

Gregory Ferenstein
Paper Executive Summary
Center for the Study of Democracy Graduate Student Conference
May 9th, 2009

*This sheet is a brief summary of the work to be presented on May 9th. The paper is a work in progress, and the evidence is still preliminary. Feedback welcome. **Please do not cite without author's permission.**

Abstract

It is hypothesized that most individuals hold one of three political philosophies that shapes their beliefs on leadership and the viability of certain organizational solutions. For instance, a person of "authoritarian" beliefs would doubt the viability of participatory solutions in all types of organization, such as schools, business, and government. Preliminary data from semi-structured interviews with college students indicates that this hypothesis holds true. These findings might help forecast political leaders' decisions.

Introduction

Several authors across various social science disciplines have observed a similar three-fold typology of political philosophies in their respective fields. Specifically, each author finds a philosophy that supports either

- 1). An authoritarian political structure, which emphasizes a coercive, centralized leadership, which is needed to stave off otherwise impending chaos. **Rules** are mechanism which leaders use to control members.
- 2). A minimalist governmental structure, where conflicts are handled through competition or contract. In general, individuals with this philosophy believe the purpose of organizations is protect **Rights**. Interaction between members should be mediated through voluntary contracts, or in an arena which guarantees an level playing field.
- 3). A populist structure, where each member has a duty to contribute. Special emphasis is placed on educating members. This philosophy is oriented toward believing that there are right and wrong actions, and that the best **Reason** should determine how the organization/members should act.

This paper presents evidence that the reason these philosophies crop-up across various disciplines is because many individuals hold *a consistent political philosophy across various domains: including the classroom, the workplace, international bodies, and domestic policy.*

Table 1 - The Typology in Various Fields

Academic Field	Author	Rules	Rights	Reason
Political Culture	Elazar	Traditionalistic	Individualistic	Moralistic
	<i>Conanical ethnography on 19th century american political culture</i>	<i>Members accept a hierarchical relationship with governing officials. The government has a positive role in society, but limits access from ordinary citizens</i>	<i>Minimalist government, where laws are only initiated after there is public pressure</i>	<i>Everyone has a duty to participate in politics</i>
Moral Psychology	Kohlberg	Authoritarian/Stage 4	Contractarian	Principled
	<i>Used responses to hypothetical moral delimmias to categorize an individuals moral development on 6 sequential 'stages'</i>	<i>Obeying laws/rules is the moral thing to do. Sometimes occpanied with a sense of enivatable choas if laws are not followed</i>	<i>Fundamental rights are prior to social laws. But, one has a greater moral obligation to those for which they have a relationship, such as a marriage</i>	<i>Morality is doing the right thing. Moral obligations extend to all humans.</i>
International Relations	Wendt	Hobbsian	Lockian	Kantian
	<i>Identifies three different philosophies on how actors behave in international politics</i>	<i>"Realist" family. Nations are self interested. Military hegemony is a solution for what is otherwise international anarchy.</i>	<i>Nations can compromise and find mutually beneficial relationships. Treaties are a solution to conflict</i>	<i>Nations are interdependent and can find consensus on overarching political goals. Global institutions, such as the UN, is a solution to conflict.</i>

Table 1 Continued

Business Management	Purcell	Unitary	Adversarial Collectivism	Cooperative
	<i>Identifies three management philosophies</i>	<i>Hierarchical management</i>	<i>Collective-Bargaining in Unions. And, payment to account for each employees contribution</i>	<i>participatory management, encourage effort from employees</i>
Sociology	Powell	Hierarchy	Market	Network
	<i>Major work which Identifies general patters in organizational structure</i>	<i>Pyramic-shapped raltionships between leaders and subordinates</i>	<i>Individualistic behavior, mediated through property rights and contracts</i>	<i>Interdependent behavior mediated through relationships.</i>
Economics	Eccles, Bradach	Authority	Price	Trust
	<i>Three "ideal" types of economic exchange</i>	<i>Coercive action by a stronger institution, such as a government or large company</i>	<i>Agreed upon currency</i>	<i>Exchange based on relationships and expected behavior</i>

Testing the Existence of the three-fold typology in a survey of Elite Foreign Policy Attitudes

Survey

A survey at US elite foreign policy attitudes is used to empirical test whether to what degree individuals adopt one of these three philosophical systems. The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations¹ survey is ideally suited since it asks questions philosophical in nature. The analysis consists of 220 respondents which are “Decision-makers in positions of leadership in government, academia, business, labor, the media, religious institutions, special interest groups, and private foreign policy organizations.

Statistical Method

Latent Class Analysis – a clustering method which minimizes the overall variance between responses. Latent Class Analysis is capable of intermixing continuous and non-continuous data. For more details, see (Stern et al, 1995)²

Results from the Chicago Survey

The data broadly supports the hypothesized philosophical orientations.³ The Hobbes/Rules orientation was extraordinarily supportive of military hegemony and almost equally opposed to positive obligations toward the global community. Equally as important, those of the rules orientation almost universally believed the President should be extremely influential over foreign policy, while tempering their support of influence of both the American People and Congress. Finally, of the three orientations, Rules was the least supportive of education. This paints an accurate picture of the Hobbesian mind: a commitment to power through centralized strength. Curiously, Rules was unsupportive of “protecting the interests of American business abroad.” Theoretically, it would seem that the protection of citizens engaged in national-interest activities with fall within a leader's protective sphere.

The Rights mentality showed a general indifference to most foreign affairs. While there was strong support for keeping out illegal immigrants and maintaining military superiority, it was highly likely that such respondents supported neither increasing nor decreasing government action. Surprisingly, the Rights-based did

1 Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY, 2002 [Computer file]. ICPSR03673-v1. Rochester, NY : Harris Interactive [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

2 Stern, H., Arcus, D., Kagan, J., Rubin, D. B., & Snidman, N. (1994). STATISTICAL CHOICES IN INFANT TEMPERAMENT RESEARCH. *Behaviormetrika*, 21(1), 1-17.

3 In the calculation, 4 classes were specified rather than 3, since there are appeared to be a group of respondents who felt strongly supportive of *every* single question. There are one of two explanations for this phenomenon. 1). Some respondents prefer to be agreeable on surveys. Or, 2). there is some hitherto unrecognized political philosophy. Regardless of which explanation is the case, the fact that the 3 hypothesized classes were still identified still confirms the typology

show strong support for increasing education.

Finally, the Reason orientation was characterized by the opposite of the Rules in many ways: increase support of global needs and increase education aid. Likewise, it was the least supportive of Presidential influence and most supportive of the American People. Theoretically, the Rules and Reason orientation should have more in common on domestic issues. Both believe in the benefits of a coercive state, and would be likely to support regulation of economic industries. As well, both should have relatively high levels of trust.

While there are identifiable patterns, the distinction between each system were not all that strong. For instance, Rules-based thinkers did not strongly oppose humanitarian aid. As well, the Rules and Rights systems both supported combating world hunger with a 21% and 28% probability, respectively. In the Survey, questions were not phrased in a way that made policy options seem mutually exclusive. In reality, there is only so much time and money to go around. In the interview, however, respondents could appear to support solving world hunger and combating terrorism; it is difficult to know what percent of the national budget should be allocated to each problem. This could also account for the unknown 4th class, which gave favorable responses to every question.

Finally, while each of the proposed typologies has a nuanced philosophical system, it is difficult to know whether respondents share the same depth of understanding. The survey does not have questions about human nature. Therefore, we cannot know whether human nature has anything to do with their response choices.

Results from LCA. Table 2A. Respondents were asked if each of the following foreign policy areas should be Very Important, Somewhat Important, or Not important in government decisions. The fractions represent the probability of an individual's response, given his classification in either the Rules, Reason, or Rights philosophy. For Instance, there is a 0.73 probability a Rule-based thinker will say Military Superiority is 'Very Important.'

Probability of Response of an Individual in a Given Class					
	Class	Very Important	Somewhat	Not Important	
Maintain Military Superiority	rules	0.7376	0.1394	0.123	
	reason	0.0604	0.6238	0.3159	
	rights	0.5688	0.4312	0	
Spread Democracy	rules	0.0887	0.6196	0.2917	
	reason	0.1523	0.7034	0.1443	
	rights	0.1055	0.7883	0.1063	
Promote Markets Abroad	rules	0.2698	0.4395	0.2907	
	reason	0.0583	0.4829	0.4589	
	rights	0.1589	0.7807	0.0604	
Defend Allies Security	rules	0.569	0.3475	0.0836	
	reason	0.2311	0.679	0.0899	
	rights	0.465	0.5098	0.0253	
Control/Reduce Illegal Immigration	rules	0.4803	0.3075	0.2122	
	reason	0.0712	0.3016	0.6272	
	rights	0.2511	0.6256	0.1232	

Table 2A Continued

Promote/Defend Human Rights	rules	0.0838	0.665	0.2512	
	reason	0.5878	0.3922	0.0199	
	rights	0.0444	0.8885	0.067	
Strengthen UN	rules	0.0408	0.0499	0.9093	
	reason	0.6132	0.3128	0.074	
	rights	0.0725	0.6332	0.2942	
Combat World Hunger	rules	0.2095	0.4983	0.2922	
	reason	0.7531	0.2294	0.0175	
	rights	0.2893	0.7107	0	
Combat Terrorism	rules	1	0	0	
	reason	0.5587	0.3888	0.0525	
	rights	0.9215	0.0785	0	
Aid to Education	rules	0.3962	0.3325	0.2713	
	reason	0.9113	0.0356	0.0531	

Table 2B – Respondents were asked how much influence certain groups should have. For instance, there is a 0.44 probability a Reason-based thinker will say that the American Public should be Highly Influential. The Actual response options ranged from 0-10, which the author regrouped into 3 ordinal categories.

		Little or no influence	Moderately Influential	Highly Influential
American Public	rules	0.1755	0.4666	0.3579
	reason	0.1227	0.4348	0.4424
	rights	0.0514	0.6765	0.2721
Congress	rules	0.0835	0.4866	0.4299
	reason	0	0.5384	0.4616
	rights	0	0.5922	0.4078
President	rules	0	0.0797	0.9203
	reason	0	0.2849	0.7151

Semi-structured Survey

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to see if a person's philosophical orientation influenced whether they would perceive some organizational solutions as viable. For instance, would a person who could be classified as a Rules-based thinker using questions from the Chicago survey also distrust participatory management in the workplace?

Respondents were first asked a series of questions to determine whether they could be classified into one of the three philosophical orientations. For brevity's sake, a discussion of the full survey will be left to the presentation. In summary, we asked questions to rate their moral psychological development (Kohlberg), their international relations attitudes (using the Chicago survey), and a few miscellaneous questions on their general attitudes toward human nature, management, and the role of the teacher in a classroom.

Dependent Variable

Respondents were finally given a series of scenarios of hypothetical problems. Each scenario was accompanied by possible solutions. Respondents were then asked to say, on a scale from 1-10, how likely each solution was likely to succeed.

For instance, one scenario went

“A school has been set up for at-risk high school students who did not attend regularly attend classes. The principle is trying to set up a program to increase class attendance”

This had 4 possible solutions

1. Threaten students with after school suspensions for every class they miss
2. Pay students \$300 for every quarter they don't skip class
3. Allow students to come and go as they please, and submit homework via email
4. Allow students to select an internship they would like to have.

Results

As hypothesized, individuals had generally consistent beliefs in accordance with their philosophical orientation. For instance, The reason-based thinkers scored “Allow students to come and go as they please” and “allow students to select an internship...” as likely successful, and scored “Threaten students...” as unlikely successful. Respondents classified as Rule-based thinkers made the opposite predictions.

In another scenario on “How a manager should increase productivity in a manufacturing firm”, Reason-based thinkers supported participatory management and transparent financial records. Likewise, they distrusted micro-management. One Reason-based thinker justified his answer by noting that “I believe people are very understanding” and that open financial records, in the long term, would make people “empathetic”.

More detailed results will be discussed in the presentation. The full set of scenarios and solutions is attached in a table below

Semi-Structured Interview Questions and Solutions

Question Setup

Now I'm going to list of series of scenarios that people have raised as potential solutions to problems. Some of them have been tried, others not. On a scale of 1-10, I want you to tell me if how likely these potential solutions are to succeed, 10 being "very likely to succeed"

Scenario 1

A school has been set up for at-risk high school students who did not attend regularly attend classes. The principle is trying to set up a program to increase class attendance

Solutions

1. Threaten students with after school suspensions for every class they miss
2. Pay students \$300 for every quarter they don't skip class
3. Allow students to come and go as they please, and submit homework via email
4. Allow students to select an internship they would like to have.

S2

To increase productivity, a manager a small manufacturing firm is considering several options

1. Make all corporate financial records transparent, then allow to employees to set their own salaries
2. have the manager give employees lots of direction: when to come to work, what to make and how to make it
3. Break employees into self-managed teams, and have the salaries depend on how well their product sells

S3

in order to reduce violence between ethnic groups within a country, an international body will try several options

1. give each ethnic group a different part of the country, and allow to make laws for their own region
2. give each ethnic group equal representation in the federal government. And, have every major decision voted on by the entire country
3. set up a system of extremely harsh punishments for anyone conducting ethnic violence, or aiding ethnic violence

To reduce violence among prisoners, a prison warden is considering several options

1. Harsh punishments for any offense and rewards for good behavior
2. Give prisoners keys to their own cells, and encourage friendliness with the guards