ABSTRACT

Research on values has rarely included notions of justice concerns. This study incorporated Wendorf, Alexander, and Firestone's (2006) five categories of people's ideological or value-based fairness concerns (procedural, interactional, participation, social standards, and individual) and their associated criteria to investigate how well justice values fit relative to the values used in the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992). Participants rated the importance of various justice concerns that were incorporated into an altered Schwartz Value Survey. Analysis indicates the five justice concerns systematically fit into the appropriate value dimensions of the Schwartz Value Survey. An additional analysis provided evidence that those participants with different political affiliations rated justice concerns contrastingly. Implications for justice and value research are examined.

METHOD

Participants:
- Number of Participants: 210 total respondents, all from Psychology classes at a public Midwestern university.
- Gender and Age: 56% Female, 44% Male, Age Range: 17-50 (M=19.6)
- Ethnic Background: 94.8% Caucasian-American, 2.4% Asian-American, 1.9% Hispanic-American, 0.9% Other Groups.
- Political Affiliation: 42.2% Democratic, 32.1% Republican, 25.7% Independent.

Materials:
- Schwartz Value Survey (1992): The original survey contains 56 values (only 3 corresponding to justice – equality, politeness, & social justice).
- Additional Items Added to the Survey: Items were written to correspond with Wendorf, Alexander, and Firestone's (2006) conceptualization of justice in five factors:
  1. Procedural Concern: This factor represents all concerns about the importance of fair procedures used to make decisions.
  2. Appropriate Interaction: This factor represents all concerns about the importance of fair interactions between decision-makers and the people who are affected by their decisions.
  3. Participation: This factor represents all concerns about the importance of people's ability to participate in decision-making procedures and allocations.
  4. Social Standards: This factor represents all concerns about the importance of determining allocations based on typical, traditional, or normative methods.
  5. Individual Concerns: This factor represents all concerns about the importance of taking individualized information into account in determining allocations.

INTRODUCTION

Justice concerns can be conceptualized as values. But within commonly used surveys of values, justice and fairness dimensions are clearly absent.

Schwartz Value Survey (1992):
- **Summary of the Schwartz Value Survey:** This survey was developed to determine the importance of human values. These values are the basic principles that guide individual behavior throughout life.
- **Categories of Values:** Schwartz's survey includes values sampled from ten value categories:
  1. Power - Status and Control over others and one’s life
  2. Achievement - Personal success and mastery of skills
  3. Hedonism - Self-gratification and pleasure
  4. Stimulation - Exciting and adventurous life
  5. Self-direction - Independent and in control of one's choices
  6. Universalism - Understanding and unity with people and the world
  7. Benevolence - Relationships with friends, family and loved ones
  8. Tradition - Following of traditions of one’s culture and/or religion
  9. Conformity - Fulfillment of social expectations in situations
  10. Security - How safe one feels

Research Questions:
- **Justice as Values:** Where do notions of justice fit relative to other values as identified by Schwartz (1992)?
- **Justice as a Function of Political Affiliation:** Does the importance attached to these justice values vary according to political affiliation?
Justice as Values: Where do notions of justice fit relative to other values as identified by Schwartz (1992)?

4. Social Standards: Social Standards fits into Schwartz’s value category of Conformity.
5. Individual Concerns: Individual Concerns fits into Schwartz’s value category of Security.

Justice as a Function of Political Affiliation: Does the importance attached to these justice values vary according to political affiliation?

1. Procedural Concern: Republicans valued fairness of procedures in decision making more when compared to Democrats and Independents.
2. Appropriate Interaction: No significant difference between groups.
3. Participation: Republicans valued the ability to participate in the decision making process more when compared to Democrats and Independents.
4. Social Standards: Republicans valued the concerns for established rules more when compared to Democrats and Independents.
5. Individual Concerns: No significant difference between groups.

Justice criteria fit into the value categories identified by Schwartz (1992) in predictable ways. Also, the importance of each justice value varies according to political affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairness Category</th>
<th>Republicans' Ratings</th>
<th>Democrats' Ratings</th>
<th>Independents' Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Concern</td>
<td>3.24 ± (2.67 – 3.79)</td>
<td>2.51 ± (2.05 – 2.96)</td>
<td>2.40 ± (1.89 – 2.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Interaction</td>
<td>4.40 ± (4.40 – 5.36)</td>
<td>6.03 ± (5.63 – 6.41)</td>
<td>6.46 ± (5.61 – 7.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4.24 ± (3.86 – 4.61)</td>
<td>3.83 ± (3.50 – 4.11)</td>
<td>3.70 ± (3.35 – 4.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Standards</td>
<td>3.97 ± (3.47 – 4.47)</td>
<td>3.33 ± (3.03 – 3.74)</td>
<td>3.00 ± (2.64 – 3.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Concerns</td>
<td>4.21 ± (3.76 – 4.66)</td>
<td>3.96 ± (3.69 – 4.33)</td>
<td>3.95 ± (3.64 – 4.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals. Ratings within each row are significantly different if they have differing superscripts (p < .05).
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