The study of morality within personality psychology, like American personality theory itself, is best read as beginning with Gordon Allport (e.g., 1921). As has been widely noted, Allport (1937, p. 52) wrote, ‘Character is personality evaluated, and personality is character devaluated.’ However, closer reading reveals that Allport’s intention was to preserve the integrity of personality by separating volition and will from external standards that can be used to evaluate behavior (Piekkola, 2011).

This distinction becomes clear in Allport’s subsequent emphasis on ‘a unifying philosophy of life’ as a defining feature of the ‘mature personality’ (p. 214) that integrates behavior through ‘some fundamental conception of value,’ as well as his reference to one’s philosophy of life as the ‘apex of development in the mature personality’ (pp. 226–227). This theme of guiding principles that structure behavioral choices pervades Allport’s writings. For example, he described the developmental transition of the mature adult from a ‘must’ conscience based on fear of punishment to an ‘ought’ conscience guided by patterns of values that inform appropriate behavior (Allport, 1955, p. 73; note the resonance with Kohlberg’s subsequent developmental stages of moral reasoning).

A clearer understanding of Allport’s fundamental embrace of value systems eliminates what otherwise would be an enormous inconsistency between his supposed rejection of morality, and his embrace of Eduard Spranger’s six ideal value types, which form the basis for the Allport and Vernon (Vernon & Allport, 1931; Allport & Vernon, 1931) Study of Values. Indeed, the Allport–Vernon–Lindzey Study of Values (SOV) was subtitled, ‘A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interests in Personality’ (italics added), and it served as the initial psychological measure of values or morality.

Braithwaite and Scott (1991) reviewed the SOV and several subsequent generations of personality and social psychological measures of morality. They focused their review on the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), which had become the dominant measure of individual value orientations. In the 23 years since that review, a new generation of researchers has introduced alternative models and measures of the moral personality. In particular, the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992), which was derived in part from the Rokeach measure, has become the dominant, broad-band measure of what we will term the moral personality; however, alternative new measures, largely derived in response to the Allport SOV and the Schwartz Value Survey, also have been introduced. In addition, distinctive new models of morality, notably those introduced by Peterson and Seligman (2004) and by Haidt (2001, 2012), are accompanied by their own, distinctive measures.

Haidt (2008; see also 2001, 2007, 2012, and Haidt & Kesebir, 2010) has provided a useful summary of major research traditions within moral psychology. The ‘main line’ in this area is the cognitive-developmental approach, which runs from Piaget (1932/1965) to Kohlberg (1969) and traces developmental stages through which children develop qualitatively distinct patterns of respect for rules. The central psychological process in this approach is moral reasoning, which Kohlberg assessed via children’s responses to a series of moral dilemmas. In contrast, Haidt described a ‘new synthesis in moral psychology’ predicated on evolutionary psychology and rising interest in affective processes, which leads to his ‘social intuitionist model’ (Haidt & Bjorklund, 2008). From Haidt’s perspective, moral judgments are understood as ‘rapid intuitive processes,’ rather than reasoned analyses.
Haidt introduced a new measure of the moral intuitions that underlie his model; however, his review does not address the wealth of contemporary instruments for measuring individual differences in moral tendencies. Indeed, with the notable exception of Chapter 3 in Peterson and Seligman (2004), there has been no systematic review of contemporary measurement models for individual differences in moral predispositions. The present chapter addresses this deficit by reviewing major contemporary measures of moral personality.

MEASURES REVIEWED HERE

Our review focuses on three dominant, contemporary lines of measurement for the moral personality: (i) the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS); (ii) Peterson and Seligman’s Values in Action measure (VIA); and (iii) Haidt’s Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ). The SVS is the most commonly used, broad-band measure of individual differences in moral characteristics. The VIA questionnaire and the MFQ are examples of recently developed, novel research programs examining morally-relevant constructs as individual differences, with the main goal of understanding how people differ in their overall patterns of moral behavior (Fleeson, Furr, Jayawickreme, Meindl, & Helzer, 2014). We also include several alternatives to the SVS measure. Scales/measures reviewed in this chapter include:

1. Study of Values (Kopelman, Rovenpor, & Guan, 2003)
2. Virtues Scale (Cawley, 1997; Cawley, Martin, & Johnson, 2000)
3. Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992)
4. Portrait Values Questionnaire (Schwartz, 2012)
5. Values in Action Questionnaire (Peterson & Seligman, 2004)
6. Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2011)

OVERVIEW OF THE MEASURES

The original Allport and Vernon (1931) Study of Values (SOV) was revised in 1951 and 1960; however, outdated item content and wording, norms, and psychometric information; statistical unsuitability of SOV scale scores for many psychometric purposes; and unexamined validity of the original Spranger model ultimately combined to render this instrument problematic for contemporary use. Although the third edition of the SOV was the third most frequently cited non-projective personality measure, and the fifth most frequently cited personality measure by 1970 (Kopelman et al., 2003), it was rarely cited at all by the 1980s. To revive the instrument, Kopelman et al. (2003) published a fourth edition of the SOV, in which they updated 15 of the original 45 items. These item changes fell into three categories: ‘gender-inclusive wording, expanded religious inclusiveness, and updated cultural conventions’ (p. 206).

Cawley et al. (2000) developed the Virtues Scale (VS) as an antidote to personality psychology’s exclusion of evaluative traits such as morality. They viewed this exclusion as paradoxical, in light of the inclusion in the Big Five of evaluative traits such as Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Cawley et al. cited Allport’s (1937) exclusion of character from personality, as well as Allport and Odbert’s (1936) exclusion of evaluative trait terms from their lexically derived list of trait terms, as influencing psychology to ‘turn away from virtue.’ They intended their VS as an empirical tool with which ‘to reintroduce the concept of virtue into modern psychology’ (p. 1001). Paradoxically, Cawley et al. also adopted Allport and Odbert’s (1936) lexical approach to identify (moral) trait terms. Thus, the Cawley et al. goal was to develop an individual differences measure of virtue that would permit and encourage empirical exploration of virtue as a psychological concept. In particular, they hoped that their VS could be used to clarify relationships among virtue, personality, and moral development. The VS includes 140 self-report items, each of which in turn includes three statements reflecting what a person is, what a person does, and how a person is viewed by others with respect to a particular virtue. The virtue items define the four virtue subscales of Empathy, Order, Resourceful, and Serenity.

Schwartz & Bilsky (1987) introduced a model containing seven universal motivational domains of values: Enjoyment, Security, Achievement, Self-Direction, Restrictive-Conformity, Prosocial, and Social Power. Each domain (except Social Power) included at least one of the 36 values previously proposed by Rokeach (1973). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) maintained Rokeach’s distinction between terminal and instrumental values, and they assumed that the seven ‘motivational domains’ (including Maturity but not Social Power) would relate in a
circular arrangement, such that adjacent domains are conceptually similar (e.g., Achievement and Enjoyment; Self-Direction and Maturity), while domains located across the circle from one another are conceptually opposed (i.e., Self-Direction vs. Restricted Conformity, Achievement vs. Security, Achievement vs. Prosocial, and Enjoyment vs. Prosocial). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) supported these hypothesized distinctions using translations of the Rokeach Value Survey in samples of Israeli public school teachers and German college students, using seven-point ratings of the relative importance of the values.

Schwartz (1992) substantially revised this earlier work, proposing a modified set of 10 motivational types. He also added 35 new values to the 21 values retained from the original 36 Rokeach values; the resulting 56 values formed the original Schwartz Value Survey (SVS), which measures these 10 motivational types. The SVS, which contains lists of 30 terminal values and 26 instrumental values, asks respondents to use a 9-point scale (7 to −1) to rate each value, ‘As a guiding principle in my life.’ Schwartz’s (1992) interpretations of Guttman-Lingoes Smallest Space Analyses generally supported his theoretical circular structure. Finally, Schwartz’s (1992, 1994; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001) cross-cultural work largely confirmed his specification of 10 motivationally distinctive, cross-culturally present value types, as well as the circumplex structure postulated to order them.

Schwartz et al. (2001; see also Schwartz, 2012) introduced the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) as a more concrete alternative to the SVS that would be appropriate to measure the 10 basic values in children and individuals with limited formal education. The PVQ also is recommended for use in cross-national samples and in online surveys. The PVQ presents short ‘verbal portraits of 40 different people, gender-matched with the respondent . . . [that] describe a person’s goals, aspirations, or wishes that point implicitly to the importance of a value’ (Schwartz, 2012, p. 11). Respondents indicate their perceived similarity to each portrait, in a manner that avoids a direct focus on values.

The Values in Action Questionnaire (VIA; Peterson & Seligman, 2004), was developed as a ‘manual of the sanities’ that would complement the DSM (American Psychiatric Association 1994). The classification was driven largely by the advent of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), and itself is intentionally modeled on the Linnaean classification of species. The classification is divided into three conceptual levels: virtues, character strengths, and situational themes. The VIA deals primarily with the first two of these levels. Peterson and Seligman (2004) intended the measure to help positive psychologists in generating a clear definition of character, and second to inform the framing of interventions to promote good character.

Haidt and Joseph (2004), and Graham et al. (2011) have proposed a new model of morality that incorporates evolutionary, personality, and developmental perspectives. Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) explores the relationship between moral intuitions and virtues. The authors believe that intuitions are automatic processes that humans are born with, alongside the innate ability to learn (Haidt, 2001). This is an important distinction from simply stating that moral intuitions are inherited; it is not that we are born with innate moral intuitions, but rather that our minds have evolved to prepare us to learn certain moral principles (Haidt & Joseph, 2004).

Haidt and Joseph (2004) drew support from research about modularity of mental functioning. Modules are evolved cognitive processes that function similarly to heuristics in that they facilitate quick, automatic responses to appropriate environmental triggers. Modules are often applied to either proper or actual domains. Proper domains are the situations the module was evolved to respond to, like seeing your child in distress; actual domains are the range of situations that the module applies to in everyday life, like seeing a suffering child on television. Haidt and Joseph (2004) connect modules to intuitive morality by positing that behavior can act as the trigger for modular thinking, leading to approval or disapproval according to specific beliefs. Thus cheating triggers the modular moral thinking and results in disapproval, and altruistic actions trigger positive moral intuitions. Subsequent research on MFT established the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) as a methodology through which to investigate both cross-cultural variability and shared views regarding morality (Graham et al., 2011).

Study of Values – 4th edition (SOV4)

(Kopelman et al., 2003).

Variable

The original (Allport–Vernon–Lindzey) SOV was distinctive in three respects. First, it was designed to measure Spranger’s six value types (theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious). Second, it was designed and scored to measure the relative ‘prominence’ of each of the six values within the respondent’s
personality, not the absolute strength of each value. As one of the clearest instantiations of Allport’s ‘idiographic’ approach to personality (cf. Piekkola, 2011), the measure reveals (only) the relative emphases placed on each value; it does not permit between-person comparisons. It is possible for the highest value of an apathetic person to be less intense and effective than the lowest value of a person in whom all values are prominent and dynamic (Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960). Third, this within-person orientation is implemented by a unique response format, in which the respondent allocates points to indicate relative preference for behavioral statements that reflect paired values.

**Description**

Kopelman et al. (2003) maintained the format and scoring of the SOV. In Part 1, the respondent rates 30 items regarding activities, preferences, and desired outcomes by allocating points between two alternatives, each of which represents one of Spranger’s values. A strong preference for one value over the other is indicated by allocating 3 points to the first and 0 points to the second, while a slight preference is indicated by allocating 2 points to the first and 1 point to the second. Part 2 is similar, but the respondent ranks four possible alternatives (representing four of the Spranger values) by assigning a score of 4, 3, 2, or 1 to each alternative. There are 120 response options in all, 20 of which refer to each of the six values. A score of 40 on each would indicate equal preference for the six values. Kopelman et al. (2003) revised and updated 15 of the original 45 SOV items. These item changes fell into three categories: ‘gender-inclusive wording, expanded religious inclusiveness, and updated cultural conventions’ (p. 206). Gender-inclusive wording was added in seven items, wording was changed to expand religious inclusiveness in five items, and eight items were changed to reflect more current cultural referents and mores. Combining the two response options is problematic, both conceptually and psychometrically. For example, responses in Part 1 yield at least quasi-interval data, but the rankings in Part 2 must be considered to be ordinal; the paired comparison response format also renders scale scores statistically non-independent.

**Sample**

Kopelman et al. (2003) had 121 university graduate students and 58 undergraduate students, all enrolled in ‘business-related programs,’ complete the original and revised versions of SOV. No age data were provided for the sample, but 54% were male.

**Reliability**

**Internal Consistency**

Mean Cronbach alpha coefficients across the six values for the original and revised SOV versions were found to be .66 and .67, respectively, although the alpha coefficient differed somewhat for the Economic value domain (.64 for the original versus .72 for the revised version) and the Political value domain (.61 for the original versus .55 for the revised version; Kopelman et al., 2003).

**Test–Retest**

Respondents completed the SOV (3rd ed.) and the SOV4 in a counterbalanced order, with approximately a two-month interval. Across the six value domains, the median cross-form correlation was 0.74. Value domain scores on the SOV (3rd ed.) and the SOV4 shared only 55% common variance.

**Validity**

**Convergent/Concurrent**

While Kopelman et al. (2003) did not report any validity correlations for the SOV4 with scores on external measures, the median between-version correlation of .74 (albeit attenuated by a two-month interval), suggests that value domain scores on the original and the revised SOV share considerable measurement variance. Kopelman, Prottas, and Tatum (2004) did compare the SOV with both the Rokeach and Schwartz value measures in terms of ideal value profiles perceived by graduate administrators for students in six graduate programs, but they compared only the idealized value domains, rather than actual scores. Mean scores on the six value domains did not differ between the two versions (see Kopelman et al., 2003, Table 1). The median correlation between corresponding scores on the six value domains was .74 (ranging from .72 to .83).
Divergent/Discriminant

Item analyses revealed statistically significant differences for only four of the 43 value domain scores affected by the Kopelman et al. (2003) changes to item wording. No other divergent/discriminant validity information for the SOV4 is currently available.

Construct/Factor Analytic

No construct/factor analytic validity evidence for the SOV4 is currently available.

Criterion/Predictive

No criterion/predictive validity evidence has been published for the SOV4.

Location


Results and Comments

Availability of a contemporary version of the SOV would be a welcome development. As Kopelman et al. (2003) have suggested, the SOV differs from many other measures of values by asking respondents to indicate their relative preference for specific activities and outcomes, rather than more abstract value terms. Such a methodology does have an intuitive appeal, although its relative utility remains an empirical question. Moreover, use of the SOV4 is limited by absence of published information regarding normative statistics, reliability, and validity. As a consequence, the relative predictive utility of the revised SOV, as well as the underlying Spranger model, has not been sufficiently evaluated. In addition, correlates of SOV4 with other established measures of values are necessary in order to establish any distinctive descriptive power of this instrument. Finally, users of the SOV4 must directly address lingering questions regarding psychometric limitations of idiographic measurement strategies, or consider migrating to a comparative response format.

### SOV4 SAMPLE ITEMS

#### Directions for Part I

A number of controversial statements or questions with two alternative answers are given below. Indicate your personal preferences by writing appropriate figures in the boxes to the right of each question. Some of the alternatives may appear equally attractive or unattractive to you. Nevertheless, please attempt to choose the alternative that is relatively more acceptable to you. For each question you have three points that you may distribute in any of the following combinations [examples illustrating the 3–0, 0–3, 2–1, and 1–2 possible allocation follow].

Item 21. ‘Are you more interested in reading accounts of the lives and work of individuals [men, in the original] such as: (a) Indira Gandhi, Theodore Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill [the Political response; versus ‘Alexander, Julius Caesar, and Charlemagne’ in the original]; (b) Ayn Rand, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Immanuel Kant [the Theoretical response; versus ‘Aristotle, Socrates, and Kant’ in the original]?

Item 41. ‘Do great exploits and adventures of discovery such as Columbus’s, Magellan’s, and Earhart’s [‘Columbus’s, Magellan’s, Byrd’s, and Amundsen’s’ in the original] seem to you significant because –

a. they demonstrate the ability of human beings [‘man’ in the original] to overcome the difficult forces of nature [the Political response]
b. they add to our knowledge of geography, meteorology, oceanography, etc. [the Theoretical response]
c. they weld human interests and international feelings throughout the world [the Social response]
d. they contribute each in a small way to an ultimate understanding of the universe’ [the Religious response].

Notes:

Written permission required prior to use. Reproduced with permission.
Virtues Scale (VS)

(Cawley, 1997; Cawley et al., 2000).

Variable

According to Cawley et al. (2000), ‘The concept of virtue has been a powerful explanatory term in moral philosophy (MacIntyre, 1981)... Nonetheless... the virtues have been largely ignored in modern personality theory.’ (pp. 997–998). To address this oversight, and following Allport and Odbert’s (1936) lexical methodology, Cawley (1997; Cawley et al., 2000) identified all virtue terms in The New Merriam–Webster Dictionary (1989), using the criterion statements, ‘What ought I to be?’ and ‘What ought I to do?’ ‘The term was recorded as a virtue if it expressed the concept of *arete* (virtue or ‘excellence’) when replacing the ellipse in one of the respective responses to the two questions: ‘Be...’ [which identified adjectival forms of virtue] or ‘Show...’ [which identified noun forms of virtue]’ (Cawley et al., 2000, p. 1002). Combining adjectives and nouns yielded 140 unique virtue terms. Cawley et al. also noted that the Five Factor Model includes constructs (agreeableness and conscientiousness) that could be understood as virtues (cf. McCrae & Costa, 1991, on ‘adding Liebe und Arbeit’).

Description

Following Goldberg and Kilkowski (1985), the 140 indicators of moral personality (‘virtues’) were converted into the VS items, each of which comprised three sentences to describe what a person is, how a person behaves, and how others view a person with respect to the particular virtue. In contrast to Kohlberg’s moral reasoning approach, Cawley et al. (2000) described the VS as ‘a psychological measure of the ethic of virtue’ (p. 999). (cf. dual process models of moral behavior – e.g., see Haidt, 2012; Paxton & Greene, 2010). Four factor analytically derived subscales were labeled as follows: Empathy, Order, Resourcefulness, and Serenity, respectively (see below).

Sample

The initial developmental sample comprised 390 undergraduates (Cawley et al., 2000). Subsequently, two validation samples were used (Ns = 181 and 143), both of which were also administered the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R), and one (N = 181) also administered Rest’s (1979) Defining Issues Test (DIT) measure of Kohlbergian moral development to check on personality correlates.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Cawley et al. (2000) reported Cronbach alpha coefficients based on the three samples as follows: Empathy (.93 in each sample), Order (.90, .91, .87), Resourceful (.87, .87, .80) and Serenity (.85, .84, .80), respectively. These alpha coefficients are high, especially for the Empathy and Order subscales (cf. Boyle, 1991).

Test–Retest

No test–retest information for the VS is currently available.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Correlations between the four VS subscales and NEO-PI-R scales were obtained in the second and third samples. Empathy correlated positively with NEO Agreeableness ($r_s = .48$ and .48) and NEO Extraversion ($r_s = .40$ and .26) domains. Order correlated positively with NEO Conscientiousness ($r_s = .63$ and .53). Resourcefulness also correlated positively with NEO Conscientiousness ($r_s = .49$ and .42), while Serenity correlated positively with NEO Agreeableness ($r_s = .45$ and .44) (Cawley et al., 2000).

Divergent/Discriminant

The VS subscale Resourcefulness correlated negatively with the NEO Neuroticism domain ($r_s = -.60$ and -.37), respectively. Likewise, the VS subscale Serenity correlated negatively with NEO Neuroticism ($r_s = -.38$, -.22). No significant correlations were found between any VS subscales and Rest’s Defining Issues Test scores. Cawley et al. (2000) concluded that, ‘The virtues approach does indeed appear to consider aspects of moral psychology which are neglected by the Kohlbergian moral development approach’ (p. 1010).
Cawley et al. (2000) conducted an exploratory maximum-likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation ($N = 390$) based on the intercorrelations of the 140 VS items from the first sample of undergraduates (163 males; 227 females). Application of the Scree test (Cattell, 1978; Cattell & Vogelmann, 1977) resulted in extraction of four factors with highest loaded items for each of the four subscales as follows: Empathy (13 items), Order (17 items), Resourcefulness (11 items), and Serenity (7 items).

Criterion/Predictive

No criterion/predictive validity evidence for the VS is currently available.

Location


Results and Comments

The lexical scale construction strategy employed by Cawley et al. (2000) has been positively cited (e.g., Haslam, Bain, & Neal, 2004; Linley et al., 2007; Macdonald et al., 2008; Noftle, Schnitker, & Robins, 2011; Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Shryack, Steger, Krueger, & Kallie, 2010), and the VS appears to be a distinctive and promising measure of moral personality. However, from a practical perspective, use of the VS is limited by lack of published information regarding normative statistics, and the psychometric properties of the four subscales, as well as minor issues such as use of ‘rank’ (rather than ‘rate’) in the instructions. Cawley et al. (2000, p. 997) concluded that, ‘Meaningful, replicated correlations between the virtue subscales and personality scales and a complete lack of relationships between the virtues scales and the [Kohlbergian] DIT indicate that virtue is a function of personality rather than moral reasoning and cognitive development.’

---

**VS SAMPLE ITEMS**

(Directions: Read each cluster of statements. Form a general impression. Then decide if that cluster pertains to you, AS YOU REALLY ARE. Does it describe your REAL virtues and personal traits? If the cluster represents your REAL virtues and traits well, rank it a ‘7’. If the cluster does not represent your REAL virtues and traits at all, rank it a ‘1’. If you feel like you are somewhere between 1 and 7, use 2 through 6 to represent your REAL virtues and traits. Make sure that you answer the way YOU REALLY ARE and not the way you ideally should be.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least like you</td>
<td>Most like you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALLY ARE</td>
<td>REALLY ARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Items

**Question 1**

I am wisely cautious in practical affairs.

I am able to make correct decisions based on my good judgment, and common sense.

The people who know me best would describe me as prudent, discreet, and sensible.

**Question 2**

I adhere to what is fair, honest, and just.

I strive to give each person what they are due.

The people who know me best would describe me as just, honorable, and upright.

Notes: The VS is available at: [www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/5/j5j/virtues/V5.html](http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/5/j5j/virtues/V5.html) (Retrieved January 10, 2014).

Reproduced with permission.
Schwartz Value Survey (SVS)  
(Schwartz, 1992, 1994).

Variable

Values are universal because they represent at least one of three types of universal human requirements: biologically based needs, prerequisites for social interaction, and survival and welfare needs of groups. Despite this universality, individuals and groups may differ substantially in the relative importance they attach to particular values. Values differ in the goals that they express, leading to differing underlying motivations. Schwartz (1992, 1994, 2012) proposed a model of 10 motivationally distinct basic values that show commonality across cultures (see Table 18.1). Schwartz’s theory is based on six principles:

1. Values are beliefs linked to emotion.
2. Values reference desired goals that lead to action.
3. Values transcend specific situations.
4. Values serve as standards.
5. Values are ordered by relative importance.
6. Relative importance of multiple values guide action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 18.1 Motivational Types of Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction: Independent thought and action – choosing, creating, exploring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with who one is in frequent personal contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition: Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Emerges when people come into contact with those outside the extended primary group, recognize intergroup interdependence, and become aware of the scarcity of natural resources.

Note: Organism: universal needs of individuals as biological organism; Interaction: universal requisites of coordinated social interaction; Group: universal requirements for smooth functioning and survival of groups.

Reprinted with permission from Schwartz (1994).

V. VICES AND VIRTUES
Some values are mutually consistent (such as Conformity and Security), but others conflict (such as Conformity and Self-Direction). Figure 18.1 displays the hypothesized circumplex relationship among the 10 Schwartz values. The closer the proximity of two values, the more related or compatible they are; the more opposite two values are, the more they conflict. Although Conformity and Tradition share the same motivational goal (Schwartz, 1992, 1994), Tradition conflicts more than Conformity with the opposing values. The basic principle that organizes the circular structure is that values exist on a continuum. The 10 values are further organized by two bipolar dimensions labeled: Openness to Change vs. Conservation values, and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence values.

**Description**

Schwartz (1992) introduced the 56-item SVS which includes two lists of value terms; the first contains 30 nouns that describe desirable end-states; the second contains 26 adjectives that describe desirable ways of acting (these two lists correspond to Rokeach’s distinction between terminal and instrumental values, a distinction that Schwartz (2012) no longer accepts). An explanatory phrase follows each item, and each item expresses the motivational goal underlying a single value. Using ‘AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE,’ items are rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale. To minimize response bias, Schwartz advised partialling out respondents’ mean value ratings to ensure that SVS scores reflect within-person (ipsative) value priorities (see Schwartz, 2012).

Schwartz (1994) subsequently produced a 57-item SVS version (see Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Importantly, Schwartz now specifies that 11 items should not be included in calculating SVS scores in cross cultural comparisons, because they have not demonstrated acceptable equivalence across cultures (see Schwartz & Bardi, 2001, Table 1; Schwartz, 2004; Schwartz, Verkasalo, Antonovsky, & Sagiv, 1997). Schwartz reported that only 45 of the specific single values in the SVS demonstrate ‘nearly equivalent meaning’ across cultures (see Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). It appears that SVS values labeled Benevolence, Self-Direction, Universalism, Security, and Conformity are the most important of the basic values across nations, while Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Tradition, and Power are the least important.
18. MEASURES OF VALUES AND MORAL PERSONALITY

Sample

Schwartz (1992, Table II, pp. 19–20) collected extensive data from 20 countries with the majority of the samples drawn from two occupational groups, undergraduate students and school teachers (4th–10th grades). According to Schwartz (1992, p. 18), the samples were from ‘cultures on every inhabited continent, representing 13 different languages, and include adherents of eight major religions as well as atheists.’ The countries included and combined sample sizes were as follows: Australia (N = 586), Brazil (N = 398), China (N = 1017), Estonia (N = 441), Finland (N = 500), Germany (N = 377), Greece (N = 429), Holland (N = 704), Hong Kong (N = 412), Israel (N = 406), Italy (N = 200), Japan (N = 978), New Zealand (N = 401), Poland (N = 390), Portugal (N = 390), Spain (N = 494), Taiwan (N = 202), USA (N = 240), Venezuela (N = 185), Zimbabwe (N = 390). Participants were excluded from the analyses if they responded more than 21 items with a 7 (of supreme importance), or repeated any response choice more than 35 times. Subsequently, Bardi and Schwartz (2003) also collected SVS scores and behavioral frequency ratings in a sample of 102 undergraduates (75 females; mean age = 22 years, SD = 3.0).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

For each of the 10 SVS value subscales, Schwartz (1992) reported mean Cronbach alpha coefficients across samples in Australia, Holland, Israel, and Japan that ranged from .55 (Tradition) to .75 (Stimulation). Some mean alpha coefficients were: Japan (.60), Australia (.67), Holland (.68), and Israel (.71). Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, and Knafo (2002) reported alphas ranging from .60 (Self-Direction) to .72 (Universalism, Power, and Achievement), with median = .65 for 246 undergraduates (65% women; mean age = 22 years). Schwartz (2003) reported alphas ranging from .45 (Self-Direction) and .53 (Tradition) to .72 (Stimulation), .76 (Hedonism), and .76 (Achievement). Haslam, Whelan, and Bastian (2009) reported alphas ranging from .57 to .81 (mean = .70) in a sample of undergraduates. Pozzebon and Ashton (2009) reported alphas ranging from .60 (Security) to .68 (Benevolence) in a sample of 252 undergraduates (58.7% women; mean age = 20.6 years).

Test–Retest

Schwartz (2005) reported stability coefficients across a six-week interval for all 10 SVS subscales that were .70 or higher (N = 205). Test–retest reliability coefficients ranged from .70 (Self-Direction, Achievement) to .82 (Tradition), with median = .76.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Roccas et al. (2002) reported correlations between the SVS subscales and Big Five factors and facets in a sample of 246 undergraduates (65% women; mean age = 22 years). Hypothesized trait-value correlations were found for Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Substantial correlations were observed for Benevolence with Agreeableness; Achievement with Extraversion; and Conscientiousness with Conscientiousness. Tradition (r = .59) exhibited the strongest correlation with a measure of Religiosity. Pozzebon and Ashton (2009) reported positive correlations between SVS scales and HEXACO-PI personality variables (r = .45 with Benevolence, and r = .36 with Universalism), and Openness to Experience (r = .38 with Self-Direction and r = .42 with Universalism) in a sample of 252 undergraduates (58.7% women; mean age = 20.6 years). The SVS Tradition subscale also correlated positively with a self-report Religiosity measure (r = .51).

Divergent/Discriminant

Negative correlations have been reported between SVS subscales and other measures, including some personality measures. For example, Pozzebon and Ashton (2009) reported a negative correlation between the SVS subscale Power and the HEXACO-PI personality variable Honesty-Humility (r = −.53). Also SVS Hedonism correlated negatively with a measure of Religiosity (r = −.44). Roccas et al. (2002) found only small correlations between SVS scores and scores on a Big Five measure of Neuroticism.

Construct/Factor Analytic

Schwartz and Boehnke (2004) employed confirmatory factor analysis to test three major models. The 57-item SVS was administered to 46 samples from 27 countries (total N = 10,857). Each sample was assigned randomly to one of two sets, in order to permit replication of the analyses. The ‘definitive’ model of a quasi-circumplex, with Tradition outside of Conformity at the same polar angle in the circle (Schwartz & Boehnke (2004, p. 250), provided the best fit to the data (RMSEA = .064 and .059, SRMR = .081 and .073, for each set, respectively).
Schwartz (1996) investigated the relationship between values and voting behavior, using an abbreviated 37-item version of the SVS, from a representative sample of the Jewish population aged 18 years or older. Supporters of the high liberalism Mapam-Ratz party rated Self-Direction, Stimulation, and Hedonism values as more important than did supporters of the low liberalism Religious party, who rated Tradition and Conformity values as more important (p < .0001). Voters for Labor and Likud, the two major parties, reported intermediate levels of importance on these five values. The size and sign of mean differences between the two extreme parties generally complied with the Schwartz circular model.

Bardi and Schwartz (2003) reported positive correlations between SVS scores and behavior ratings value scales ranging from .30 (Benevolence) to .68 (Stimulation), with median = .47. These positive correlations were replicated with student couples. The mean correlation across nations was found to be .92 (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001, p. 11). Pozzebon and Ashton (2009) reported positive correlations greater than .50 between SVS Stimulation, Hedonism, and Tradition and the Bardi and Schwartz behavior scales in 252 undergraduates (58.7% women; mean age = 20.6 years). Positive correlations of the SVS self-report scores with peer-reported scores on each of the 10 behavior scales ranged from .24 to .45 (mean = .37).

Location

Original 56-item SVS


Revised 57-item SVS


Results and Comments

Given the extensive normative, reliability, and validity evidence that has been generated for the SVS, this measure remains an excellent choice for researchers who seek a broad spectrum measure of individual differences in value orientations. Its content remains current, and it is distinctive in having been widely used in cross-national studies on differential value preferences. Evidence supports the two dimensional, quasi-circumplex structural model that underlies the 10 basic values measured by the SVS, although differences do exist across countries. The major question concerns the extent to which the SVS items, and the 10 basic values that it measures, sufficiently capture the full range of human values. Some researchers may prefer measures based on behavioral items, rather than abstract value terms.

Schwartz’s recommended exclusion of 11 items from the scale indices has not been adopted by all users, and may be a source of some confusion. In addition, the ipsative centering of SVS scores that Schwartz advocates has not been adopted universally. Not all users are aware that ipsatization guarantees that individual differences in SVS scores reflect differences in relative importance, not differences in absolute importance. Finally, the asymmetrical, 7 to –1, response scale necessarily gives responses to the SVS a correspondingly asymmetrical scalar shape; that is, the scale is stretched at the important end, and it is compressed at the not important end, with no room for degrees of opposition.

Schwartz Value Survey

In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: ‘What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?’ There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your life. Use the rating scale below:

0 – means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.
3 – means the value is important.
6 – means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.
1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.
7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life; ordinarily there are no more than two such values.

In the space before each value, write the number (−1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to my not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values important very supreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important importance importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it −1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

**VALUES LIST I**

1. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2. INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3. SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4. PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5. FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7. SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
10. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
11. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12. WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14. SELF RESPECT (belief in one’s own worth)
15. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)
16. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
17. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
18. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)
19. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)
20. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
21. PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)
22. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
23. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
24. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
25. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)
26. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
27. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
28. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
29. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
30. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)

**VALUES LIST II**

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in YOUR life. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

V. VICES AND VIRTUES
Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or — if there is no such value — choose the value least important to you, and rate it −1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

31__ INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
32__ MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling and action)
33__ LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
34__ AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
35__ BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
36__ HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
37__ DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
38__ PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
39__ INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
40__ HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
41__ CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)
42__ HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)
43__ CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
44__ ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life’s circumstances)
45__ HONEST (genuine, sincere)
46__ PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my ‘face’)
47__ OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)
48__ INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)
49__ HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
50__ ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)
51__ DEVOUT (holding to religious faith and belief)
52__ RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
53__ CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)
54__ FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
55__ SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
56__ CLEAN (neat, tidy)
57__ SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>SVS items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>11, 20, 40, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>18, 32, 36, 44, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>33, 45, 49, 52, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>1, 17, 24, 26, 29, 30, 35, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>5, 16, 31, 41, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>9, 25, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>4, 50, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>34, 39, 43, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>3, 12, 27, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8, 13, 15, 22, 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Items are rated ‘AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE’ on a 9-point scale ranging from 7 = ‘Supreme importance’, through 0 = ‘Not important’, to −1 = ‘Opposed to my values’.
For most purposes, it is necessary to correct for individual differences in response scale. Eleven items are not included in indices intended for cross-cultural comparison, because they have not demonstrated acceptable equivalence of meaning across cultures.


Reproduced with permission.

Schwartz Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ)

(Schwartz et al., 2001).

**Variable**

The PVQ measures the same 10 basic values as the SVS (Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-Direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity, and Security). The PVQ was developed as an alternative to the SVS for use in younger samples, and in samples not familiar with the abstract thinking required to evaluate the specific SVS value items. The PVQ is presumed to generate the same circumplex relationship among these 10 motivational types of value as the SVS. Davidov, Schmidt, and Schwartz (2008) reported multidimensional scaling results indicating that all PVQ value items have demonstrated ‘near-equivalence of meaning’ across various cultures.

**Description**

Rather than indicating perceived importance of value terms as on the SVS, the PVQ instructs respondents to rate their similarity to each of 40 brief verbal portraits of hypothetical people. Each portrait describes a person of the same sex as the respondent, whose goals and aspirations correspond to one of the 10 basic motivational types of values; that is, the rating task focuses on another person, without specifically mentioning the underlying value. No value items from the SVS were used in these portraits. Respondents are instructed to indicate, ‘How much like you is this person?’ on a 6-point scale. Respondents are to compare the portrait description with oneself, rather than comparing oneself with the portrait, on the presumption that comparing another with oneself directs the respondent’s attention only to value-relevant attributes of the other portrayed in the portrait. The PVQ contains from three (Stimulation, Hedonism, Power) to six (Universalism) portraits for each motivational type of value. The respondent’s importance score for each value is the average rating across all portraits for a given motivational value.

In addition to 20- and 29-portrait versions of the PVQ, Schwartz (2003) constructed a 21-portrait version of the PVQ for the European Social Survey (ESS), a biennial, cross-national survey designed to measure stability and change in attitudes, beliefs, and patterns of behavior across Europe (for ESS PVQ items, see Schwartz, 2006; see Davidov et al., 2008; and Bilsky, Janik, & Schwartz, 2011, for cross-national validity studies).

Schwartz’s goal with the SVS and the PVQ is to measure respondents’ value priorities, reflecting the relative importance rather than the absolute levels of particular values. Thus, an average rating of ‘4’ on Power has different meanings for respondents who rate other values at the same, lower, or higher levels. Note the similarity of this approach to Allport’s idiographic approach in his Study of Values. Absolute values’ response ratings are converted into ‘relative importance scores’ by subtracting each respondent’s mean response across all value items from the response to each individual item (Schwartz, 2012).

**Sample**

Lindeman and Verkasalo (2005, Study 1) employed a sample of 670 Finnish respondents (72.3% women; Mean age = 19.76 years, SD = 5.23; 392 senior high school and 278 university students) for their comparative study of a short version of the SVS, the PVQ, and the SVS. In a second study (N = 3261), they ‘replicated the quasi-circular structure in a more heterogeneous sample’ (Lindeman & Verkasalo, p. 170). Smaller samples of 112 and 38 participants were employed to check further on the psychometric properties of the various Schwartz measures. In a separate study, Caprara, Schwartz, Capanna, Vecchione, and Barbaranelli (2006) used a sample of 3044 Italian voters in assessing the predictive validity of personality and values (measured via the PVQ) on voting behaviors.
Reliability

Internal Consistency

Caprara et al. (2006) reported Cronbach alpha coefficients for the 40-item PVQ ranging from .61 (Tradition) to .83 (Achievement). Schwartz (2003) reported alpha coefficients for the 21-item, ESS version of the PVQ ranging from .37 (Tradition) and .48 (Conformity) to .79 (Hedonism), .76 (Stimulation), and .64 (Security). Schwartz (2006) also reported alphas for the 21-item, ESS PVQ ranging from .36 (Tradition), .44 (Power), and .48 (Self-Direction) to .64 (Stimulation), .67 (Hedonism), and .70 (Achievement).

Test–Retest

Schwartz (2005) reported six-week stability coefficients for the PVQ ranging from .62 to .82 (median = .75) for German students, as well as two-year stability coefficients ranging from .50 to .66 (median = .61) for a French sample. Likewise, Caprara et al. (2006, p. 14) reported two-year stability coefficients (corrected for attenuation) for the 10 PVQ values in a French sample (N = 870), ranging from .75 to .94 (mean = .85).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Schwartz (2003) reported positive correlations between the 10 motivational SVS value scales and the 21-item ESS version of the PVQ. Convergent correlations ranged from .44 (Conformity), .50 (Tradition), and .50 (Hedonism) to .63 (Self-Direction), .67 (Security), and .70 (Stimulation). Lindeman and Verkaslo (2005, Study 1) reported positive correlations between Finnish versions of a 45-item SVS and the PVQ ranging from .52 (Conformity) and .55 (Benevolence) to .72 (Stimulation) and .78 (Universalism) (Mdn = .64). They also reported that the Conservation variable from the shortened SVS correlated .75 and .76 with Conservation variables from the SVS and the PVQ, respectively. Similarly, the Self-Transcendence variable from the shortened SVS correlated .78 and .76 with the Self-Transcendence variables from the SVS and the PVQ.

Divergent/Discriminant

In his correlational study of the 10 motivational SVS value scales and the 21-item ESS version of the PVQ, Schwartz (2003) also reported that discriminant validity of the PVQ value scales was supported by the finding that each single trait–multimethod convergent correlation was higher than any of the corresponding 18 multitrait–multimethod correlations. Based on raw scores, correlations among PVQ scales that are opposed in the theoretical circumplex structure correlated from .05 (Power vs. Self-Direction) to −.66 (Security vs. Stimulation). As evidence of discriminative validity of the PVQ scales, zero-order and negative correlations among opposite scales were reported fully by Hinz, Brahler, Schmidt, and Albani (2005, Table 1, p. 187).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Hinz et al. (2005) investigated the circumplex structure of the PVQ in a sample of 1896 German individuals (875 males, M = 48.4 years; 1021 females, M = 48.9 years), using multidimensional (MDS) scaling, as well as principal components analysis (PCA) of both raw data and ipsative data (i.e., the individual’s mean score across the 10 scales was subtracted from each individual score). Hinz et al. accepted a two-component solution (with varimax rotation) for both data sets which represented a semi-circle, not the Schwartz circumplex. Values in Schwartz’s Self-Transcendence and Conservation quadrants (Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity, Security) defined Component 1, and values in the Self-Enhancement and Openness to Change quadrants (Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-Direction) defined Component 2. The two-component solution from the ipsative data did approximate a circle; however, Stimulation, as well as Tradition and Conformity, did not appear in the locations designated in the Schwartz model.

Davidov et al. (2008) tested the circumplex structure derived from the 21-item ESS PVQ using strict probability samples representing the non-institutionalized population aged 15 years or older in 20 European countries (total sample = 39,596). Separate CFAs in the 20 countries identified 71 instances in which pairs of the motivational constructs were unified, although 69 of those instances involved values that are adjacent in the Schwartz circumplex model. Three pairs of adjacent values (Power and Achievement; Conformity and Tradition; Universalism and Benevolence) were highly intercorrelated, so these pairs were combined to form seven value constructs. Following modifications, fit indices from a simultaneous CFA across all 20 countries (RMR = 0.06, NFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.01, PCLOSE = 1.0, and AIC and BCC lower than in previous models) suggested that configural invariance of the 7-factor model could not be rejected. A second analysis showed that factor loadings of
items on the seven value constructs were invariant, indicating equivalent meaning of the value constructs across countries (RMR = 0.08, NFI = 0.89, CFI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.01, and PCLOSE = 1.0).

Criterion/Predictive

Caprara et al. (2006) compared values with personality traits as predictors of voting behavior, within a diverse sample of 3,044 individuals who had voted in the Italian national election of 2001. As predicted, Universalism consistently showed the strongest positive point-biserial correlation with voting for the center-left rather than the center-right party ($r = .28$). The hypothesized negative correlations were found for Security ($r = -.20$), Power ($r = -.14$), and Achievement ($r = -.08$).

Location


Results and Comments

The PVQ is an interesting approach to measuring values, one that seems well suited for broad survey use, such as the ESS. Its utility is limited by the qualities that suit it well for use with less educated samples; that is, as Lindeman and Verkasalo have noted, the language level of the PVQ makes it 'not the best value questionnaire for educated, Western adults' (2005, p. 177). Perhaps for this reason, limited empirical evidence has yet accumulated regarding its predictive utility, although work by Caprara et al. (2006) and von Collani and Grumm (2009) is promising. In addition, existence of multiple length versions of the PVQ may create some ambiguity among potential users, and equivalence among the multiple versions of the PVQ has not been established.

Existing evidence for convergence among equivalent value scales (e.g., Schwartz, 2006) ranges from weak to reasonable. Schwartz (2012) has provided initial demonstrations of the PVQ fit to the standard circumplex configuration. In contrast, Hinz et al. (2005) analyses led them to conclude that the Schwartz circumplex structure was ‘not confirmed,’ however, the somewhat closer confirmation using ipsative data is consistent with Schwartz’s admonition to use centered rather than raw scores. Davidov et al. did establish sufficient invariance of the ESS PVQ to provide ‘legitimacy’ for cross-country work with that measure; however, they concluded that ‘the ESS values scale may not capture all of the fine-tuned distinctions in the theory’ (2008, p. 431). Hinz et al. (2005) raised questions regarding the scope of PVQ items and scales, suggesting that the PVQ items do not include ‘areas of daily life such as health, work, or family’ (2005, p. 191).

Finally, there is ambiguity regarding Schwartz’s methodology for converting PVQ value scores into relative value priorities. As noted above, Schwartz (2012) recommends subtracting respondents’ mean response across all portrait items from the response to each item. In order to avoid ‘the problem of linear dependency in some analyses,’ Lindeman and Verkalso calculated respondents’ mean response tendency using only a representative set of 30 out of the 40 PVQ portrait items. That is, they calculated scores for the 10 value scales by ‘dividing the sum of the appropriate items by the personal mean of all 30 [representative] items multiplied by the number of items on the scale’ (2005, p. 172).

**PVQ SAMPLE ITEMS**

‘He likes to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do what he says.’ (Power)
‘Being very successful is important to him. He likes to stand out and to impress other people.’ (Achievement)

*Notes:* Items (portraits) are rated on a 6-point scale ranging from: 6 = ‘Very much like me’ to 1 = ‘Not at all like me’.

From Caprara et al. (2006) Table 1.
Reproduced with permission.
Values in Action Questionnaire (VIA)  
(Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

**Variable**

Character strengths have been defined as, ‘psychological ingredients – processes or mechanisms – that define the virtues’ (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p.13). They listed six virtues (wisdom and knowledge, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence) under which fall 24 character strengths (see Table 18.2). There are 10 criteria set as the standards to which true character strengths must align (see Table 18.3).

**Description**

Peterson and Seligman (2004) defined virtues as the central characteristics that have been valued by moral philosophers and religious thinkers worldwide. Six central virtues were defined following extensive historical studies: wisdom and knowledge, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. In this account, virtues are seen as universal traits possibly grounded in biology through an evolutionary process that selects the best traits for solving the most important tasks at hand (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).
Table 18.3  Criteria for Inclusion as Character Strength  
(Peterson & Seligman, 2004)

1. Ubiquity – is widely recognized across cultures
2. Morally valued – is valued in its own right
3. Does not diminish others – elevates those who witness it
4. Traitlike – is an individual difference with generality and stability
5. Measurable – has been measured as an individual difference
6. Distinctiveness – is not redundant (conceptually or empirically)
7. Paragons – is strikingly embodied in some individuals
8. Prodigies – is precociously shown by some children or youth
9. Idiots – is missing altogether in some individuals
10. Institutions – societal practices and rituals that try to cultivate it

Character strengths are the means that one may employ to exhibit a particular virtue. While each of these strengths requires the acquisition and use of knowledge, and are intimately (though not exclusively) connected with a particular virtue, they are distinct from one another. Twenty-four strengths were identified from extensive cross-cultural and historical investigations, and repeated reductions of larger trait lists. However, not all the character strengths listed are morally relevant (e.g., zest and open-mindedness).

Sample
A web-based version of the 240-item Values in Action Questionnaire (VIA Survey-240) was taken by more than 150,000 people, as reported by Peterson and Seligman (2004). The vast majority of the sample (85%) was American, with most of the remaining 15% coming from English speaking countries. The sample was two-thirds women, and racially, ‘approximates that of the country as a whole’ (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 628). The average participant was 35 years, married, employed, and had completed some education post-high school (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). A 72-item version of the Values in Action Questionnaire (VIA Survey-72), with three items per strength, has also been developed.

Reliability
Internal Consistency
All strength dimensions on the VIA Survey-240 exhibited Cronbach alpha coefficients exceeding .70 (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 631). This was also the case for the VIA Survey-72, with the exception of fairness, kindness and leadership, which exhibited alpha coefficients ranging from .60 to .87 (Mdn = .74) (www.viacharacter.org/www/en-us/research/24alphas72itemssurvey.aspx) – (Retrieved January 12, 2014).

Test–Retest
The test–retest correlations, across a 4-month period, were found to be greater than .70 (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 631).

Validity
Convergent/Concurrent
Peterson and Seligman (2004) reported that self-nominations of strengths correlated positively ($r = .50$) with the matching scale scores for all 24 strengths. Additionally, ‘other’ nomination of strengths (by friends or family members) correlated modestly with the matching scale scores for most of the 24 strengths. Noffle, Schnitker, and Robins (2010) found that most VIA character strengths were moderately related to at least one Big Five facet on the NEO-PI-R. Each character trait facet correlated at least .27, with the largest facet correlate reaching .63.

Divergent/Discriminant
Limited information on the discriminant and divergent validity on the VIA scales is available, apart from summaries provided at www.viacharacter.org website which reports that the VIA scores did not correlate significantly with the Marlow–Crowne social desirability scores, with the exception of Prudence ($r = .44$) and Spirituality ($r = .30$). While few differences were observed across ethnicities, African-Americans exhibited higher Spirituality scores. Interestingly, participants recovering from physical or psychological problems scored more highly on Appreciation of Beauty, Gratitude, and Hope (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).
**Construct/Factor Analytic**

Peterson and Seligman (2004) also reported evidence from an exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation suggesting five factors labeled as follows:

- **Strength of restraint** (fairness, humility, mercy, prudence).
- **Intellectual strengths** (e.g., creativity, curiosity, love of learning, appreciation of beauty).
- **Interpersonal strengths** (e.g., kindness, love, leadership, teamwork, and playfulness).
- **Emotional strengths** (e.g., bravery, hope, self-regulation, zest).
- **Theological strengths** (e.g., gratitude, spirituality).

Noftle et al. (2010) conducted confirmatory factor analyses but conclude that none of the models of character strength fit the data well. In a study comparing the VIA and the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ), Steger, Hicks, Kashdan, Krueger, and Bouchard (2007) found that the MPQ accounts for up to 26% of the total variance in individual character strength scores. MacDonald, Bore, and Munro (2008) using factor analysis found a sizeable overlap between the VIA and Big Five dimensions. The largest correlations were between Extraversion and the ‘positivity’ factor (.71), Openness and the ‘intellect’ factor (.68), Conscientiousness and the ‘conscientiousness’ factor (.71), and Agreeableness and the ‘niceness’ factor (.57). Noftle et al. (2010) expanded upon these findings in a later study, and found that the Big Five, ‘predicted more than 20% of the variance for each of the individual strengths’ (p. 213), suggesting that the VIA does share some variance in common with personality constructs.

**Criterion/Predictive**

Additionally, Peterson and Seligman (2004) found that the NEO-PI-R facets explained between 30% and 49% of the predictive variance in participants’ VIA character strength scores. Those who identified as conservative were more likely to have high scores for Spirituality. Unlike many of the other strengths, Wisdom and Knowledge did not correlate with life satisfaction (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

**Location**


**Results and Comments**

The VIA project has made some progress in developing assessment tools for the empirical study of character strengths. With a preliminary objective of creating a multi-method strategy that can be employed among English speakers in the contemporary Western world, four measures are currently in different stages of development: the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IA), the Values in Action Rising to the Occasion Inventory (VIA-RTO), the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths for Youth (VIA-Youth), and the Values in Action Structured Interview. Of these, the VIA-IA has been revised five times, and has been administered to over 150,000 individuals. It is a 240-item face-valid self-report questionnaire, and all scores obtained from it have substantial test–retest correlations (> .70) and alpha coefficients (> .70).

Relatively few studies have examined the relationship between the VIA character strengths and basic personality traits. This is surprising given that understanding this relationship would result in a better understanding of the basic traits associated with each strength, and a more precise understanding of how the VIA increases understanding of personality above and beyond the Big Five (Noftle et al., 2011). However, the VIA has received some criticism, particularly over its structure, conceptual framework, and overlap with other measures (Noftle et al., 2011).

---

**VIA SAMPLE ITEMS**

**Instructions:** Please choose one option in response to each statement. All of the questions reflect statements that many people would find desirable, but we want you to answer only in terms of whether the statement describes what you are like. Please be honest and accurate! We cannot rank your strengths until you answer all of the 240 questions.

(Response options: Very much like me, Like me, Neutral, Unlike me, Very much unlike me)

1. I find the world a very interesting place.
2. I always go out of my way to attend educational events.
Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ)
(Haidt & Joseph, 2004).

Variable
The MFQ is a novel measure that assesses moral relevance and moral judgments across five foundations posited by moral foundations theory (harm, fairness, ingroup, authority, and purity; Graham et al., 2011). Moral relevance questions measure the relative importance of each of the five foundations, and moral judgment questions ask about behaviors relevant to the five foundations.

Description
Haidt and Joseph (2004), and Graham et al. (2011) put forth a new model of morality that incorporates evolutionary, personality, and developmental perspectives. Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) uses a modified nativist approach that explains morality as both innate and learned (Haidt & Joseph, 2004; Haidt, 2008). Subsequent research on Moral Foundations Theory established the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) as a methodology through which to investigate both cross-cultural variability and shared views (Graham et al., 2011). The MFQ measures the differences in application and importance of the five foundations of Moral Foundations Theory between individuals and cultures (Graham et al., 2011). The first and second versions of the scale were tested on large, heterogeneous populations (total $N = 3825$), recruited from the internet. These initial studies found the five-factor MFQ to be a better fit than other models of morality with fewer factors. However, internal consistency was low and in the second MFQ, some items meant to measure one foundation correlated more strongly with others. This led to the development of the third version of the MFQ, which collected pilot data from more than 28,000 participants (Graham et al., 2011).

The fourth version of the MFQ was developed using the results from Graham, Haidt, and Nosek (2009). The scale contains two sections: moral relevance and moral judgments. Each section includes three questions on each of the 5 foundations. Previous versions of the MFQ did not include questions about moral judgments. Moral judgment questions contextualize abstract moral considerations by asking participants whether they would or would not behave in a certain manner (Graham et al., 2011). Graham et al. (2009) found that while the relevance scale measures obvert beliefs about what is morally relevant, the judgment scale reveals that application of moral foundations in decision-making. Taken together, the two subscales arguably provide a dynamic picture of personal moral conceptions (Graham et al., 2011).

Sample
The fourth edition of the MFQ was piloted on www.yourmorals.org/index.php (Retrieved January 12, 2014) with a large sample of 34,476 participants (37% women, mean age 36.2) (Graham et al., 2011).

Reliability
Internal Consistency
Graham et al. (2011) reported moderate Cronbach alpha coefficients for the five moral domains assessed by the MFQ as follows: .65 for Fairness, .69 for Harm, .71 for Ingroup, .74 for Authority, and .84 for Purity.
Test—Reetest

Test–retest reliability was established using college students, who took the MFQ twice, between 28 and 43 days apart (Graham et al., 2011). Stability coefficients were .71 for Harm, .68 for Fairness, .69 for Ingroup, .71 for Authority, and .82 for Purity.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Graham et al. (2011) identified multiple scales that they predicted would be related to each of the MFQ foundation scores, and these scales were grouped into five external criteria scale sets, with one set for each foundation. The items for the same scale were averaged together, and the correlations between the foundations and the scales were averaged together for each criterion group. Each foundation was the strongest predictor for its own conceptually related group of external scales with an average correlation of .51, compared with an average correlation of .14 for the off-diagonals.

Divergent/Discriminant

The Graham et al. (2011) study also provided evidence of discriminative validity given the average off-diagonal correlation of .14 between the foundations and the conceptually-unrelated criteria scales. The data gathered also suggest that Eastern participants display greater concern about ingroup and purity foundations than Westerners (Graham et al., 2011). Graham et al. found that compared with Westerners, Eastern participants showed stronger concerns about Ingroup (mean difference = .23), t(107149) = 12.42, p < .0001, d = 0.08, and Purity (mean difference = .25), t(110749) = 10.51, p < .0001, d = 0.06. Additionally, women were significantly more concerned than men about Harm (mean difference = .47), t(118238) = 99.16, p < .0001, d = 0.58; Fairness (mean difference = .16), t(118238) = 37.75, p < .0001, d = 0.22; and Purity (mean difference = .16), t(118238) = 25.10, p < .0001, d = 0.15.

Construct/Factor Analytic

Explanatory maximum-likelihood factor analyses with direct oblimin rotation found significant explanatory power for only two of the foundations, with Harm and Fairness loading on and ‘Individualizing’ factor, and Ingroup, Purity and Authority loading on a second ‘Binding’ factor. However, confirmatory factor analyses provided support for the 5-factor model (CFI = 0.82, and RMSEA = 0.05 for the U.S. sample; Graham et al., 2011).

Criterion/Predictive

Graham et al. (2011) tested whether the MFQ had predictive validity over and above Schwartz’s SVS in predicting a range of morally relevant scales, attitudes and behaviors. The MFQ increased the predictive power over the SVS on a variety of scales and topics including attitudes on social groups and political positions (average ΔR² = 8%; all ΔR²s significant at p < .001; Graham et al., 2011).

Location


Results and Commentary

Graham et al. (2011) have presented evidence for the reliability and validity of the MFQ and also have presented a rigorous methodology to select items to maximize both internal and external validity. Moreover, the MFQ shows incremental predictive validity beyond the SVS for multiple external scales of moral personality, attitudes, and political beliefs. The MFQ scale is internally consistent while maintaining a broad degree of coverage of moral domains over and above ‘traditional’ moral domains such as harm and fairness. Confirmatory factor analysis provided evidence of the 5-factor representation. Finally, external validation of the MFQ using a range of widely used scales showed convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity.
**MFQ ITEMS**

**Part I: Moral Relevance** (responded to using the following response options: not at all relevant, not very relevant, slightly relevant, somewhat relevant, very relevant, extremely relevant)

**Harm:**
- EMOTIONALLY — Whether or not someone suffered emotionally*
- WEAK — Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable*
- CRUEL — Whether or not someone was cruel

**Fairness:**
- TREATED — Whether or not some people were treated differently from others*
- UNFAIRLY — Whether or not someone acted unfairly*
- RIGHTS — Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights

**Ingroup:**
- LOVECOUNTRY — Whether or not someone’s action showed love for his or her country*
- BETRAY — Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group*
- LOYALTY — Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty

**Authority:**
- RESPECT — Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority*
- TRADITIONS — Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society*
- CHAOS — Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder

**Purity:**
- DECENCY — Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency*
- DISGUSTING — Whether or not someone did something disgusting*
- GOD — Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

**Part II: Moral Judgments** (responded to using the following response options: strongly disagree, moderately disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, moderately agree, strongly agree)

**Harm:**
- COMPASSION — Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.*
- ANIMAL — One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.*
- KILL — It can never be right to kill a human being.

**Fairness:**
- FAIRLY — When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.*
- JUSTICE — Justice is the most important requirement for a society.*
- RICH — I think it’s morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.

**Ingroup:**
- HISTORY — I am proud of my country’s history.*
- FAMILY — People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.*
- TEAM — It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

**Authority:**
- KIDRESPECT — Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.*
- SEXROLES — Men and women each have different roles to play in society.*
- SOLDIER — If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer’s orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

**Purity:**
- HARMLESSDG — People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.*
- UNNATURAL — I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.*
- CHASTITY — Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

*Notes: An asterisk indicates that the item is also included in the 20-item short-form MFQ.

The fourth version of the MFQ can be found at [www.YourMorals.org](http://www.YourMorals.org). Reproduced with permission.
In this chapter, we have attempted to provide an overview of some of the major attempts to measure moral personality. There are several research programs that focus on conceptualizing and measuring individual differences in moral tendencies. We conclude by noting that there are many fundamental questions concerning morality that can be answered using an individual differences approach.

For example, more research into moral traits is needed (Fleeson et al., 2014), such as whether these traits are best conceptualized in terms of Big Five type broad traits or in terms of more narrow, facet-like traits (see Doris, 1998; 2002, for a philosophical argument against ‘broad’ moral traits). Moreover, innovative models of personality that emphasize both stability and variability in behavior (Blackie, Roepke, Forgeard, Jayawickreme, & Fleeson, 2014; Fleeson, 2001; Mischel & Shoda, 1995) may afford the possibility to integrate moral traits and features of the situation to better predict moral behavior (e.g., Miller, 2013, and Jayawickreme et al., 2014). The extent to which moral traits can be perceived, and the degree of agreement over the presence of a moral trait is also an important future research area (Gosling, John, Craik, & Robins, 1998, and Vazire, 2010). Examining social-cognitive mechanisms underlying moral traits, how moral traits change over time, and how such change can be positively facilitated (e.g. Narvaez & Lapsley, 2009) has both important theoretical and practical implications (see Fleeson et al., 2014).

Interest in measuring moral reasoning and behavior has a long history in personality psychology, with well-validated measures (SVS), new measures that expand the scope of moral domains being assessed (MFQ) and measures of moral personality that may benefit from greater psychometric evaluation (VIA). One important implication of increased interest in the study of values is a broadening of the field of personality beyond the study of ‘normal’ personality traits. Research into moral personality has the potential to complement other approaches to studying values, such as situationist, reasoning and intuitionist approaches (Jayawickreme & DiStefano, 2012). As Hill & Roberts (2010) have noted, a more integrative approach to personality (e.g. Fleeson, 2013) can provide researchers with a strong empirical and research base to answer important questions about the nature of morality.

Acknowledgment

This publication was made possible through the support of a grant from the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation.

References

Blackie, L. E. R., Roepke, A. M., Forgeard, M. J. C., Jayawickreme, E., & Fleeson, W. (2014). Act well to be well: The promise of changing per-approaches to studying values, such as situationist, reasoning and intuitionist approaches (Jayawickreme & DiStefano, 2012). As Hill & Roberts (2010) have noted, a more integrative approach to personality (e.g. Fleeson, 2013) can provide researchers with a strong empirical and research base to answer important questions about the nature of morality.

V. VICES AND VIRTUES