

## Chapter 6

*The measurement of socio-political orientations*

Suggestions by

*John Curtice*  
*Caroline Bryson*

## Contents

<b>6.1</b>	<b>Proposal by John Curtice and Caroline Bryson .....</b>	<b>235</b>
	<b>6.1.1 <i>Left-right orientation</i>.....</b>	<b>237</b>
	<b>6.1.2 <i>Libertarian-authoritarian orientations</i> .....</b>	<b>241</b>
	<b>6.1.3 <i>Environmentalism</i>.....</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>6.2.</b>	<b>Comments of the CCT .....</b>	<b>250</b>
	<b>6.2.1 <i>Measurement of left right orientation</i> .....</b>	<b>250</b>
	<b>6.2.2 <i>Measurement of Libertarian-Authoritarian orientation</i> .....</b>	<b>253</b>
	<b>6.2.3 <i>Measurement of Environmentalism</i>.....</b>	<b>256</b>

## 6.1 Proposal by John Curtice and Caroline Bryson

People's underlying 'deep-rooted' value orientations tend not only to predict and help explain people's opinions, attitudes and behaviour patterns (Rokeach, 1973), but also to influence – and be influenced by – social, political and economic changes within their respective societies. The rigorous measurement of differences in value structures between countries, and of changes in their character and distribution, is one of the primary motivations for the ESS.

The problem of course is the absence of a comprehensive, well-tested and analytically powerful set of tools for measuring underlying values across nations. Although the Eurobarometer, the European (and World) Values Surveys and the International Social Survey Programme have all made major contributions, upon which we certainly intend to draw, even their combined lists of individual items and, more importantly their combined array of validated scales, are not comprehensive enough for the purposes of the ESS.

It is important for the ESS core module to identify and monitor the key socio-political cleavages that exist across cultures and nations within Europe (and beyond). Robust measures of these dimensions tend to serve primarily as independent variables, helping to explain and predict other substantive variables such as party identification (Andersen and Heath, 2001), voting behaviour and certain moral standpoints. But they too may serve on occasions as dependent variables in their own right, helping to describe and understand the nature of value changes in society, and on occasions political changes as well. Whereas the terms of debate about particular issues tend to vary from country to country, underlying values (such as in relation to 'equality' or 'liberty', or people's religious identification) tend in contrast to transcend nations and are thus more amenable to being tapped by multinational survey instruments such as the ESS.

As we are trying to measure abstract value orientations, it is cognitively too demanding to measure them directly with one or two questions (which good survey practice should always steer against). Rather, a set of questions should be administered, all of which are designed to tease out how far a respondent expresses support or opposition to different dimensions of the underlying value. From these, scales can be constructed which summarise respondents' answers to the set of questions. Of course, in developing scales, we need to apply stringent tests to ensure that they are indeed reliable measures of a single underlying value.

If wishing to compare the relative explanatory power of different dimensions, each one should preferably be measured using similar metrics. We thus anticipate that each dimension will usually be measured by the construction of Likert scales derived from a battery of agree/disagree items. In order to avoid the confounding influence of acquiescence effects, each set of items should contain some question statements that are worded in one direction and some in the opposite direction (Schuman and Presser, 1981).

Of course, there is considerable debate about the key socio-political orientations within European societies. After a good deal of discussion we have identified the following three socio-political attitude scales that ESS should consider measuring :

1. Left-right orientation
2. Libertarian-authoritarian orientation
3. Environmentalism

In so doing we have taken into account the fact that the following value orientations are already being covered in the core module :

1. Post-materialism
2. Basic human values (Schwartz)
3. Satisfaction with democracy
4. Trust in institutions, confidence in the economy
5. Interest in politics, party affiliation and voting turnout
6. Personal and system efficacy
7. Religious adherence, church attendance and belief in God
8. National sentiment

We are not yet in a position to recommend the exact items which should be included within each of the proposed scales. Rather, in the following sections we outline the ways in which similar scales have been constructed in previous studies (some pan-European, others national). Our next stage must be to test the workability and reliability of these existing items within the context of the ESS participating nations. Data for this will be provided by the inclusion of more items – rather than less – within the ESS pilot. We will need to investigate the reliability of the various items, and their ability combine to form scales which are not only robust and reliable, but also are proven to measure the dimensions in which we are interested.

### 6.1.1 *Left-right orientation*

#### Theoretical starting point

It is widely accepted that a key value orientation in most, if not all, western democracies comprises a left-right, or liberal-conservative, continuum. This dimension is widely thought to be at the heart of differences in social and political attitudes between the middle and the working class. It is commonly found to be correlated with both party identification and voting behaviour (Knutson, 1995). Meanwhile European societies are often found to exhibit greater support for left-wing values than do Anglo-American societies or Japan (Taylor-Gooby, 1993).

There are in fact two related but distinct elements of left-right values. One is sympathy or otherwise for greater economic equality in society. The other is sympathy or otherwise for government intervention in the operation of the market. For simplicity, we refer to these two elements as 'egalitarianism' and 'interventionism' respectively. These two elements are usually found to be correlated with one another. Thus, those, for example, who favour greater equality of incomes are also usually found to be more likely to believe that the government should own and run key industries. So while it is important that any left-right scale includes items that capture both elements, and their intercorrelation is assessed, it is not clear that two separate scales will be required.

Inter alia, this value orientation is expected to be related to attitudes towards the welfare state, the role of trade unions and the need for progressive taxation.

#### Different measures of Left-right orientation

There have been several attempts at forming scales to measure the left-right dimension. The European Values Survey (EVS), Eurobarometer and ISSP are examples where attempts have been made cross-nationally. We also give examples of scales used in Britain (in British Social Attitudes (BSA) and the British Election Studies (BES)) and in a series of Dutch studies on political culture (Middendorp (1991)).

##### *The EVS (1990)*

Using factor analysis, Knutsen (1995) examined the 1990 data to test whether a common left-right value orientation could be identified in 13 European countries. He found that 5 items all had high loadings on the same dimension in 10 of the 13 countries while three of those items also loaded together on the same dimension in the other 3 countries. All the items included are double sided scales (thus should be free from acquiescence bias) scoring from 1 to 10. The scale covered the following dimensions (for which we currently have some, but not all, of the question wordings)-

"I'd like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale?" (scale of 1 to 10)

##### *a) Economic equality*

Incomes should be made more equal

*vs*

There should be greater incentives for individual effort

*b) Nationalisation*

Private ownership of business and industry should be increased

*vs*

Government ownership of business and industry should be increased

*c) Individual/Public responsibility*

Individuals should take more responsibility for providing for themselves

*vs*

The state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for

b), c) and d) lay on the same dimension in all countries.

#### *Eurobarometer*

Using 5 items from Eurobarometer 11, Knutsen shows the existence of a workable left-right scale in 7 out of 8 EU countries (see also Inglehart 1984, 34-32; 1990, 290-300). These items are labelled by Knutsen as -

- economic equality;
- public ownership;
- government management of the economy;
- equal representation for employees;
- public control of multinationals.

#### *ISSP*

Bryson and Curtice (1998) were able to derive an inequality scale from the 1992 ISSP module on social inequality as administered in 4 European countries. It has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.77 and encompasses much if not all of what we have identified as left-right values. Note however that all the items in this scale are worded in the same direction.

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items were -

Inequality continues because it benefits the rich and powerful

Differences in income in \_\_\_\_\_ (country) are too large

It is the responsibility of the government to reduce the differences in income between people with high incomes and those with low incomes

The government should provide a job for everyone who wants one

The government should provide everyone with a guaranteed basic income

#### *British Election Study*

The British Election Study has developed a Likert scale of items that purport to measure a left-right value orientation. The items are balanced in terms of the direction of the wording of the items<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Full technical details about the scales, including details of reliability etc., can be found in Evans and Heath (1995) and Evans et al, (1996).

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items were -

Ordinary people get their fair share of the nation's wealth

There is one law for the rich and one for the poor

There is no need for strong trade unions to protect employees' working conditions and wages

Private enterprise is the best way to solve Britain's economic problems.

Major public services and industries ought to be in state ownership

It is the government's responsibility to provide a job for everyone who wants one.

We are not aware that this scale has been administered outside of the UK. Certainly, the cross-national translation (both of wording and concept) of some of the items (e.g. idioms such as 'There is one law for the rich and one for the poor') may be problematical .

#### *British Social Attitudes*

The BSA time series has a left-right scale which uses similar items those in the BES -

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items were -

Government should redistribute income from the better off to those who are less well off

Big business benefits owners at the expense of workers

Ordinary people do not get their fair share of the nation's wealth

There is one law for the rich and one for the poor

Management will always try to get the better of employees if it gets the chance

In 1999, the BSA left-right scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.82, showing a high level of reliability when fielded in Britain.

#### *Middendorp studies*

Using data from a series of Dutch studies (not known to have been replicated elsewhere), Middendorp appears to have developed a series of scales, each of which measured a different element of the left-right dimension (equality of income, government intervention, taxation policy, etc.). He then used combined scores from each of these scales to form a variable on the left-right dimension. For the purposes of the ESS, such an approach would be too lengthy. However, we could test the potential for a smaller number of items (from within the scales) to form a left-right scale. Candidates would be -

Differences in class should be smaller than is the case at present

Do you want the differences between higher and lower incomes to increase, decrease or remain as it is?

Are you in favour of or against the government taking radical measures to reduce the differences in income levels?

The government should firmly control prices after wage increases

The government should allow for the minimum income to rise more sharply than other income levels

The government should nationalise large industries and firms

A proposal

Although there are two elements of the left-right continuum - egalitarianism and interventionism – we have found empirically that they are highly correlated. Therefore, one scale should accommodate both elements. We propose testing the following items. A number of them are overlapping, and thus choices should be made after analysis of the pilot data.

The first three items are to measure the egalitarian element, the next two the interventionism element.

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- It is not the government's role to redistribute income from the better off to the worse off*
- It is the government's responsibility to provide a job for everyone who wants one*
- Management will always try to get the better of employees if it gets a chance*
- Private enterprise is the best way to solve Britain's economic problems*
- Major public services and industries ought to be in state ownership*



### 6.1.2 *Libertarian-authoritarian orientations*

#### Theoretical starting point

It has been widely argued that the most important value orientation to cut across the left-right dimension is a libertarian-authoritarian one. Those who have a libertarian view believe that individuals should largely be free to make their own moral choices, emphasise the importance of self-actualisation and self-expression and accept the merits of cultural pluralism. In contrast those with a more authoritarian view believe that society should uphold certain common moral and cultural standards and thus, they are prepared to accept some limitations on personal freedom for the greater good of maintaining a cohesive and secure society (Heath et al, 1991; Flanagan, 1987; Flanagan and Lee, 1988; Kitschelt, 1994; Kitschelt, 1995).

People's placement on this continuum helps to predict their attitudes to traditional 'law and order' issues to do with crime and punishment, to moral issues such as abortion, and social issues such as immigration. Those who are well educated and/or of a secular disposition tend to adopt libertarian views while those who are less well educated or religious tend to be more authoritarian. The dimension thus helps capture the values behind the traditional religious cleavage found in many European polities, as well as elements of purported postmaterialist attitudes (Inglehart, 1977; Inglehart, 1997; Bryson and Curtice, 1998).

#### Different measures of a Libertarian-authoritarian orientation

So far, we have found few studies which have successfully tapped this orientation. A lot of further work will be needed in the development of a libertarianism scale for the ESS. None of the examples we give have been fielded in more than one country (with the possible exception of the Adorno scale).

##### *British Election Study*

The British Election Study has developed a scale designed to measure this orientation, though it has a rather lower Cronbach's alpha than the equivalent left-right scale (c. 0.50 v. c. 0.65)<sup>2</sup>.

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items were -

Young people today don't have enough respect for traditional British values  
 Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards  
 Homosexual relations are always wrong  
 People in Britain should be more tolerant of those who lead unconventional lives  
 People should be allowed to organise public meetings to protest against the government  
 Political parties which wish to overthrow democracy should be allowed to stand in general elections

##### *British Social Attitudes*

---

<sup>2</sup> Technical details are again to be found in Evans and Heath (1995) and Evans et al (1996)

Again, the BSA time series includes a similar scale to measure libertarian-authoritarian dimension. It has a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.70 (on 1999 data). This level of reliability can be regarded as respectable. The items are –

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items were -

Young people today don't have enough respect for traditional British values  
 Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards  
 People who break the law should be given stiffer sentences  
 For some crimes, the death penalty is the most appropriate sentence  
 School should teach children to obey authority  
 The law should be obeyed, even if a particular law is wrong

Important work that suggested that a libertarian/non-libertarian dimension is separate from Inglehart's materialist/post-materialist dimension is Flanagan (1987) and Flanagan and Lee (1988). We believe this work has an empirical basis in a scale developed by Flanagan, which we are looking into further (*Willem – again I'm awaiting these books*).

#### *Middendorp studies*

As with his left-right dimension, Middendorp appears to have developed a series of scales, each of which measured a different element of the libertarian-authoritarian dimension (freedom of expression, tolerance towards criminals, family traditionalism, etc.). He then used combined scores from each of these scales to form a variable on the libertarian-authoritarian dimension. For the purposes of the ESS, such an approach would be too lengthy. However, we could test the potential for a smaller number of items (from within the scales) to form a libertarian-authoritarian scale. Candidates would be -

It is mostly for the good of teenagers that they obey their parents  
 It goes without saying that children show regard and respect for their parents  
 The most important thing children should learn is total obedience to their parents' wishes  
 Homosexuals should be eradicated from society  
 Do you think that homosexuals should be left as free as possible to live their own life, or do you feel that this should be opposed as much as possible?  
 Homosexuals should be firmly dealt with

Criminals should not be punished in the first instance but one should attempt to change their ways  
 Sexual criminals should not be punished in the first instance, but one should attempt to cure them  
 It might be a good thing to reintroduce the death penalty for certain crimes

If a woman so wishes, it should be possible for her to have an abortion  
 Suppose a physician is able to put a patient out of his misery, at his own request, by giving them an injection. What do you think he should do?

*Adorno et al*

The following scale was developed by Adorno et al in 1950, measuring authoritarianism. The response categories ranged from 'strongly agree', 'mildly agree', 'neither agree nor disagree', 'mildly disagree', 'strongly disagree'.

There are two sorts of people: the strong and the weak

Most people fall short of your expectations when you get to know them better

Young people often revolt against social situations that they find unjust; however, when they get older, they ought to become resigned to reality

Most of our problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feeble-minded people

What we need are fewer laws and institutions and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom people can trust

Ill-mannered people cannot expect decent people to want to mix with them

Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private

The wording of many of these items would certainly be problematic within the context of the ESS.

#### A proposal

Again following the criteria above, we have revisited what was originally a long list of possible items. We have tried to select the best example for each of five elements of the libertarian-authoritarian scale. In some cases, we have played around with the wording in order to aid cross-national comprehension and to provide a balanced list of positive and negative statements. Our suggestions are -

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- *Young people should be taught to respect authority*
- *There is nothing wrong in homosexuality*
- *Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards*
- *People who propose overthrowing democracy should be free to stand in national elections*
- *The law should always be obeyed, even when a particular law is felt to be wrong*

### 6.1.3 *Environmentalism*

#### Theoretical starting point

No subject has been more closely associated with the idea of the 'new political agenda' in Europe, or indeed with the advent of postmaterialism, than environmentalism. At one end of this value orientation are those who believe in the continued pursuit of material growth. At the other end are those who believe that a more 'sustainable' and 'holistic' approach to economic activity needs to be adopted, in which greater account is taken of its impact on the environment. The latter perspective may be supported because of concerns about the environmental risks created by economic activity. Alternatively, it may be supported because (in line with postmaterialist thinking) the marginal benefits of greater economic affluence are not worth the costs both to the environment and to individuals (Dalton and Rohrschneider, 1998).

We would expect environmentalism to be related to attitudes towards transport and industry. An important issue will be to explore how far and in what ways it is related to the other value orientations, and to such topics as feminism and defence, subjects on which debate about Inglehart's theory of postmaterialism has generated significant controversy.

Many writers have claimed a growth in support for environmentalism (Dalton, 1994). Meanwhile, the apparent politicisation of this value orientation is evident by the rise of 'Green' parties, especially in western Europe. Thus, it appears essential to find space on the ESS for robust measures of change in these values within a time series starting in the early part of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### Different measures of Environmentalism

We are not aware of a well-developed scale of environmentalist values. Although it is not uncommon (e.g. Nas, 1995) to develop scales of environmental 'concern' or 'behaviour', it is open to question how far these tap a distinctive set of 'values'. Below, we set out four possible scales, each tapping various environmentalist dimensions.

##### *ISSP*

Maybe the best sources of cross-nationally fielded questions are the two ISSP modules on the environment (1993 and 2000). There have been two attempts to form scales from the 1993 (which could be replicated using the 2000 data).

Bryson and Curtice (1998) developed two scales, one on 'environmental concern' scale and another tapping 'anti-progress' attitudes.

##### Environmental concern

Based on five items, it has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.72 across four European countries. The first three questions asked respondents to respond using a five point scale (very willing to very unwilling (plus can't choose)) –

How willing would you be to pay much higher prices in order to protect the environment?

And how willing would you be to pay much higher taxes in order to protect the environment?

And how willing would you be to accept cuts in your standard of living in order to protect the environment?

The last two questions consisted of statements to which respondents should respond using a five point scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree (plus can't choose) –

“It is just too difficult for someone like me to do much about the environment”

“I do what is right for the environment, even when it costs more money or takes more time”

#### Anti-progress

The ‘anti-progress’ scale is based on the following four items. It has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.67 across four European countries.

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the items (which are one directional in terms of their wording) were –

“How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:”

“Any change humans cause in nature – no matter how scientific – is likely to make things worse”

“Almost everything we do in modern life harms the environment”

“Nature would be at peace and in harmony if only human beings would leave it alone”

“Economic growth always harms the environment”

#### New Environmental Paradigm (NEP) index

These latter four items also form part of an eight-item scale formulated by Dalton and Rohrschneider which they dub a ‘new environmental paradigm’ (NEP) index. They write, however, ‘We advise caution in judging the reliability and validity of the resulting NEP scale’.

Their 8 items (grouped) – all using the same five point scale - are –

##### a) Biocentric values

Humans should respect nature because it was created by God

Nature would be at peace and in harmony if only human beings would leave it alone

Animals should have the same moral rights that human beings do

##### b) Scepticism of science

We believe too often in science, and not enough in feelings and faith

Overall, modern science does more harm than good

##### c) Economic growth

Economic growth always harms the environment

##### d) Social change

Any change humans cause in nature - no matter how scientific - will make things worse

Almost everything we do in modern life harms the environment

ISSP (2001) contains a number of new items that would appear to have the potential to form a new scale, but they would require analysis. These are -

Using a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree -

Modern science will solve our environmental problems with little change to our way of life

We worry too much about the future of the environment and not enough about prices and jobs today

People worry too much about human progress harming the environment

In order to protect the environment Britain needs economic growth

Economic growth always harms the environment

There are more important things to do in life than protect the environment

There is no point in doing what I can for the environment unless others do the same

Many of the claims about environmental threats are exaggerated

And how willing would **you** be to accept cuts in your standard of living in order to protect the environment? (very willing to very unwilling)

*The Global Environmental Survey (GOES)*

Many of the ISSP items above are included in GOES. In addition, GOES includes a set of questions which could potentially form a scale on the 'impact on the environment of society's behaviour' –

Do you **agree or disagree** with the following statements, or haven't you thought about it enough to have an opinion?

Whether you save energy or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you save water or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you litter or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you recycle or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you do volunteer work or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you give money or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

Whether you participate in meetings or not does not really make a difference in the protection of the environment

### A proposal

Again following the criteria above, we have revisited what was originally a long list of possible items. We have tried to select the best example for each of five elements of the libertarian-authoritarian scale. In some cases, we have played around with the wording in order to aid cross-national comprehension and to provide a balanced list of positive and negative statements. Our suggestions are -

*Young people should be taught to respect authority*

*There is nothing wrong in homosexuality*

*Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards*

*People who propose overthrowing democracy should be free to stand in national elections*

*The law should always be obeyed, even when a particular law is felt to be wrong*

### Environmentalism scale

Taking into account the above criteria (primarily the avoidance of items that ask respondents to make comparisons to the current situation), we have now rejected the items that asked about willingness to change behaviour in order to protect the environment. Rather, we have selected items that ask respondents to comment on general principles, choosing two items on concern for the quality of the environment and three on material progress versus environmental sustainability.

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- There are much more important things for me to do than protect the environment*
- Many of the claims about environmental threats are exaggerated*
- Economic growth always ends up harming the environment*
- Modern science will solve our environmental problems with little change to our way of life*
- Governments should worry more about protecting jobs than protecting the environment*

## References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J and Sanford, R.A. (1950) *The Authoritarian personality*, New York: Harper and Row
- Andersen, R. and Heath, A. (2001), 'Social Cleavages and Political Context: A Comparative Analysis of the United States, Canada and Britain' (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco).
- Bryson, C. and Curtice, J. (1998), 'The end of materialism?', in R. Jowell et al (eds.), *British – and European – Social Attitudes: the 15<sup>th</sup> report* (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- Dalton, R (1994), *The Green Rainbow: Environmental Interest Groups in Western Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press)
- Dalton, R. and Rohrscheider, R. (1998), 'The Greening of Europe', in R. Jowell et al (eds.), *British – and European – Social Attitudes: the 15<sup>th</sup> report* (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- Evans, G. and Heath, A. (1995) 'The measurement of left-right and libertarian-authoritarian values: a comparison of balanced and unbalanced scales', *Quality and Quantity*, 29, 191-206.
- Evans, G., Heath, A., and Lalljee, M. (1996), 'Measuring left-right and libertarian-authoritarian values in the British electorate', *British Journal of Sociology*, 47, 93-112.
- Flanagan, S. (1987), 'Value Change in industrial society', *American Political Science Review*, 81, 1303-19
- Flanagan, S. and Lee, A. (1988), 'Explaining value change and its political implications in eleven advanced industrial democracies' (Paper presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Washington DC, Aug. 28- Sept. 1)
- Heath, A., Jowell, R., Curtice, J., Evans, G., Field, J. and Witherspoon, S. (1991) *Understanding political change: the British Voter, 1964-1987* (Oxford: Pergamon Press)
- Inglehart, R. (1977), *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Inglehart, R. (1984), 'The Changing Structure of Political Cleavages in Western Society', in R. Dalton, S. Flanagan and P. Beck (eds.), *Electoral Change in Advanced Western Democracies: Realignment or Dealignment?* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press)
- Inglehart, R. (1990), *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press)
- Inglehart, R. (1997), *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Kitschelt, H. (1994), *The Transformation of European Social Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)



Kitschelt, H. (1995), *The Radical Right in Western Europe – A Comparative Analysis* (Ann Arbor, Mich.; Univ. of Michigan Press)

Knutsen, O. (1995), 'Left-Right Materialist Value Orientations', in J. van Deth and E. Scarbrough (eds.), *The Impact of Values* (Oxford: OUP)

Flanagan, S. (1982), 'Changing values in advanced industrial society', *Comparative Political Studies*, 14, 403-44.

Middendorp, C.P. (1991) *Ideology in Dutch politics: the democratic system reconsidered 1970-1985* (Van Gorcum, Assen Maastricht, Netherlands)

Nas (1995), 'Green, Greener, Greenest', in J. van Deth and E. Scarbrough (eds.), *The Impact of Values* (Oxford: OUP)

Rokeach, M. (1973), *The Nature of Human Values* (New York: Free Press).

Schumann and Presser, 1981 – reference to come

Taylor-Gooby, P. (1993), 'What citizens want from the state', in R. Jowell, L. Brook and L. Dowds (eds.), *International Social Attitudes: the 10<sup>th</sup> BSA report* (Aldershot: Dartmouth)

## 6.2. Comments of the CCT

In this part several different measurement instruments are discussed. In the next sections we will each time in each section finish a topic completely. That means that we first present the discussion that took place between the authors of the proposal and the CCT about the specific topic, including the proposal of the CCT for the pilot. Then the results of the pilot study are presented and then another section follows with the final proposal of the CCT .

### 6.2.1 Measurement of left right orientation

For measurement of left right orientation the following items were suggested:

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- *It is not the government's role to redistribute income from the better off to the worse off*
- *It is the government's responsibility to provide a job for everyone who wants one*
- *Management will always try to get the better of employees if it gets a chance*
- *Private enterprise is the best way to solve Britain's economic problems*
- *Major public services and industries ought to be in state ownership*

#### Discussion

In this case the problem is not the quality of the different item separately as can be seen from the predictions of the data quality by SQP in the next table.

item	reliability	validity	method effect	total quality
1	.80	.81	.19	.65
others	.66	.85	.15	.56

The problems is more that the items are not all indicative for the two aspect which have been mentioned as typical for left right orientation. The items 2,3 and 4 are not clear in this respect.

Providing jobs in item 2 is not the same as reducing income inequality.

The link with the activities of the management in item 3 is not clear to us.

The fourth item suggest that private enterprise is the best solution for the economy and the people have to infer that government intervention is worse.

On the other hand very clear items have not been chosen such as:

*It is the responsibility of the government to reduce the differences in income between people with high incomes and those with low incomes*

*Are you in favour of or against the government taking radical measures to reduce the differences in income levels?*

With respect to interventionism the following items are left:

*Private ownership of business and industry should be increased- versus- Government ownership of business and industry should be increased*

*The government should nationalise large industries and firms*

The authors replied: we appreciate the need to hone in on the best of the potential items for each of the scales. However, in places we do not agree with the criteria by which you include or eliminate individual items. We therefore agree with the inclusion of some of your suggested items, but we would choose to include others as well, and to reject some of your initial suggestions.

Although there are two elements of the left-right continuum - egalitarianism and interventionism – we have found empirically that they are highly correlated. Therefore, one scale should accommodate both elements, but they should better take account of the above criteria than they did in our first draft. We propose testing the following items. A number of them are overlapping, and thus choices should be made after analysis of the pilot data.

**CARD E1** *Using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly...READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID*

	<i>Agree strongly</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree strongly</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>	
<b>E1</b> <i>The less that government intervenes in the economy, the better it is for Britain</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	458
<b>E2</b> <i>The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	459
<b>E3</b> <i>Some public services are too important to be left to private enterprise</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	460
<b>E4</b> <i>Taxes should be as low as possible, even if welfare spending suffers</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	461
<b>E5</b> <i>Workers need strong trade unions to protect their working conditions and wages</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	462
<b>E6</b> <i>If people really want a job they can usually find one</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8	463

The CCT decided to test this version of the questionnaire in the pilot study

### The results of the pilot study

Given that the format of the items is not the problem the test in the pilot study was mainly directed to the scalability of these items. In that context factor analysis was used together with Cronbach's  $\alpha$  to evaluate the scales.

Although for this topic one factor was expected the analysis indicated that two factors better described the data. One factor represents more or less the egalitarian orientation with items 2,3 and 6 while the other factor represented more an interventionist orientation. However the internal consistency of the items for each factor is not very high as shown by the values of the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient which were respectively .57 and .39.

Since the single items had a higher reliability than the scale it was suggested to use in the first wave of the ESS only single items from the different factors.

### The final choice

On the basis of the above argument the following items have been chosen for the first wave of the ESS:

**CARD E1** *Using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly...*  
**READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID**

	<i>Agree strongly</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree strongly</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>
<b>E1</b> <i>The less that government intervenes in the economy, the better it is for Britain</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8
<b>E2</b> <i>The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8
<b>E3</b> <i>Workers need strong trade unions to protect their working conditions and wages</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8

The first item represents the interventionist orientation, the other two the egalitarian orientation but a different aspect of it.

### 6.2.2 *Measurement of Libertarian-Authoritarian orientation*

The following suggestion was made:

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- *Young people should be taught to respect authority*
- *There is nothing wrong in homosexuality*
- *Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards*
- *People who propose overthrowing democracy should be free to stand in national elections*
- *The law should always be obeyed, even when a particular law is felt to be wrong*

#### Discussion

Also for this set of items the quality of the single items is not the problem as can be seen in the table below:

Item	reliability	validity	method effect	total quality
1	.79	.83	.17	.65
others	.67	.85	.15	.56

The problem is again the relationship between the items and the concepts. It is suggested that libertarian orientation means that the people should largely be free to make their own moral choices. That does not mean that the people have to be positive about any deviation from normal but that one allows people their own choices. This is a right not a judgement.

Therefore item 2 does not fit in this set. But items like the ones below fit better:

*People should be allowed to organise public meetings to protest against the government*

*Do you think that homosexuals should be left as free as possible to live their own life, or do you feel that this should be opposed as much as possible?*

*If a woman so wishes, it should be possible for her to have an abortion*

*Suppose a physician is able to put a patient out of his misery, at his own request, by giving them an injection. What do you think he should do?*

The second component is protection of the norms and values. It is questionable if the first items belongs in this set because it asks something about the education of children not about norms and values. The last item is also very questionable given the last part of the sentence.

The authors replied: We have revisited what was originally a long list of possible items. We have tried to select the best example for each of five elements of the libertarian-authoritarian scale. In some cases, we have played around with the

wording in order to aid cross-national comprehension and to provide a balanced list of positive and negative statements. Our suggestions are

**CARD E1 AGAIN** Still using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly ...

**READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID**

- *Homosexuals should be free to live their own life as they wish*
- *Whatever the circumstances, the law should always be obeyed*
- *Political parties which wish to overthrow democracy should be banned*
- *Authorities should never interfere with people's right to take part in non-violent protests and demonstration*
- *It is more important for the legal system to protect the innocent than to convict the guilty*
- *People who want children ought to get married first*

The CCT decided that this version should be tested in the pilot study

### The results of the pilot study

Also for this topic two factors better described the data than one factor. One factor represented more or less an individual libertarian orientation with items 1,2 and 6 while the other factor represented more a political component with items 3,4 and 5. However the internal consistency of the items for each factor were very low as shown by the values of the Cronbach's a coefficient which were respectively .13 and .33.

Since the single items had a higher reliability than the scale is was suggested to use in the definite study only single items from the different factor.

### The final choice

On the basis of the above argument the following items have been chosen for the first wave of the ESS:

**CARD E1 AGAIN** Still using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly ... **READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID**

	<i>Agree strongly</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree strongly</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>
<b>E4</b> <i>Homosexuals should be free to live their own life as they wish</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8
<b>E5</b> <i>Whatever the circumstances, the law should always be obeyed</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8
<b>E6</b> <i>Political parties which wish to overthrow democracy should be banned</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8

The first two items represent the individual libertarian orientations. The third one represents the political libertarian orientation.

### 6.2.3 Measurement of Environmentalism

The proposal was:

*How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items ? (7 pnts)*

- *There are much more important things for me to do than protect the environment*
- *Many of the claims about environmental threats are exaggerated*
- *Economic growth always ends up harming the environment*
- *Modern science will solve our environmental problems with little change to our way of life*
- *Governments should worry more about protecting jobs than protecting the environment*

#### Discussion

Also for this issue the quality of the individual items with respect to reliability and validity was the problem as can be seen below

Item	reliability	validity	method effect	total quality
1	.81	.81	.19	.66
others	.66	.87	.13	.57

In environmentalism the basic contrast is between material progress and environmental sustainability. In this context one can think of preferences for the one or the other. Another aspect connected to this concept is behaviour directed to preservation of the quality of the environment.

Item 1 above gives no clear alternative. One can think about many things which are important. It depends on what people consider in this case what their answer will be. But here the comparison should be with economic growth. Item 2 also discusses only one end of the scale. Item 4 makes a link with another aspect of life: science

On the other hand there are other items which indicate more clearly the comparison between the economy and the environments such as:

*We worry too much about the future of the environment and not enough about prices and jobs today*

*People worry too much about human progress harming the environment*

*So far the item discuss opinions. One can also be interested in intended behavior such as indicated* in

*How willing would you be to pay much higher prices in order to protect the environment?*

*And how willing would you be to pay much higher taxes in order to protect the environment?*



*And how willing would you be to accept cuts in your standard of living in order to protect the environment?*

Curtice and Bryson reply: In any cross-national study, we would like to avoid the use of items which ask respondents to make comparisons with the current situation (we should do *more*, things should be *better*, etc.). Opinions will be given from different starting points, dependent on the current national situation. For the same reason, we do not feel that we should to ask about government policies, because analysis would require a prior knowledge of the national policy on which the respondent draws. Rather, we need to ask respondents about their support for general principles. In that way, we will get closest to achieving a context-free measure of respondents' general orientations, which is the whole purpose of these sorts of scales.

Taking into account the above criteria (primarily the avoidance of items that ask respondents to make comparisons to the current situation), we have now rejected the items that asked about willingness to change behaviour in order to protect the environment. Rather, we have selected items that ask respondents to comment on general principles, choosing two items on concern for the quality of the environment and three on material progress versus environmental sustainability.

**CARD EI AGAIN** *Again still using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly ...*

**READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID**

*Many claims about environmental threats are exaggerated*

*Economic growth always ends up harming the environment*

*Modern science can be relied on to solve our environmental problems*

*We worry too little about the future of the environment and too much about prices and jobs today*

The CCT decided also to test this form in the pilot study.

### The results of the pilot study

With only 4 items only one factor can be expected but it turned out that the first item was only very weakly related with the other three. So, the first item should be omitted. Furthermore the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for the sum of the other three items was still rather low (.48). Therefore, it was decided to choose only two item out of this set.

### The final choice

On the basis of the above mentioned arguments the following two items have been chosen for the first wave of the ESS:

**CARD EI AGAIN** *Again still using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly ...* **READ OUT EACH STATEMENT AND CODE IN GRID**

	<i>Agree strongly</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree strongly</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>
<i>E7 Economic growth always ends up harming the environment</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8
<i>E8 Modern science can be relied on to solve our environmental problems</i>	1	2	3	4	5	8