

The future of the welfare state: paths of social policy innovation between constraints and opportunities

Urbino, 17-19 September 2009

Values and attitudes towards redistribution: The Impact of Basic Human Values on Support for Welfare State Redistribution in Great Britain, Germany and Sweden

Joakim Kulin*

Paper presented at the 7th ESPAnet conference 2009
Session: nr. 7a - The Role of Welfare Attitudes in Welfare State Change

*Department of Sociology, Umeå University
SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden
e-mail: joakim.kulin@soc.umu.se

Values and Attitudes towards Redistribution

The Impact of Basic Human Values on Support for Welfare State Redistribution in Great Britain, Germany and Sweden

Paper (preliminary draft)

Joakim Kulin

Department of Sociology, Umeå University

joakim.kulin@soc.umu.se

ABSTRACT

This article takes interest in the empirical relationship between values and attitudes towards the welfare state – a relationship often ignored in comparative research on welfare state legitimacy. While an attitude is a set of beliefs focused on a specific object or situation, a value on the other hand is a belief that transcend specific objects and which refers to a personally or socially preferable mode of conduct or end-state of existence. Values are thus abstract principles, standards or criteria which regulate what attitudes should be held towards a specific object. Empirical comparative research dealing with people's views on welfare state arrangements tend to centre on the concept of attitudes, yet disregard the role of values. In this article the effects of two value dimensions from the theory of basic human values – self-transcendence and self-enhancement – on support for welfare state redistribution is estimated and compared in the three European countries Great Britain, Germany and Sweden. The study draws on data from European Social Survey (ESS) Round 3 (2006). Effects are explored using multi-group structural equation modelling (MGSEM). While individual level effects of the two value dimensions display similar patterns across countries, the impact of values on support differ across European national contexts.

Introduction

During the last decades, the issue of welfare state legitimacy has become an increasingly central theme in sociology and other related fields. While previous research presents clear evidence of considerable cross-national differences at an aggregated level regarding support for redistributive policies in different welfare states (e.g. Svallfors, 1997; Gelissen, 2000; Andreß and Heien, 2001; Blekesaune and Quadagno, 2003; Linos and West, 2003), it has proven difficult to find consistent patterns in attitudes towards redistribution, and the precise determinants of public support has been hard to assess (For an overview see e.g. Jæger, 2006).

Following Mettler and Soss (2004:64), there is a need to expand our understanding of the particular explanatory mechanisms associated with welfare state support, and to reveal the processes that link public policies to mass responses. Especially, there is a need to probe

deeper into the foundation of support on the individual-level, and its cross-level interaction with contextual (e.g., institutional) level factors.

This paper takes interest in an empirical relationship that has remained unexplored in comparative research on welfare state legitimacy, namely, the role of human values and their relation to attitudes towards welfare state redistribution. In 1968 Rokeach directed attention to the fact that studies which take interest in attitudes seldom concern themselves with values and vice versa. Unfortunately, several decades later, the situation has not dramatically changed in the field of survey research (for an exception, see Davidov et al., 2008a). As observed by Halman and de Moor “in practice, survey researchers distinguish little between values and attitudes” (1994:22). Perhaps one of the most apparent reasons is that, while attitudes and values are fairly distinguishable in theory, this distinction has been particularly difficult to capture through empirical operationalization (Aalberg, 2003). Most comparative studies dealing with people’s value orientations and views regarding welfare state arrangements tend to centre on the concept of attitudes. Consequentially, the empirical relationship between values and welfare state attitudes in survey research has, to a great extent, remained in a black box. This is problematic because of the risk to misinterpret the underlying mechanisms behind the structuring of attitudes – as well as attitudinal stability and change – if our understanding of the operational components involved in such processes is inaccurate. Some studies do, however, focus on the concept of values yet employ survey questions that tap people’s views in relation to specific objects, i.e., “attitude items”, as indicators (e.g., Andreß and Heien, 2001; Blekesaune and Quadagno, 2003; Taylor-Gooby, 2004). Inevitably, in the absence of sufficient survey data, the problem of distinguishing between values and attitudes has been a cumbersome task to say the least and the potential of examining their interrelationship empirically have been small. This study employs data from the *European Social Survey (ESS) Round 3*, which provide a unique opportunity to solve this problem. In the ESS, items are included that measure both (1) basic human values, and (2) attitudes towards welfare state redistribution. The aim of this study is to estimate and compare the effects of values on attitudes towards redistribution in different European national contexts.

Theoretical framework

Values and attitudes towards redistribution

Attitudes and values are theoretically as well as empirically distinct. An *attitude* can be defined as an “organization of several beliefs focused on a specific object or situation, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner” (Rokeach, 1968:550). Attitudes are thus individual dispositions to act in a preferential manner towards a specific object, behaviour, person, institution, or event (Ajzen, 1993; Rokeach, 1968). In this study attitudes towards a particular object will be investigated, namely, state-regulated income redistribution. The attitude in question therefore concerns individual support for state-regulated reduction of income differences. As state-regulated redistribution is, for the most part, carried out by welfare state institutions such as social insurances and transfers – and because these programs constitutes a major part of the welfare state – the inclination to support redistribution can also be seen as an indirect indicator of support for the welfare state itself.

While attitudes refer to specific objects, values, on the other hand, can be defined as enduring beliefs that refer to desirable abstract and motivational goals that serve as guiding principles in a persons life (Schwartz, 1994). Therefore, values transcend specific objects, actions or situations – and instead, refer to personally or socially preferable end-states of existence and to preferable modes of conduct (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). Values serve as standards or criteria in the evaluation of specific objects, and it is the perceived ability of an object to promote or block abstract and motivational goals that elicit and motivate the attitude held towards it (Schwartz, 1992; Sagiv and Schwartz, 1995).

Schwartz (1992) identifies 10 basic human values that can be distinguished through their respective emphasis on different motivational goals¹. The 10 values can be classified into a circular continuum representing their relationships, where: adjacent values are related; more distant values less related; and, diametrical values are each others opposites and therefore directly negatively linked. Schwartz also distinguishes four higher order value types along two orthogonal dimensions in the circular continuum: self-transcendence vs. self-enhancement, and openness to change vs. conservatism.

¹ See Table 1

In this study the impact of self-transcendence and self-enhancement values on support for redistribution are examined. Self-transcendence values involve benevolence and universalism which focuses on the transcendence of selfish interests in favour of equality and the caring for others. Self-enhancement values, on the other hand, involves achievement, power and hedonism which focuses on the enhancement of personal success, status and pleasure (Schwartz, 1994). The relevance of these two value dimensions in relation to attitudes towards redistribution receives support from earlier studies. In a study of values and political preferences in 14 countries, Barnea (2003) found that when political competition revolves around the distribution of material resources, the key values were universalism and benevolence versus power and achievement – the main components of self-transcendence and self-enhancement higher order value dimensions.

For a long time survey research has been lacking a comprehensive theory of values as well as lack of reliable, theory-based instrument to measure values (Davidov et al., 2008b). In recent years, however, Schwartz developed the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) based on the theory of basic human values (Schwartz, 1992). The PVQ is a measurement instrument for values included in several large surveys – including the European Social Survey (ESS)². Through the PVQ, the theorized circular structure (quasi circumplex) of human values has been tested in many countries and displayed extensive cross-cultural validity (Schwartz et al., 2001), which suggests that certain features of the content and structure of basic human values are universal (Schwartz, 1994). Furthermore, the Schwartz values scale as included in the ESS has also been used in earlier studies to measure values (Davidov et al., 2008b) and the effect of values on attitudes (See e.g., Davidov et al., 2008a).

As stated above the evaluation of, or attitude towards, a particular object is partly dependent on the extent to which it realizes or obstructs desirable, abstract and motivational goals. Consequently, the link between the particular set of relevant values and the particular attitude is likely to be stronger (positively or negatively associated) if the object in question is seen as either promoting or blocking abstract and motivational goals linked to these values. If the object is seen as neither promoting nor obstructing the realization of the abstract goals the linkage is expected to be weaker (low or no association). Thus, if certain values are promoted through a particular redistributive program it is bound to receive a higher degree of support,

² For space limitation purposes the ESS contains a reduced version of the PVQ.

and if values are obstructed the program is bound to receive a lower degree of support. If a redistributive program is neither promoting nor blocking values, the link between values and attitudes towards redistribution is expected to be weaker.

In general one would expect values that are theoretically related to some of the common goals of all welfare states – equality, social justice and the general welfare of citizens – to be more strongly linked to pro-welfare state attitudes. In this study, therefore, it is hypothesized that self-transcendence values, which focus on the promotion of equality and caring for others, is positively related support for redistribution. Consequentially, the opposing higher order value dimension self-enhancement values, which focus on promoting personal success and power, should be negatively related to support, although this relationship is probably weaker.

However, values do not determine attitudes and the values-attitudes link have been shown to be characterized by dissonant elements (Rokeach, 1968:552). While the importance of a particular set of values might or might not vary among individuals, e.g., between individuals among national contexts, the impact of values on attitudes does not necessarily follow the same pattern. For instance, a particular value might be of (approximately) equal importance to individuals X and Y living in two different countries while, at the same time, the impact of this value on a particular attitude might differ between the individuals within these national contexts. Since differences in the impact on attitudes do not necessarily correspond to the relative importance of a particular set of values, it is adequate to focus more on the effects of values on attitudes rather than on absolute scores in values. The question of whether and to what extent attitudes towards specific objects such as attitudes towards welfare state arrangements are structured by values – and, whether the connectedness between values and attitudes vary, e.g., among different national contexts – is bound to be a matter of empirical testing.

Cross-country differences

The literature on the public legitimacy of welfare states seems to converge on the idea that political institutions have a considerable impact on the individual level – both in defining interests and conflict lines (e.g., Esping-Andersen, 1990; Korpi and Palme, 1998) and conveying moral standards which affect values, attitudes and norms (e.g., Svallfors, 1996; 2003; 2007; Rothstein, 1998; Mau, 2003; 2004). In this perspective welfare state institutions are seen as comprised of embedded normative features inherited through historical

institutionalization processes – normative features which influence the very notions about distribution and justice that constitutes the basis of its support (e.g. Svallfors, 1996; 2007; Rothstein, 1998). People support redistribution not only because they are beneficial from an economic self-interest point of view but because they conform to deeply held norms of reciprocity and appeal to demands of fairness and justice (Bowles and Gintis, 2000; Ullrich, 2002; Mau, 2003; Svallfors, 1996; 2007). This suggests that the impact of institutions on values and attitudes are accompanied by feedback effects, ending up in virtuous or vicious circles depending on whether a particular set of institutional arrangements elicit values that facilitate further support or not (e.g., Rothstein, 1998:135). Nevertheless, many of the empirical specificities tied to different national contexts – regarding the role of values and their relation to welfare state institutions and their public legitimacy – has yet to be uncovered. Consequently – to understand the mechanisms behind the relation between values and attitudes towards redistribution, and potential cross-country differences in the values-attitudes link – it is crucial to consider some of the potentially relevant aspects of the political and institutional context in which this relation can be found.

Redistributive institutions display considerable cross-country variation regarding their scope and salience as well as in their redistributive strategies, e.g., in terms of dominating distributive principles (Korpi and Palme, 1998) and in their underlying notions of justice (Arts and Gelissen, 2001) and reciprocity norms (Mau, 2003). As a result, redistributive institutions might potentially appeal to a variety of basic human values depending on their construct. Here it is hypothesized that in countries where redistributive programs clearly promote and/or obstruct relevant abstract motivational goals, the effect (positive or negative) of values on attitudes towards redistribution will be stronger.

This study sets out to examine the link between values and attitudes in Great Britain, Germany and Sweden – three European countries that differ considerably in their institutional structure in terms of redistributive strategies and dominating distributive principles (Korpi and Palme, 1998). In Great Britain social insurances are often based on citizenship or contributions, but with relatively low flat-rate benefit levels. In addition to low levels of basic insurance some programs in Great Britain are targeted, i.e., they are aimed at helping those worst off. In these programs eligibility for entitlement, and determination of benefit levels, are based on established needs via means tests, often resulting in relatively low benefit levels. In Germany eligibility is based on a combination of contributions and belonging to specific

occupational categories. Entitlements often differ between occupational branches and benefit levels are clearly related to earlier incomes. In Sweden social security transfers are encompassing and eligibility is based on citizenship and contributions. Programmes are extensive and universal, and they incorporate basic security with relatively high flat-rate benefits for all citizens, combined with income-related programmes for higher income earners on top.

In summarizing and comparing the traits of these three European countries one can distinguish Sweden on the one hand, from Great Britain and Germany on the other. The last two focuses more narrowly in single distributive principles, as with low level flat-rate benefits based on citizenship or contributions combined with means-tested benefits based on established needs in Great Britain, or income related benefits tied to occupational groups in Germany. In Sweden several distributive principles are salient in redistributive social security benefits – both universal and comparably generous flat-rate benefits for all combined with income related benefits (Korpi and Palme, 1998). One could argue that redistributive welfare state institutions in Sweden are more encompassing and salient than its European neighbours Great Britain and Germany and that redistributive programs in Sweden are more versatile and incorporate a greater variety of different distributive principles potentially relevant to human values in terms of abstract and motivational goals. Especially the unique encompassing and universal aspects of redistributive programs in Sweden supposedly promotes self-transcendence values to a greater extent than redistributive programs does in Great Britain and Germany. It is, however, uncertain precisely how institutions affect the values-attitudes link, which calls for cautiousness regarding the hypothesized pattern of cross-country differences prior to the analysis. In this study the hypothesized cross-country differences in the values-attitudes link is limited to a tentative supposition that the relationship between values and attitudes is stronger in Sweden than in Great Britain and Germany.

Data and method

To test the hypothesized relationship between values and attitudes in Great Britain, Germany and Sweden, this study use data from the European Social Survey (ESS) Round 3 from 2006. The number of respondents that completed the items for the basic human value scale and the

item indicating support for redistribution (in parenthesis) in the questionnaire, for each country, are Great Britain (1858), Germany (2173), and Sweden (1781).

To measure values this study uses two value dimensions reflected by values particularly relevant to distribution of material resources (Barnea, 2003): achievement and power (self-enhancement) and universalism and benevolence (self-transcendence). The value hedonism, which partly belongs to the self-enhancement higher order value dimension, also partly belongs to the higher order value dimension openness to change. As a consequence of the uncertainty of how this value is related to both dimension, and because it is uncertain to what extent hedonism is relevant in the distribution of material resources (see Barnea, 2003), it was excluded from the self-enhancement dimension in this study. As indicators for values the ESS basic human values scale items – a reduced version of the aforementioned PVQ – are used (see appendix 1 for an overview of value dimensions and their respective values). Each value is measured by two or three items as indicators, which are verbal portraits of persons with different goals and aspirations. It is then asked how similar the described person is to the respondent, concerning a particular value such one of the items for universalism: “she/he thinks that every person in the world should be treated equally and that everyone should have equal opportunities in life”. The items indicating different values all range from 1 to 6 where: 1=“not like me at all” and 2=“not like me”, 3=“a little like me”, 4=“somewhat like me”, 5=“like me”, 6=“very much like me”³.

The ESS item that will be used to indicate support for welfare state redistribution is a 5 point Likert type scale “The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels” (gincdif), which range from 1 to 5 where 1=“disagree strongly”, 2=“disagree”, 3=“neither agree nor disagree”, 4=“agree”, and 5=“agree strongly”⁴. It should also be mentioned that the variable (item) from the ESS used in this study has been used to indicate support for welfare state redistribution in previous research (Jæger, 2006) which facilitate at least some comparisons regarding findings and conclusions.

To estimate and compare the effects of values on attitudes towards redistribution across countries Multi Group Structural Equation Modelling (MGSEM) is used. Before it is possible

³ The human values items have been recoded so that higher values indicate more similarity between the described person and the respondent. In other words, higher values indicate a higher score on a particular human value.

to move on to the structural part to estimate and to compare effects across countries, measurement invariance or equivalence must be established across groups. Earlier studies have shown that the ESS basic human values scale demonstrates configural and metric invariance, two necessary conditions to establish cross-country equivalence of the meaning of constructs and scalar invariance, which allows for the study of relationships among, e.g., values and attitudes across countries (Davidov et al., 2008b; Davidov et al., 2008a). However, these studies use ESS Round 1 data from 2002-03, and as this study uses ESS round 3 data from 2006, one could argue that a unique test for invariance is required.

In order to assess measurement invariance Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is used. If the measurement does not possess measurement invariance, between-group comparisons becomes highly problematic (Vandenberg and Lance, 2000). Essentially, one wants to be sure that the same phenomena are measured in different countries. Several hierarchical levels of invariance can be distinguished based on constraints imposed on different parameters in the model. In this type of analysis, where effects are to be compared across countries, at least metric invariance is needed (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998), which means that factor loadings between items and theoretical constructs (latent variables) are equivalent across groups. For the assumption of measurement invariance across groups to hold, several scholars have argued that partial invariance is sufficient. Partial invariance means that the factor loadings of at least two items per construct have to be invariant across groups (e.g., Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998). However, the ultimate situation is of course if all factor loadings are equivalent across groups, in which case full metric invariance is achieved.

To measure basic human values, the items for the values belonging to each of the higher order value dimensions are modelled to load directly on their respective dimension. Accordingly, the items indicating the values achievement and power load on the higher order value dimension self-enhancement and items indicating the values universalism and benevolence load directly on the self-transcendence value dimension. The multi-group CFA to test for metric invariance contains two latent variables for the higher order value dimensions, with four items (observed variables) as indicators for self-enhancement and five items for self-transcendence. After going through the modification indices and making theoretically justifiable, yet minor, modifications – allowing for error correlation between items belonging

⁴ The variable has been recoded so that higher values indicate stronger support.

to the same value, and adding one cross-loading – an acceptable model was reached. The overall fit measures (CFI= ,931; NFI= ,922; RMSEA= ,033; PCLOSE= 1,000) suggests that the initial model with full metric invariance is acceptable. All factor loadings were statistically significant ($p < 0,05$) and all standardized factor loadings were above 0,4.⁵

Results

In Table 1 means and standard deviations for the item indicating support for redistribution (gincdif) are presented. The means show that support for redistribution is highest in Sweden (3,73) followed by Germany (3,63) and Great Britain (3,46) where support for redistribution is lower. The standard deviations show that there is a higher degree of consensus regarding support in Sweden (0,94) compared to Germany (1,04) and Great Britain (1,05).

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

In Table 2 the effects of the value dimensions self-enhancement and self-transcendence values (se and st values) on support for redistribution (gincdif) is presented in two models – one without controls (model 1) and one with controls (model 2). Focusing at the present on model 1: The hypotheses hold for all three countries that self-enhancement values have a significant negative effect, and that self-transcendence values have a significant positive effect, on support for redistribution. In other words, people who score high on the self-enhancement values power and achievement in general tend to have more negative attitudes towards redistribution. People who score high on the self-transcendence values universalism and benevolence, on the other hand, tend to be more positive towards redistribution. It is also discernable that the effect of self-transcendence values on support is greater than that of self-enhancement values, in all countries⁶.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

The analysis also shows considerable cross-country differences regarding the impact of values on support for redistribution. The effect size of self-enhancement values support for

⁵ A complete account for factor loadings and modifications can be obtained from the author.

⁶ This holds true also when looking at standardized effects.

redistribution is approximately double in Sweden (-,323) compared to Great Britain (-,144) and Germany (-,135), and the effect size of self-transcendence values is also greater in Sweden (.59), more than double the effect size, compared to Great Britain (.277) and Germany (0,20). In other words, people perceive that self-transcendence values are blocked and self-enhancement values are promoted by redistribution to a considerably greater extent in Sweden compared to Great Britain and Germany. Turning to the explained variance in the item indicating support for redistribution, the amount of explained variance in support is considerably higher in Sweden (.125) compared to Great Britain (.016) and Germany (.012). In model 1 values explain 12,5 percent of the variance in support for redistribution, while only explaining 1,6 percent and 1,2 percent in Great Britain and Germany respectively. Thus, in Sweden, people's attitudes towards redistribution are to a considerable extent determined by their values, while people's attitudes towards redistribution in Great Britain and in Germany are more determined by other factors than their values.

In model 2 (table1) controls are introduced, to make sure that the relationship between values and attitudes is not spurious and caused by other factors. Also, some of the controls might be related to human values (Schwartz, 2006). When controlling for income, education, age and gender the pattern of the effects of values on attitudes remains intact, although the coefficients are slightly decreased. Self-transcendence values in Sweden, for instance, is reduced from ,59 in model 1 to ,519 in model 2. An exception from this pattern is the increased effect of self-transcendence values in Germany when introducing controls. Also the negative effect of self-enhancement values in Germany is comparatively low in model 2. The explained variance regarding support is considerably higher in Great Britain and Germany after introducing controls, which suggests that control variables have a much stronger effect than values in these two countries compared to Sweden. All controls have similar effects on support for redistribution in all countries. One exception might be the relatively substantial cross-country gender differences in support, and the relatively strong effect of income on support in Germany.

Conclusion and discussion

The aim of this study was to estimate and compare the effects of values on attitudes towards redistribution in different European national contexts. Three countries – Great Britain,

Germany and Sweden – were selected based on their institutional differences and varying redistributive strategies. The analysis showed that the impact of basic human values on attitudes towards redistribution is comparably weak in Great Britain and Germany, and that values explain below two percent of the total variance in support for redistribution. In Sweden, on the contrary, the impact of values on attitudes is considerable and they explain 12,5 percent of the variance in support. This confirms the substantive supposition derived from theory, namely, that the relationship between values and attitudes is stronger in welfare states where values are clearly promoted or blocked via social insurances and transfers. In this study, a particularly strong connection between values and attitudes was found in Sweden, where welfare state redistribution is encompassing and universal, and where several distributive principles are applied.

Further research should include more countries in the analyses to test for heterogeneity and homogeneity in the effects of values on attitudes towards redistribution, to assess whether the patterns of the effect sizes in the values-attitudes link, and institutional and other contextual factors, is recurring across other European countries. This would also enable correlation of macro (country) effects of values on attitudes and institutional variables (see e.g., Davidov et al., 2008a).

Tables

Table 1 Means, standard deviations and N for gincdif

	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
GB	3,4621	1,05261	2361
GER	3,6339	1,04114	2835
SWE	3,7264	0,94035	1886

Table 2 Unstandardized effects of value dimensions and controls on gincdif (s.e. in parenthesis)

	Model 1			Model 2 (with controls)		
	GB	GER	SWE	GB	GER	SWE
SE Values	-,144 (.034)	-,135 (.032)	-,323 (.034)	-,109 (.038)	-,069 (.035)	-,280 (.037)
ST Values	,277 (.07)	0,20 (.057)	,59 (.068)	,246 (.075)	,238 (.061)	,519 (.072)
Income				,083 (.009)	,129 (.009)	,052 (.012)
Education				,064 (.017)	,068 (.018)	,073 (.016)
Age				,004 (.001)	,000 (.001)	,003 (.001)
Gender				-,100 (.044)	-,046 (.039)	-,184 (.048)
Explained variance (gincdif)	,016	,012	,125	,074	,092	,159
Model fit	CFI= ,931; NFI= ,922; RMSEA= ,033; PCLOSE= 1,000			CFI= ,915; NFI= ,904; RMSEA= ,032; PCLOSE= 1,000		

Effects in bold p<0,05

Appendix

APPENDIX

Appendix 1 Value dimensions and respective values

VALUES AND VALUE-DIMENSIONS

Now I will briefly describe some people. Please listen to each description and tell me how much each person is or is not like you.

SELF-ENHANCEMENT VALUE-DIMENSION

POWER #1 [p1]: It is important to her/him to be rich. She/he wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.

Variable name and label: IMPRICH Important to be rich, have money and expensive things

POWER #2 [p2]: It is important to her/him to get respect from others. She/he wants people to do what she/he says.

Variable name and label: IPRSPOT Important to get respect from others

ACHIEVEMENT #1 [a1]: It's important to her/him to show her/his abilities. She/he wants people to admire what she/he does.

Variable name and label: IPSHABT Important to show abilities and be admired

ACHIEVEMENT #2 [a2]: It is important to her/him to be successful and that people recognize her/his achievements.

Variable name and label: IPSUCES Important to be successful and that people recognize achievements

SELF-TRANCENDANCE VALUE-DIMENSION

UNIVERSALISM #1 [u1]: She/he thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. She/he believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.

Variable name and label: IPEQOPT Important that people are treated equally and have equal opportunities

UNIVERSALISM #2 [u2]: It is important to her/him to listen to people who are different from her/him. Even when she/he disagrees with them, she/he still wants to understand them.

Variable name and label: IPUDRST Important to understand different people

UNIVERSALISM #3 [u3]: She/he strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to her/him.

Variable name and label: IMPENV Important to care for nature and environment

BENEVOLENCE #1 [b1]: It's very important to her/him to help the people around her/him. She/he wants to care for their well-being.

Variable name and label: IPHLPL Important to help people and care for others well-being

BENEVOLENCE #2 [b2]: It is important to her/him to be loyal to her/his friends. She/he wants to devote herself/himself to people close to her/him.

Variable name and label: IPLYLFR Important to be loyal to friends and devote to people close

VALUES AND CATEGORIES

1 Very much like me

2 Like me

3 Somewhat like me

4 A little like me

5 Not like me

6 Not like me at all

7 Refusal

8 Don't know

9 No answer

Respondents answering 7-9 on any of the questions has been removed from the analysis.

References

- Aalberg, T. (2003) *Achieving Justice: Comparative Public Opinion on Income Distribution*, Brill, Leiden/Boston.
- Ajzen, I. (1993) Attitude theory and the attitude-behavior relation, In *New Directions in Attitude Measurement* (Ed, Krebs, D. S., P.) de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 41-57.
- Andreß, H. J. and Heien, T. (2001) Four worlds of welfare state attitudes? A Comparison of Germany, Norway, and the United States, *European sociological review*, **17**, 337-356.
- Arts, W. and Gelissen, J. (2001) Welfare States, Solidarity and Justice Principles: Does the Type Really Matter?, *Acta Sociologica*, **44**, 283-299.
- Barnea, M. (2003) *Personal Values and Party Orientations in Different Cultures*, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.
- Blekesaune, M. and Quadagno, J. (2003) Public Attitudes toward Welfare State Policies: A Comparative Analysis of 24 Nations, *European Sociological Review*, **19**, 415-427.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (2000) Reciprocity, self interest and the welfare state, *Nordic Journal of Political Economy*, **26**.
- Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Billiet, J. and Schmidt, P. (2008a) Values and Support for Immigration: A Cross-Country Comparison, *European Sociological Review*, **24**, 583-599.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. and Schwartz, S. H. (2008b) Bringing values back in - The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, **72**, 420-445.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press, Oxford.
- Gelissen, J. (2000) Popular support for institutionalised solidarity: a comparison between European welfare states, *International Journal of Social Welfare*, **9**, 285-300.
- Halman, L. and de Moor, R. (1994) Value Shift in Western Societies, In *In The Individualizing Society: Value Change in Europe and North America* (Eds, Ester, L., Halman, L. and de Moor, R.) Tilburg University Press, Tilburg.
- Jæger, M. M. (2006) Welfare Regimes and Attitudes Towards Redistribution: The Regime Hypothesis Revisited, *European Sociological Review*, **22**, 157-170.
- Korpi, W. and Palme, J. (1998) The Paradox of Redistribution and Strategies of Equality: Welfare State Institutions, Inequality, and Poverty in the Western Countries, *American Sociological Review*, **63**, 661-687.
- Linos, K. and West, M. (2003) Self-interest, Social Beliefs, and Attitudes to Redistribution, *European Sociological Review*, **19**, 393-409.
- Mau, S. (2003) *The Moral Economy of Welfare States. Britain and Germany Compared*, Routledge, London.
- Mau, S. (2004) Welfare Regimes and the Norms of Social Exchange, *Current Sociology*, **52**, 53-74.
- Mettler, S. and Soss, J. (2004) The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship: Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics, *Perspectives on politics*, **2**, 55-73.
- Rokeach, M. (1968) The role of values in public opinion research, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, **32**, 547-559.
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The Nature of Human Values*, Free Press, New York.
- Rothstein, b. (1998) *Just institutions matter. The moral and political logic of the universal welfare state*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sagiv, L. and Schwartz, S. H. (1995) Value priorities and readiness for out-group social contact, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **69**, 437-448.

- Schwartz, S. H. (1992) Universals in the Content and Structure of Values - Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, **25**, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994) Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? , *Journal of Social Issues*, **50**, 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006) A theory of cultural value orientations: explication and applications, *Comparative Sociology*, **5**, 132-187.
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M. and Owens, V. (2001) Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **32**, 519-542.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. and Baumgartner, H. (1998) Assessing measurement invariance in cross national consumer research, *Journal of consumer research*, **25**, 78-90.
- Svallfors, S. (1996) *Välfärdsstatens moraliska ekonomi*, Boréa, Umeå.
- Svallfors, S. (1997) Worlds of welfare and attitudes to redistribution: A comparison of eight Western nations, *European Sociological Review*, **13**, 283-304.
- Svallfors, S. (2003) Welfare Regimes and Welfare Opinions: A Comparison of Eight Western Countries, *Social Indicators Research*, **64**, 495-520.
- Svallfors, S. (2007) *The Political Sociology of the welfare State: Institutions, Social Cleavages, and Orientations*, Stanford University Press, Stanford CA.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (2004) Open markets and welfare values: Welfare values, inequality and social change in the silver age of the welfare state, *European Societies*, **6**, 29-48.
- Ullrich, C. G. (2002) Reciprocity, justice and statutory health insurance in Germany, *Journal of European Social Policy*, **12**, 123-136.
- Vandenberg, R. J. and Lance, C. E. (2000) A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: suggestions, practices and recommendations for organizational research, *Organizational Research Methods*, **3**, 4-69.