

*Learning Accelerator Research Paper*

# Isms: Social Beliefs and Attitudes

**Jeremy Burrus**

**Lauren Carney**

**2015**

**Burrus, J., & Carney, L. C. (2015). Social belief and attitudes: Personality and the isms. In J. Wright (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition) (pp. 162-167). Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier.**

**This is a draft of “Social belief and attitudes: Personality and the isms,” and the copy of record is with Elsevier. (ISBN: 978-0-08-097087-5)**

**ACT**<sup>®</sup>

**M**AWI<sup>™</sup>  
LEARNING

**ACT**<sup>®</sup> **Tessera**<sup>®</sup>

## Isms: Social Beliefs and Attitudes

Jeremy Burrus

ACT

Lauren Carney

Educational Testing Service

Burrus, J., & Carney, L. C. (2015). Social belief and attitudes: Personality and the isms. In J. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)* (pp. 162-167). Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier.

This is a draft of “Social belief and attitudes: Personality and the isms,” and the copy of record is with Elsevier. (ISBN: 978-0-08-097087-5)

## **Abstract**

Social attitudes and beliefs can have a powerful influence on how one interprets, and respond to, everyday events. Employing a factor analytic approach, Saucier (2000; 2013) recently developed a taxonomy of social attitudes and beliefs which contains five dimensions. He labeled these dimensions “isms” because words describing these attitudes and beliefs tend to end in “ism” (e.g., fundamentalism, relativism, materialism). The five dimensions of isms are: Tradition-Oriented Religiousness, Unmitigated Self-Interest, Communal Rationalism, Subjective Spirituality, and Inequality-Aversion. In this chapter, we briefly discuss beliefs and attitudes more generally before discussing isms in detail. We then discuss the relationship of Big Five personality dimensions to isms and additional correlates of isms before providing a few areas for future research directions. The chapter concludes by making an argument that isms are a potentially very important, but highly under-researched, aspect of human individual differences.

Keywords: Isms; Beliefs; Attitudes; Values; Personality

Each of us adheres to a set of beliefs and attitudes that, at least in theory, guide the way we interpret events and respond to them. We are consciously aware of most of these beliefs. For instance, when I get in my car in the morning to go to work, I believe that turning the key will start the engine. And so, faithfully, every morning I turn the key, expecting my car to start. Almost invariably, it does. Only when the engine does not start do I start to question the veracity of this belief. Other beliefs are held more implicitly. For example, whereas some implicitly believe that each of us is born with a fixed amount of intelligence (an “entity” theory), others believe that intelligence is malleable and can be increased with practice (an “incremental” theory; Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995). As another example, people have a tendency to believe that something is more likely to be true the more often they have heard it (e.g., Allport & Lepkin, 1945). At times, these beliefs can have an evaluative quality. I can believe that my soul will enter the afterlife after I die, and I can also believe that it is *good* for my soul to enter the afterlife after I die. Typically, the evaluative components of beliefs are referred to as “attitudes”.

A particular set of beliefs and attitudes, “...whose referents have shared general societal relevance to many people in religious, economic, political, educational, ethnic, and other social areas” (Kerlinger, 1972, p. 614, as cited in Saucier, 2000) can be referred to as “social attitudes and beliefs”. For example, people who believe in egalitarianism believe that all people should be treated equally, regardless of their status in the social hierarchy. As such, they will tend to treat all people in a similar fashion. In everyday conversation, we use a range of words to describe such different belief systems, that could be used to describe social (e.g., egalitarianism, ethnocentrism), political (e.g., liberalism, conservatism), and religious (e.g., spiritualism, religionism) attitudes or beliefs, all of which might affect the way we behave. Note that each of the example social attitude or belief ends in “ism”. Thus, these terms were labeled “isms” by Saucier (2000).

Below, we delve deeper into the origin and structure of beliefs and attitudes. Next, we provide more detail specifically on social attitudes and beliefs, focusing on Saucier’s isms dimensions. We then discuss several issues surrounding isms, including: their relation to Big Five personality dimensions, their relationship to other constructs, and future directions for research involving isms. Although some empirical findings are discussed, because isms are a relatively understudied construct, much of this discussion relies heavily on theory.

### **Beliefs**

A belief is how sure one is that knowledge acquired (e.g., the Earth revolves around the sun) or a subjective experience (e.g., last night’s party was the most fun night of my life) is true (Wyer & Albarracin, 2005). Beliefs can vary in terms of strength, such that the surer one is that a proposition is true, the stronger the belief. They can refer to objects or events from the past (e.g., Facebook was founded on February 4, 2004), the present (e.g., my wife is 5’ 9”), or the future (e.g., all cars will be driverless in 15 years). Beliefs about the future can also be thought of as “expectations” (Wyer & Albarracin, 2005).

As stated briefly above, beliefs can also be held explicitly or implicitly. On the one hand, explicitly held beliefs are those which one is aware of holding. For example, I have a very strong explicit belief that I had scrambled eggs and coffee for breakfast this morning. On the other hand, unless brought to conscious awareness, one is generally unaware of holding implicit beliefs. Oftentimes, these beliefs consist of basic assumptions regarding the workings of the mind and the world in general, and are sometimes referred to as implicit, or naïve, theories (e.g., Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995; Schwarz, 2004; Wyer & Albarracin, 2005). The entity versus incremental theories of intelligence example from above is one example of an implicit theory.

Others include the naïve theory that written material that is easier to process (e.g., is written clearly rather than blurrily) has been seen before (e.g., Schwarz, 2004), and that behavior has occurred more frequently if examples of it can be easily brought to mind (Schwarz, Bless, Strack, et al., 1991). An important point in distinguishing explicit versus implicit beliefs is that implicit beliefs can influence our judgment, and subsequent behavior, without our awareness.

Beliefs can be based in cognition or motivation. Clearly many of the examples of beliefs discussed above are cognitive in nature. They refer to the probability that knowledge acquired through experience about oneself or others, events, places or objects, is true or correct. People may also hold beliefs because they are motivated to do so. Although people might hold a variety of motivations, a few basic ones have been identified in the psychological literature. For example, people strive to interact meaningfully with other individuals (“communion striving”), to have influence over others (“status striving”), to have control over their lives (“autonomy striving”), and to feel competent (“achievement striving”; see Barrick, Mount, & Li, 2013 for a review). Additionally, people have the need to feel like the world is fair and just (Lerner & Miller, 1978), and also the need to reconcile thoughts of their own impending deaths (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986). Individuals vary on their level of each of these needs; one might have a very low need for communion striving but a high need for achievement striving, whereas another person might demonstrate the opposite profile. Beliefs can be generated that can help ease one’s concerns about each of these motivations. For example, the belief, “Even though I have few friends, the friends I do have are very close to me.” might be generated to help one feel he or she is achieving progress toward fulfilling the communion striving need. Additionally, the belief, “People have souls that are separate from their physical bodies” might be generated to help ease one’s fear of death.

### **Attitudes**

An attitude is an evaluation of a person, object, or event (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). They consist of an experiential and an instrumental component (Ajzen, 2006). The experiential component represents the valence of the entity and can be measured with scales ranging from *good-bad*, to *pleasant – unpleasant*, to *enjoyable – unenjoyable*. The instrumental component represents the utility of an entity and can be measured with scales ranging from *useful - useless*, to *beneficial - harmful*, to *valuable-worthless*. Thus, it can be said that I have a positive attitude toward math if I enjoy the experience of doing math, and/or if I feel that math is useful and valuable (e.g., Lipnevich, MacCann, Krumm, et al., 2011).

Although the relationship of beliefs to attitudes is not necessarily agreed upon (Wyer & Albarracín, 2005), one prominent theory of attitudes states that attitudes develop from beliefs (Theory of Planned Behavior; Ajzen, 1991). That is, beliefs about a person, object, or event become linked to a positive or negative attribute to form an attitude. Because I am pretty sure that I was born, I have a very strong belief that I indeed have a birthday. My attitude toward my birthday, however, may change with age. When I am young, I associate my birthday with positive features (parties and presents), and so I have a positive attitude toward my birthday. Later in life, however, I may begin to associate my birthday with negative features (getting older and thus closer to death), and my attitude toward my birthday may turn negative. These positive or negative associations can come from personal experience or from witnessing (or learning about) others’ experiences (e.g., “Social Learning Theory”, Bandura, 1977).

If attitudes are truly derived from beliefs, it follows that they, too, have both cognitive and motivational bases. We can develop an attitude because we know (or think we know) something, or we can develop an attitude because we want (or need) to believe something.

Similarly, attitudes can be explicitly and implicitly held (Nosek, 2007). As with beliefs, an explicit attitude is one that is aware of holding and can consciously report on. In contrast, one is not always aware of holding an implicit attitude and thus he or she cannot consciously report on them. In fact, they are usually activated automatically. Typically, they are measured with the Implicit Association Test (IAT), which measures the strength of associations between two sets of concepts (e.g., good vs. bad; black vs. white). Explicit attitudes often agree with implicit attitudes (Nosek, 2007) but sometimes diverge. For example, people often explicitly claim no racial favoritism, although results from the IAT find that they implicitly favor whites to blacks (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002).

### **Social Beliefs and Attitudes: Isms**

As briefly described above, social attitudes and beliefs have been coined “Isms” by Saucier (2000). Prior to the year 2000, several social attitudes and beliefs had been identified in the research literature (e.g., Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950); however, no attempt was made to create a taxonomy of such attitudes and beliefs until Saucier’s seminal work.

In an attempt to find a simplified structure within such a wide range of attitudes and beliefs, Saucier (2000) factor-analyzed 266 isms using a college student population. He found 4 dimensions of isms, initially labeling them with Greek letters to avoid using misleading terms in categorizing such broad factors. He later felt more comfortable in providing more conventional labels to these dimensions. Saucier (2000) provides a detailed description of the first 4 dimensions. His descriptions are summarized below and additional examples and definitions are included in Table 1.

“Alpha”, or “Tradition-oriented Religiousness”, is described as the degree to which an individual reveres religious authority and believes in, and supports, conventional and traditional forms of religion. Cultural traditions are important for those who score high on alphaisms. This value may result in many behavioral manifestations, including a willingness to behave aggressively in the name of traditional sources of authority. It would follow, for example, that many of those who volunteered to participate in The Crusades in the late Middle Ages in the name of the Catholic Church would have scored high on alpha. Taking an example from more recent events, we would hypothesize that the political unrest in the Middle East, and the associated aggressive actions taken, is highly motivated by alphaisms. An example item used to measure alpha is, “Religion should play the most important role in civil affairs”.

“Beta”, or “Unmitigated Self-Interest”, measures the degree to which someone justifies different forms of self-interest, such as materialism or forms of physical pleasure. According to Saucier (2000), it concerns attitudes and beliefs about one’s immediate environment. Whereas many alphaisms focus on the past, betaisms tend to be present focused. We hypothesize that an individual high on betaisms would be more likely to sacrifice potential future gains for present ones than an individual low on betaisms. As such, for example, we would conjecture that most environmental activists would score low on betaisms. One example item is, “The pleasures of the senses are the highest good”.

“Gamma”, or “Communal Rationalism”, stresses the support of a nation and a common institution which guarantees individual freedom and which emphasizes the use of reason. This dimension covers isms such as patriotism, humanism, and functionalism. We believe that the prototypical coach of a team sport provides an apt example of a person high on gamma. A quick scan of the gamma examples in Table 1 makes this clear. “Nationalism” (I am devoted to one particular nation) can be retranslated to “teamism” (I am devoted to one particular team).

“Hedonism” (Behavior is motivated by the desire for pleasure and the avoidance of pain) is displayed in coaches who motivate players by inducing pain to punish player mistakes (e.g., yelling at them, making them run extra laps, etc.). Finally, “fundamentalism” (I adhere firmly to fundamental and basic principles) is clearly a part of coaching, as one important job of the coach is to teach a sport’s basic fundamentals and principles. An example gamma item is, “I believe in government by law with the consent of those people governed”.

“Delta”, or “Subjective Spirituality”, is the degree to which a person values subjective spiritual or “paranormal” experiences. Though some psychologists tend to group religion (or alphaisms) and spirituality (deltaisms) into one factor, evidence shows these are two distinct factors (Saucier 2000, 2013; Saucier & Skrzypinska, 2006). Religious beliefs place emphasis on the opinions of an organized group of people, while spiritual beliefs are formed based on subjective experiences and individual feelings. Saucier (2000) implies that delta has roots in Indian Hinduism, and, in American tradition, Transcendentalism. An important aspect of delta is the belief that divinity is not exclusive to humans; nature also has divine aspect. An example delta item is, “Enlightenment is gained through meditation, self-contemplation, and intuition”.

Later, Saucier (2013) again factor-analyzed a large collection of isms, but this time with a wider community sample. He replicated the four factors of alpha, beta, gamma and delta. However, there was also evidence of a fifth factor, “epsilon”, or “Inequality-Aversion”, relating to egalitarianism. “One pole of the dimension is anchored by item clusters endorsing communal ownership, social welfare programs, and a socialist society; the other pole involves views supportive of domination of one class, group, or nation over others (e.g., elitism, chauvinism, jingoism). This dimension is concerned foremost with attitudes toward inequalities within one’s own society, but this extends secondarily to inequalities between societies.” (Saucier, 2013, p. 931). An example item is, “Free market capitalism leads to gross inequalities in income and wealth, which is a great social evil.” Thus, the current Survey of Dictionary-based Isms (SDI), developed by Saucier, contains items that measure all five of the dimensions.

It should be clear from the examples provided that isms are indeed forms of beliefs (e.g., Solipsism: “The self is the only thing that can be known and verified.”) and attitudes (e.g., Materialism: “Physical well-being and worldly possessions are the greatest good and highest value in life.”). As such, it follows that if beliefs and attitudes can be held both explicitly and implicitly, then so should isms. We posit that, if the explicit/implicit distinction is thought of as a continuum, most isms would fall closer to the implicit side of the pole. It seems clear that many isms are influenced by, or are indeed products of; ideas imbued by one’s culture that drive one’s view of the world.

One definition states that culture has three components that are learned and shared by a group of people: “1) The *things* people make and use (called artifacts), 2) the ways people *behave* (including language), and 3) the *ideas* people have” (e.g., Caligiuri, Noe, Nolan, Ryan, & Drasgow, 2011, p. 2). These components are thought to be relatively stable in nature, although they can change depending on circumstances (Caligiuri et al., 2011). Culture is often explained using the iceberg metaphor (e.g., Herman, 1970), such that most of culture’s influence in everyday life is unseen or “below the surface of the ocean”. The part that can be seen or is above the surface includes the norms, artifacts, and behaviors of specific cultures. Just below the surface are the values and interests held by specific cultures. Finally, deeper below the surface still are the assumptions held by specific cultures. These “below the surface” aspects of culture appear to be synonymous with isms. It is thought that cultural assumptions influence values and

interests, which then influence norms, artifacts, and behaviors. Isms may represent some combination of culturally influenced assumptions, values, and interests.

The likely relation of isms to cultural values and assumptions calls to mind other taxonomies of cultural values. For instance, Hofstede (1983) has identified several dimensions upon which cultures vary. These include: “power distance” (acceptance of unequal power), “uncertainty avoidance” (tolerance for ambiguity), “individualism vs. collectivism” (the degree that people are oriented toward groups), and “masculinity” (the degree to which men and women’s values differ in a society). Another prominent theory, Schwartz’s (1992) cultural values, identifies several values that can be organized into 2 factors: “organization vs. change” and “self-enhancement vs. self-transcendence”. To the best of our knowledge, the relation of isms to Hofstede’s dimensions has not been investigated. Saucier (2013) did investigate the relation of isms to Schwartz’s dimensions and found that 3 of the isms dimensions fell within the Schwartz 2-dimensional structure, with subjective spirituality and communal relationism falling outside of the structure.

One possible way that isms differ from the beliefs and attitudes discussed above is that, whereas beliefs and attitudes in general vary as to the extent to which they are cognitively or motivationally determined, isms seem to be primarily motivational in nature. That is, each of the isms provided in the examples in this chapter (see Saucier, 2000; 2013 for a complete list) can be said to speak to one of the fundamental motives described above. For example, to conjecture from the examples listed in Table 1:

- *Communalism* (I believe in communal (group or community) ownership of goods and property) relates to communion striving
- *Classism* (I prefer people of a certain social or economic class) relates to status striving
- *Solipsism* (the self is the only thing that can be known and verified) relates to autonomy striving
- *Materialism* (physical well-being and worldly possessions are the greatest good and highest value in life) relates to achievement striving
- *Triumphalism* (moral laws are fixed, absolute, and the same everywhere) relates to the need to feel the world is fair and just
- *Animism* (there are spiritual beings separate, or separable, from bodies) relates to the need to reconcile thoughts of one’s own death

If the isms are indeed related to one’s basic motivations and needs, this suggests that manipulating these motivations (for example, making thoughts of death more accessible) should lead to a change in one’s endorsement of corresponding isms. Although we do not know of any research that speaks directly to this issue, some naturalistic research does speak indirectly. For example, in the days immediately following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (a clear example of increasing the salience of one’s death) 74% to 82% of Americans showed their patriotism by displaying the American flag on their home, car, or person (Morgan, Wisneski, & Skitka, 2011). This percentage had decreased to 56% by 2003.

Although we speculate that one’s endorsement of isms can be manipulated, and thus are malleable, isms are typically thought of as relatively stable individual differences. This may come as a surprise to some given the large literature in social psychology that documents techniques for persuasion and attitude change (e.g., Cialdini, 1993). However, certain types of attitudes have shown considerable stability. Such is the case with vocational interests; attitudes about activities involving goal-related behaviors (Rounds & Su, 2014). Meta-analysis has found

that interests stabilize as early as age 12, and remain stable at least through middle adulthood (Low, Yoon, Roberts, & Rounds, 2005). In fact, they appear to be more stable than personality. One commonality we see between isms and vocational interests are their high relevance to the self. It is likely that highly self-relevant attitudes are more accessible (easier to bring to mind) than less self-relevant attitudes (e.g., Fazio & Olson, 2007). As such, they influence one's interpretation of daily life-events and, as they do so, increase in strength over time. The fact that isms have been identified by Saucier as individual-differences, and the likelihood that they are relatively stable, may suggest to some that isms might simply be another way to label the Big Five personality traits (See Chapter X this volume). This is discussed briefly below.

#### *Isms and Personality*

Many have questioned the ways in which personality and belief systems overlap; some believed that various beliefs could be just another dimension of personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Homer & Kahle, 1988). Saucier (2013) found that each of the five ism dimensions significantly correlated with at least one of the Big 5 factors, yet they did not correlate higher than  $r = .25$ . This suggests that the isms dimensions do have important associations with the Big 5, but are actually unique from these personality factors. For example, people who were less conscientious were more likely to endorse Subjective Spiritualism (however, there was no significant correlation between conscientiousness and endorsing traditional religions). People who were more agreeable were more likely to endorse Inequality-Aversion and be more egalitarian, as one might expect. Openness was found to be negatively correlated with Unmitigated Self-Interest, while people who were less emotionally stable were more likely to endorse traditional religions. Saucier (2013) also examined change in personality characteristics across the span of ten years and found that Unmitigated Self-Interest was correlated with a negative change in agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness.

Isms, thus, represent one alternate conceptualization of personality that focuses on individual differences in social attitudes and beliefs. Importantly, the magnitude of correlations of isms and the Big Five personality factors suggests that they do not completely overlap with the Big Five. This suggests that isms might act as an important complement to the Big Five for both illuminating the nature of individual differences and predicting important outcomes.

#### *Other Correlates of Isms*

The relative paucity of research on isms means that very little work has been conducted investigating isms's correlates. Recently, however, Saucier (2013) examined the relation of isms to previously used measures of social attitudes and beliefs, political preference, and subjective well-being (SWB). He found that several isms correlated significantly with previous measures of social attitudes and beliefs. To provide a few examples of correlations that exceeded .20, tradition-oriented religiousness and inequality-aversion correlated with right-wing authoritarianism (social conservatism) at .76 and -.29 respectively, and, unmitigated self-interest and inequality aversion correlated with social dominance orientation (a preference for hierarchy) at .22 and -.54 respectively. Thus, it could be argued that tradition-oriented religiousness and inequality aversion overlap to such an extent with previously identified constructs so as to be redundant. This is especially the case for tradition-oriented religiousness.

Interestingly, only one ism was found to be significantly correlated with measures of subjective well-being, Communal-Rationalism, which suggests that people who believe in the importance of a fair and just government are also happier. The relationship was weak, however, ( $r = .13$ ). Given the oft-replicated finding that those who participate in religious activities tend to

have higher SWB (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999), it is surprising that people who endorsed traditional religious or spiritual beliefs were not found to be significantly happier. Finally, isms were related to political preference, with republicans more likely to be high on tradition-oriented religiousness, and democrats more likely to be high on communal relationism, subjective spirituality, and inequality aversion.

#### *Future Directions*

There are numerous avenues for future research on isms. One important area will be to investigate the development and temporal stability of isms. Presumably, given the discussion of above, one strong influence of ism development is one's culture. However, other influences likely come into play. One obvious influence should be religious upbringing. Others include parental attitudes and parenting style, sociopolitical events that occur during one's formative years, formal and informal educational experiences, and a host of idiosyncratic personal experiences. Furthermore, some social attitudes have been shown to have a genetic component (e.g., Waller, Kojetin, Bouchard, Lykken, & Tellegen, 1990), and so, too, could isms.

As is the case with vocational interests, we suspect that isms are relatively stable throughout the lifespan. However, despite prior belief to the contrary, individual differences such as personality have been shown to change throughout the lifespan (e.g., Roberts, Walton, Viechtbauer, 2005). As we posited above, one possible mechanism for ism change over the lifespan would be to threaten one's basic needs. For instance, major sociopolitical, or personal life, events that threaten one's belief that the world is fair and just could lead to shifts in one's level of tradition-oriented religiousness.

Another important area for future research will be to replicate the structure of isms across several cultures. To the best of our knowledge, the only attempt at a cross-cultural replication was Krauss's (2006) replication in Romania. In this study, Krauss roughly replicated the first 4 isms factors. It will be important, however, to replicate the structure in non-European cultures, such as the cultures of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It's our belief that nearly any pattern of results would be interesting. Replication across all, or most, cultures might suggest a common human evolution of social attitudes and beliefs that are somehow related to the survival of the species. By contrast, distinct isms patterns across cultures would provide important information about the structure of cultural differences.

A final area for future research will be to predict important school and work outcomes with isms. Meta-analysis has found that attitudes predict a wide range of behaviors (Kraus, 1995), and individual difference measures predict important outcomes both at school (e.g., Poropat, 2009) and at work (e.g., Judge, Rodell, Klinger, Simon, & Crawford, 2013). Isms should be no different. Numerous hypotheses can be put forth. Some examples include:

- Tradition-oriented religiousness is negatively related to creativity
- Unmitigated self-interest is negatively related to teamwork
- Communal relationism is positively related to leadership
- Subjective spirituality is positively related to coping skills (this hypothesis is less clear than the others)
- Inequality-aversion is positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (positive behaviors such as helping coworkers, being cooperative, and putting forth extra effort to get the job done; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

If isms are indeed shown to relate to important outcomes, it is unclear about how to best use them to improve outcomes for individuals. One potentially fruitful use would be in providing

feedback to students and employees as to how their unstated assumptions and values influence both their behavior and their interpretation of the events that happen at school and work.

### *Conclusion*

Each of us has a set of social attitudes and beliefs that guide our perception and behavior as we traverse life. To witness their power in everyday events, one merely needs to turn on the television or read the news. Once one is aware of these isms dimensions, it is clear that nearly (or probably) all major social and political events are heavily influenced by them. We suspect that they also have a profound influence in nearly all minor everyday events. As such, a further exploration of these dimensions has the potential to greatly understand our understanding of human behavior in general, and our prediction of important performance outcomes more specifically.

### **References**

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harpers.
- Allport, F. H., & Lepkin, M. (1945). Wartime rumors of waste and special privilege: Why some people believe them. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 40, 3-36.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (2006). *Constructing a TpB Questionnaire: Conceptual and methodological considerations*. Retrieved from <http://www.unix.oit.umass.edu/~aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 132-153.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caligiuri, P., Noe, R., Nolan, R., Ryan, A. M., & Drasgow, F. (2011). *Training, developing, and assessing cross-cultural competence in military personnel* (Technical Report No. 1284). Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1993). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: Morrow.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276 - 302.
- Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6, 267-285.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2007). Attitudes: Foundations, functions, and consequences. In M.A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp.123-145). London: Sage.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T. & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R.F. Baumeister (ed.), *Public Self and Private Self* (pp. 189-212). Springer-Verlag (New York).
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. K. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1464-1480.
- Herman, S. M. (1970, September). *The organization as an iceberg*. Paper presented at the Organizational Development Network Conference, Chicago, IL.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 46-74.
- Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). A structural equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 638-646
- Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2013). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 875-925
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1972). The structure and content of social attitude referents: A preliminary study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *32*, 613-630.
- Kraus, S. J. (1995). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 58-75.
- Krauss, S. (2006). Does ideology transcend culture? A preliminary examination in Romania. *Journal of Personality*, *74*, 1219 –1256.
- Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin*, *85*, 1030 - 1051.
- Lipnevich, A. A., MacCann, C., Krumm, S., Burrus, J., & Roberts, R. D. (2011). Math attitudes and mathematics outcomes in U.S. and Belarusian middle school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *103*, 105-118.
- Low, K. S. D., Yoon, M., Roberts, B. W., & Rounds, J. (2005). The stability of vocational interests from early adolescence to middle adulthood: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 713–737
- Morgan, G. S., Wisneski, D. C., & Skitka, L. J. (2011). The expulsion from Disneyland: The social psychological impact of 9/11. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 447-454.
- Nosek, B. A. (2007). Implicit–explicit relations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 65-69.
- Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration website. *Group Dynamics*, *6*, 101-115.
- Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*, 322-338.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: a meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 1-25.
- Rounds, J., & Su, R. (2014). The nature and power of interests. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*, 98-103.

- Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366-385.
- Saucier, G., & Skrzypińska, K. (2006). Spiritual but not religious? Evidence for two independent dispositions. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 1257-1292.
- Saucier, G. (2013). Isms dimensions: Toward a more comprehensive and integrative model of belief-system components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104, 921-939.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Schwarz, N. (2004). Metacognitive experiences in consumer judgment and decision making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14, 332-348.
- Schwarz, N., Bless, H., Strack, F., Klumpp, G., Rittenauer-Schatka, H., & Simons, A. (1991). Ease of retrieval as information: Another look at the availability heuristic. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 195 - 202.
- Waller, N. G., Kojetin, B. A., Bouchard, T. J., Lykken, D. T., & Tellegen, A. (1990). Genetic and environmental influences on religious interests, attitudes, and values: A study of twins reared apart and together. *Psychological Science*, 1, 138-142.
- Wyer, R. S., & Albarracín, D. (2005). Belief formation, organization, and change: Cognitive and motivational influences. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The Handbook of Attitudes* (pp. 273-322). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Table 1. Example isms and their definitions (Saucier, 2000; 2013)

---

<b>Alpha (Tradition-Oriented Religiousness)</b>	
<i>Calvinism:</i>	God is all-powerful, and those whom God chooses will be saved by God's grace alone.
<i>Secularism:</i>	Religious considerations should be excluded from civil affairs and public education.
<i>Triumphalism:</i>	Moral laws are fixed, absolute, and the same everywhere.
<b>Beta (Unmitigated Self-Interest)</b>	
<i>Solipsism:</i>	The self is the only thing that can be known and verified.
<i>Materialism:</i>	Physical well-being and worldly possessions are the greatest good and highest value in life.
<i>Ethnocentrism:</i>	I believe in the superiority of my own ethnic group.
<b>Gamma (Communal Rationalism)</b>	
<i>Nationalism:</i>	I am devoted to one particular nation.
<i>Hedonism:</i>	Behavior is motivated by the desire for pleasure and the avoidance of pain.
<i>Fundamentalism:</i>	I adhere firmly to fundamental and basic principles.
<b>Delta (Subjective Spirituality)</b>	
<i>Animism:</i>	There are spiritual beings separate, or separable, from bodies.
<i>Anthropomorphism:</i>	Many nonhuman things have human motivation and human characteristics.
<i>Pragmatism:</i>	I adhere to and am dedicated to the facts.
<b>Epsilon (Inequality-Aversion)</b>	
<i>Classism:</i>	I prefer people of a certain social or economic class.
<i>Communalism:</i>	I believe in communal (group or community) ownership of goods and property.
<i>Anarchism:</i>	All forms of government are oppressive and undesirable and should be abolished.

---