalism (respectively). Nonetheless, Elitism and Rebellion also uniquely predicted conservatism and liberalism (respectively) in summary analyses, and cannot be dismissed as inconsequential.

Beyond this, results also suggested that values are related to normative forms of political behavior; while vices are related to non-normative political behavior. Tradition specifically predicted conservative voting; while Inclusiveness predicted liberal voting and normative collective action. By contrast, Rebellion predicted non-normative collective action. Future research should include measures focused on System-Defending forms of Collective Action (Osborne et al., 2019) to better understand Elitism and Tradition's relationship with collective action.

Elitism and Dominance of the Disadvantaged

Additional analyses began to characterize each goal by relating them to constructs from past theories. Early theories from political psychology (Altemeyer, 1981; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Pratto et al., 1994) emphasized the seemingly undesirable goal of conservatives to maintain existing inequalities. We broadly hypothesized that Elitism would capture such a goal. Indeed, Elitism was strongly correlated with Prejudice against Disadvantaged groups (e.g., Black people, Women) and Social Dominance Orientation. However, the latter correlation was not significantly stronger than Tradition or Prominence's relationship with SDO. It is possible that Tradition's stronger-than-expected correlation is driven by a shared focus on *group-based* superiority; while Prominence's correlation is driven by a shared focus on *deserved status*. By contrast, Elitism seems to emphasize an *individual's* willingness to forcibly take power even when others find one undeserving.

Tradition and the Double-Edged Sword of Parochialism

Unlike Elitism, Tradition is a generally-desirable value (i.e., the average person reports a commitment to approach it). Consistent with this, it was strongly correlated with the ‘Binding’ Moral Foundations and Moral Motives for Social Order. However, ingroup love can sometimes turn to outgroup hate (Brewer 1999; Janoff-Bulman & Carnes, 2013). Indeed, Tradition was also strongly correlated with Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Prejudice against Unconventional groups (e.g., gay men & lesbian women). These findings converge on a view of Tradition as a double-edged, parochial sword that involves both ingroup love and outgroup derogation. Thus, generally-desirable values can sometimes be associated with negative outcomes for a minority.

Inclusiveness and the Expanding Circle of Moral Motives

In contrast to Tradition, Inclusiveness appears to reflect what moral philosopher Singer (1981) referred to as the ‘Expanding Circle of Morality’. It reflects a desire to treat not just one’s kin or community members morally (e.g., Helping/Fairness & Not-Harming motives), but also to treat all of humanity morally (i.e., Social-Justice motives). Importantly, there was no evidence linking it to anti-Conservative prejudice. While there are surely other downsides to Inclusiveness, it appears to be a uniquely prosocial goal. This suggests that an ideological asymmetry is present for the values.

Rebellion and Left-Wing Combativeness

While liberals may have the prosocial “angel” of Inclusiveness on one shoulder, our findings suggest that they have the antisocial “demon” of Rebellion on the other. Thus, liberalism more generally does have a combative side, and it involves disparaging defenders of the conventional order and willingness to use force against them. Ideological asymmetry does not extend to the vices. In our view, one of the main contributions of this investigation is to more coherently describe the nature of generally-undesirable liberal goals. Constructs such as LWA

and anti-Conservative bias may be united by a desire to defy and overturn the conventional social order.

Limits to Generalizability

The current investigation focused solely on Americans, so it will be critical to examine the generalizability of these findings to other cultures. While we employed samples that were diverse in many ways, it would nonetheless be useful to further examine these hypotheses in a truly representative American sample.

Summary and Conclusions: Toward a More Balanced Account of Political Principles

The current findings suggest that the PINT Taxonomy provides a more balanced account of political principles. It recognizes both the values and vices of conservatives and liberals alike. Perhaps more importantly, it moves the field toward a unified description of political goals. To be clear, this account is meant only as a description of what *is*, and not as a prescription of what *ought to be*. There are many goals that can only be obtained by using Traditions to coordinate people's actions with one another and distributing the benefits in a fair and Inclusive manner (see Fitzsimmons & Finkel, 2018). Nonetheless, there are times when people authentically feel that tyranny must be ended through violent Rebellion (e.g., Paine's, 1791, call to overthrow the French monarchy), and times when people authentically feel that authoritarian and Elitist actions are needed to maintain a valuable social order (e.g., Burke's, 1790, call to violently defend the French monarchy). In our view, the tradeoff between these goals nicely captures the motivational dynamics of large-scale political groups.

References

- Altemeyer, R.A. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, R.A. (2006). *The Authoritarians*. Winnipeg: R.A. Altemeyer.
- Badaan, V., & Jost, J. T. (2020). Conceptual, empirical, and practical problems with the claim that intolerance, prejudice, and discrimination are equivalent on the political left and right. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *34*, 229-238.
- Bergh, R., & Brandt, M. J. (2021). Mapping principal dimensions of prejudice in the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000360>.
- Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). The ideological-conflict hypothesis: Intolerance among both liberals and conservatives. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*, 27-34.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429-444.
- Buhrmester, M. D., Talafar, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2018). An evaluation of Amazon's Mechanical Turk, its rapid rise, and its effective use. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*, 149-154.
- Burke, E. (1790). *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Everyman's Library.
- Conway III, L. G., Houck, S. C., Gornick, L. J., & Repke, M. A. (2018). Finding the Loch Ness monster: Left-wing authoritarianism in the United States. *Political Psychology*, *39*, 1049-1067.
- Cumming, G. (2014). The new statistics: Why and how. *Psychological Science*, *25*, 7-29.

- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality, 21*, 113-130.
- Duarte, J. L., Crawford, J. T., Stern, C., Haidt, J., Jussim, L., & Tetlock, P. E. (2015). Political diversity will improve social psychological science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 38*, 1-58.
- Dunwoody, P. T., & Funke, F. (2016). The Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale: Testing a new three factor measure of authoritarianism. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 4*, 571-600.
- Fitzsimons, G. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2018). Transactive-goal-dynamics theory: A discipline-wide perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*, 332-338.
- Goh, J. X., Hall, J. A., & Rosenthal, R. (2016). Mini meta- analysis of your own studies: Some arguments on why and a primer on how. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10*, 535-549.
- Graham, J. & Haidt, J. (2012). Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach. In P. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Morality: Exploring the Causes of Good and Evil* (pp. 11-31). APA Books.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Motyl, M., Meindl, P., Iskiwitch, C., & Mooijman, M. (2018). Moral foundations theory: On the advantages of moral pluralism over moral monism. In K. Gray & J. Graham (Eds.), *Atlas of moral psychology* (pp. 211-222). Guilford.

- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., ... & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO₇ scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 1003-1028.
- Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political diversity in social and personality psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 496-503.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Carnes, N. C. (2013). Surveying the moral landscape: Moral motives and group-based moralities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17*, 219-236.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Carnes, N. C. (2016). Social justice and social order: Binding moralities across the political spectrum. *PloS one, 11*, e0152479.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big-five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). Guilford Press.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system- justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27.
- Kugler, M., Jost, J. T., & Noorbaloochi, S. (2014). Another look at moral foundations theory: Do authoritarianism and social dominance orientation explain liberal-conservative differences in “moral” intuitions? *Social Justice Research, 27*, 413-431.
- Litman, L., & Robinson, J. (2020). *Conducting online research on Amazon Mechanical Turk and beyond*. Sage Publications.
- Moskalenko, S., & McCauley, C. (2009). Measuring political mobilization: The distinction between activism and radicalism. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 21*, 239-260.

- Nilsson, A., & Jost, J. T. (2020). The authoritarian-conservatism nexus. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 148-154.
- Osborne, D., Jost, J. T., Becker, J. C., Badaan, V., & Sibley, C. G. (2019). Protesting to challenge or defend the system? A system justification perspective on collective action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 244-269.
- Paine, T. (1791). *Rights of man: Being an answer to Mr. Burke's attack on the French Revolution*. JS Jordan.
- Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 153-163.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741.
- Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47, 609-612.
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 248-279.
- Singer, P. (1981). *The expanding circle*. Clarendon Press.
- Sinn, J. S., & Hayes, M. W. (2017). Replacing the moral foundations: An evolutionary-coalitional theory of liberal- conservative differences. *Political Psychology*, 38, 1043-1064.

- Washburn, A. N., & Skitka, L. J. (2019). Strategies for promoting strong inferences in political psychology research. In B.T. Rutjens & M.J. Brandt (Eds.), *Belief systems and the perception of reality* (pp. 134-146). Routledge.
- Wilkowski, B. M., Fetterman, A., Lappi, S. K., Williamson, L. Z., Leki, E. F., Rivera, E., & Meier, B. P. (2020). Lexical derivation of the PINT taxonomy of goals: Prominence, inclusiveness, negativity prevention, and tradition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119*, 1153-1187.
- Wilkowski, B. M., Williamson, L. Z., Rivera, E., Fetterman, A., & Meier, B. P. (2021). What is the “opposite” of a value? A lexical investigation into the structure of generally undesirable goal content. *Journal of Personality*. DOI: 10.1111/jopy.12670
- Wilson, M. S., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). Social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism: Additive and interactive effects on political conservatism. *Political Psychology, 34*, 277-284.
- [reference blinded]