Alexander Tatarko, Anna Mironova

ELECTORAL CHOICES AND BASIC VALUES OF RUSSIANS

Alexander Tatarko[1], Anna Mironova[2]

ELECTORAL CHOICES AND BASIC

VALUES OF RUSSIANS[3]

This research assesses which values were related to the voting results of the Russian presidential election in March 2012. This empirical study was based on the results of a representative poll conducted in two federal districts of Russia (N=2058), which was held shortly after the elections. Participants were given Schwartz's values questionnaire and were asked which of the five Russian presidency candidates they voted for. Empirical analysis showed that the respondents' values were related to their political preferences. The study showed that the conservation–openness to change values were related to participants' voting choices. The conservation values were related to four of the five candidates, which suggest an absence of key differences in the values represented by these politicians.

JEL Classification: Z

Key words: basic values, political behaviour, voting, elections.

---

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics. International Laboratory of Socio-Cultural research. Senior Researcher; E-mail: atatarko@hse.ru.
[2] National Research University Higher School of Economics. International Laboratory of Socio-Cultural research. Junior Research Fellow. E-mail: nusa13@rambler.ru.

.

Introduction

Presidential elections are a crucial event in the political life of the state. People express their choice and influence political life by voting. Therefore, research on the values of people making particular political choices is important.

Election campaigns are widely reported in the media and are accompanied by numerous discussions. The 2012 presidential elections in Russia were accompanied by protests, enhanced security measures and turmoil (Pain & Gudkov, 2012). The presidential election of 2018 is rapidly approaching. Therefore, we analyse the values that guided Russians when voting for different candidates in 2012.

Russia plays a significant role in the world political arena and its actions depend primarily on the decisions of its president. Therefore, it is important to ascertain the values of the Russian electorate as they relate to their voting preferences.

Existing models of electoral behaviour are mostly based on demographic characteristics and political perspectives, taking into account different institutional factors (Caprara et al., 2012).

The present study uses a method based on the theory of basic human values to determine which universal human values motivated the Russian electorate when choosing a particular candidate for the presidency of the Russian Federation in 2012.

The factors influencing voting preferences during political elections

There are various models in political science explaining people's voting motivations. According to Caprara et al. (2012) the main models are as follows: (1) the resource model, which focuses on education and income; (2) the mobilization model, according to which political candidates and parties mobilize people to become politically active; (3) the electorate competition model, which considers the effects of social-demographic characteristics of the electorate and connects them to long-term political changes; and (4) the civil virtues or values model, which considers political participation as an aspect of civil mentality or social capital.

These models explain particular aspects of electoral behaviour, yet they do not take into account the individual and psychological features of the electors. Researchers are increasingly paying attention to the individual determinants of choice rather than just the elector's group affiliation (Caprara, 2007; Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004). Voting is considered to be an individual decision determined by individual characteristics such as moral priorities, beliefs, expectations and values (Caprara et al., 2012). The present research focuses on the role of values.

Values are related to a wide spectrum of human behaviour (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003; Schwartz, 2006). The present study assesses how values relate to political behaviour, and more specifically, to voting behaviour.

Theoretical background of the study

This study suggests that individual values may be related to the electors' choices during presidential elections. Values orient one's choices in a particular direction and can be either positively or negatively related to a particular choice. If an individual does not sense that any of the political candidates or their platforms correspond to their value priorities, they will not participate in the elections at all. Caprara et al. (2012) found this value congruence for the political activity of electors to be significant.

The existence and strength of the relations between values and political behaviour have already been addressed in previous research, with a clear link between basic human values and political choices. The existence of this link was proven in different cultural contexts and in different political systems (Barnea and Schwartz, 1998; Feldman, 2003; Schwartz, 1994a; Vecchione et al., 2013). These papers suggest that people express their most important values through their political choices; people's values influence their political choices (Caprara et al., 2006; Schwartz et al., 2010). In addition, these studies consider the psychological mechanisms through which individual values influence political behaviour. First, basic values lead to the formation of certain political values within an individual, which directly impact their political behaviour (Leimgruber, 2011; Vecchione et al., 2013). Second, values, being abstract principles, reflect human needs (Braithwaite, 1997). As such, these needs motivate people to make particular political choices which they believe will ensure the satisfaction of those needs. These assumptions form the basis for the first hypothesis of the study:

Hypothesis 1. Basic human values are related to political preferences of people, particularly their voting choice for a specific presidential candidate.

This research investigates which values related to particular political choices during the Russian presidential elections in March 2012. The main competition during those elections was between Vladimir Putin (the candidate from the so-called "party of power" (United Russia), with a centrist orientation), Gennady Zyuganov (the communist opposition, or "the left") and Mikhail Prokhorov (the centre-right opposition). There were two additional candidates — Vladimir Zhirinovsky (a right wing patriotic views) and Sergey Mironov (centre-left opposition). We ascertain which basic values motivated the choices of those who elected the three leading candidates.

The current study is unique in two ways. First, the present study is the first to explore a possible connection between the basic values of Russians and their political choices. What basic

values motivated people to vote for the current president, the leader of the communist party or a representative of the right-wing opposition? Second, this study is the first to apply Schwartz's refined theory of basic human values (which includes 19 rather than 10 values) to research on political behaviour.

Basic human values

Individual basic values include the basic principles and beliefs one holds regarding what is desirable and important. Values guide behaviour across situations, including political behaviour. Schwartz developed two theories of basic values — relating to values on a cultural level (cultural values) (Schwartz, 1994a) and on an individual level (individual values) (Schwartz, 2006). As the current study only considers individual behaviour (voting), it utilizes the theory of individual values. Every individual holds many values, each with its own importance for that person. Individuals differ in the importance they give to the same values. According to Schwartz's theory of basic values, values are traditionally defined as motivational, cross-situational goals, serving as guiding principles in people's lives (Schwartz, 1992). In its original version, the theory described 10 basic human values: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security. Testing of this theory on over 300 samples from 70 countries has confirmed this model (Bilsky et al., 2011).

Relatively recently, Schwartz developed a refined theory of basic individual values (Schwartz et al., 2012). The refined theory includes 19 values and provides wide heuristic and predictive opportunities compared with the original theory of 10 values. In the refined theory, the values form a circular motivational continuum. The refined theory is compatible with the structure of the original ten-value theory, for these 19 values embrace the same motivational continuum as the original ten.

Schwartz et al. (2012) differentiated 19 basic values with potentially different motivational meanings. Table 1 presents the 19 values of the refined theory and definitions of each one in terms of motivational goals.

Table 1

The 19 Values in the Refined Theory, Each Defined in Terms of Its Motivational Goal

Value	Conceptual definition in terms of motivational goals
Self-direction–thought	Freedom to cultivate one's own ideas and abilities
Self-direction–action	Freedom to determine one's own actions
Stimulation	Excitement, novelty, and change
Hedonism	Pleasure and sensuous gratification
Achievement	Success according to social standards
Power–dominance	Power through exercising control over people
Power–resources	Power through control of material and social resources
Face	Security and power through maintaining one's public image and avoiding humiliation
Security–personal	Safety in one's immediate environment
Security–societal	Safety and stability in the wider society
Tradition	Maintaining and preserving cultural, family, or religious traditions
Conformity–rules	Compliance with rules, laws, and formal obligations
Conformity–interpersonal	Avoidance of upsetting or harming other people
Humility	Recognizing one's insignificance in the larger scheme of things
Benevolence–dependability	Being a reliable and trustworthy member of the ingroup
Benevolence–caring	Devotion to the welfare of ingroup members
Universalism–concern	Commitment to equality, justice, and protection for all people
Universalism–nature	Preservation of the natural environment
Universalism–tolerance	Acceptance and understanding of those who are different from oneself

From Schwartz et al. (2012).

The original theory determines the order of the values in the circle. Schwartz (1992; 1994b) based the order of the values on the opposition or the compatibility between certain values which

people try to realize in a single decision or action. For example, the decision to challenge power may create a conflict between the self-direction and conformity values, yet it also encourages both the self-direction and stimulation values. The second factor determining the order of the values is their focus on individual (for example, hedonism) or social (for example, tradition) results. Further refinement of the theory created additional criteria determining the order (Schwartz, 2006): if the goal for a certain value is avoidance of anxiety (for example, security) or relative freedom from anxiety (for example, universalism); if it helps to cope with external threats (for example, power) or encourages self-development and growth (for example, benevolence). Based on this theoretical construction, Schwartz et al. (2012) developed a preliminary scheme of 19 values.

The refined theory of basic values was also tested in a Russian context, using a Russian version on a sample of 506 people. Confirmative factor analysis and multidimensional scaling showed the existence of 19 values. The order of the values as predicted by the theory was confirmed by the results of multidimensional scaling (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014).

Relations between values can be presented as a two-dimensional structure including four types of higher-order values. The first dimension is the "Openness to change" (which includes the self-direction and stimulation values)—"Conservation" (which includes the security, conformity and tradition values) opposition. This dimension reflects a conflict between an emphasis on the independence of individual thoughts, actions, and focus on change – on the one hand – and voluntary self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices and defences—on the other (Schwartz, 1996). The second dimension is the "Self-transcendence" (which includes the benevolence and universalism values)—"Self-enhancement" (which includes the power and achievement values) opposition. This dimension reflects a conflict between acceptance of other people as equals and concern for their welfare – on the one hand – and a focus on individual success and dominance—on the other (Schwartz et al., 2012). The values of "hedonism", "humility", and "face" have not included in these 4 types of higher order values, based on the results of multidimensional scaling.

Which values are connected to political preferences?

A range of studies consider the link between political values and political behaviour (McCann, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2010; Petukhov, 2000; Lebedev, 2000). Political values are more distinct and specific than the basic human values. The following values, for example, are considered by researchers to be political values (McCann, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2010): "law and order", "equality", "freedom of enterprise", "civil liberties", and "patriotism". Basic values are more abstract and fundamental than political values (Schwartz, 2006). Basic values manage different types of behaviour and their unique influence on political behaviour and political preferences is not

evident. Basic values underpin a range of attitudes that relate to and directly manage behaviour (Schwartz et al., 2010). Therefore, a link may be uncovered between respondent's particular values and their voting choices. As mentioned, the main proposition of this study is that core individual values influence an individual's political choices, particularly in voting for a particular political candidate. The next question to be addressed concerns **which** basic values are related to the preference or rejection of a particular political candidate.

It is assumed that if the values identified with a particular candidate correspond to the voter's values, they will vote for that candidate.

The existing political spectrum is characterized by a wide range of views and trends. The most common measurement of political ideologies are right-left and liberal-conservative (Conover and Feldman, 1981; Jacoby, 1995), although the number of political ideologies go beyond the framework of these two measurements. In Russia, "left" and "right" denote something other than their accepted meanings in Western countries, particularly the USA. In Russia, the "left" refers to the communist party, while the "right" refers to parties with liberal political views. When the so-called "party of power" ("United Russia") appeared, a party of centrist, conservative views, "the right", began to act as the opposition. Thus, in Russia there is currently no "left" (communist) and "right" (liberal) opposition in the ruling government.

During elections there is often a clash between opposing value systems. People vote for the candidate or political party that supports their individual values (Schwartz et al., 2010). This means that people see a reflection of their values in the political rhetoric or action of the politicians for whom they vote.

Schwartz et al. (2010) analysed different studies devoted to this problem and provided an overview of works considering different value systems in political practice. In Hungary in the 1990s the main disputes were between preserving the traditional way of life and rapid modernization (an opposition between the values of tradition and conformity and the values of stimulation, self-direction, and hedonism). In Australia there is an opposition between parties oriented towards the state regulation of the economy and those favouring free enterprise (an opposition between the power values and the universalism values). During the 2001 elections in Italy, voters for the centre-left demonstrated a greater commitment to the universalism and benevolence values (Schwartz et al., 2010). The results of further research conducted in Italy were similar (Vecchione et al., 2013). Voters for the centre-right demonstrated a stronger commitment to the power, achievement, and security values (Schwartz et al., 2010). The left, liberal ideology is characterized by equality, solidarity, and social justice, as opposed to the right conservative ideology focusing on social order. Further studies have shown that an orientation towards the security, tradition, conformity and power values motivates people to vote for centre-right parties and coalitions (Vecchione et al., 2013).

It has also been demonstrated that basic values can predict electoral behaviour. Barnea and Schwartz (1998) empirically demonstrated that the Openness to change–Conservation opposition was the main value dimension explaining the support of certain political parties in Israel. Devos et al. (2002) found that respondents supporting the "right" in Switzerland attached more importance to the values of power, security and conformity, while those who supported the "left" attached more importance to the values of universalism.

Based on the results of these international studies, we suggest that during the 2012 Russian presidential elections, the main opposition of values was between Openness to change (voting for the right opposition) and Conservation (voting for the candidate from the current authority). Voting for the candidate from the communist party (left opposition) was a version of conservation.

Hypothesis 2. The results of the presidential elections in Russia were mainly related to the values belonging to dimension of Openness to change (self-direction in thought and action, stimulation, hedonism)–Conservation (interpersonal and rules conformity, tradition, societal and personal security).

Method

Participants. The socio-psychological survey was held in two federal districts of Russia – the Central Federal District and the North Caucasian Federal District. The total size of the general population was 24.755 million people in the Central Federal District and 5.812 million people in the North Caucasian Federal District (based on the last population census conducted in 2010 by the Russian Federal Public Statistics Service). A representative sample was obtained in the two regions, totalling 2,058 people. 1,024 interviews were held in the Central Federal District and 1,034 interviews were held in the North Caucasian Federal District. The sample was composed of men (49.4%) and women (50.6%). The respondents' age varied between 18 and 60 years (M=35.5; ϭ=11.4). All respondents were eligible for voting in the Russian Federation.

Instruments of the study

Values. Respondents filled out the Russian version of the Portrait Values Questionnaire — Revised, which includes 57 questions (Schwartz et al., 2012). The questionnaire has been adapted for the Russian population and has good validity and reliability (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). The questionnaire enables assessing each of the 19 values with 3 questions.

Electoral behaviour. To assess electoral behaviour, respondents were asked if they participated in the 2012 elections and if so, which presidential candidate they voted for. The question was formulated as follows: "Did you vote in the presidential elections on March 4 of the present year and if so, who did you vote for?"

1) Zhirinovsky

2) Zyuganov

3) Mironov

4) Prokhorov

5) Putin

6) Did not go to the election

Of the 2,058 respondents, 460 refused to answer this question, 1,598 respondents remained for further data processing.

Social-demographic variables. Additional social-demographic variables were assessed: gender, age, education level (coded incrementally) and a subjective assessment of income level.

Data processing. Descriptive statistics and multinomial logistic regression analysis were used to process the data, because the dependent variable was nominal and had 6 options (5 are the names of the presidential candidates and the 6th option – "Didn't vote"). We have used the option "did not vote" as a reference variable. That means we observed which values guided those respondents who voted for certain candidates compared to those respondents who did not vote. We built the one model for the whole sample and all the presidential candidates (Table 3). The quality index of the logistical regression was Nagelkerke's R^2. The ratio varied from 0 to 1 but this was not the same with R^2 in the linear regression. Nagelkerke's R^2 is useful for evaluating competing models, yet is not a measure of the explained variance. We also used the Likelihood Ratio Test as another indicator of the quality of model.

Results

Percentage rates of the respondents' political preferences were assessed, with the following results (in descending order): Putin — 50.0%; Zyuganov — 6.6%; Prokhorov — 4.4%; Zhirinovsky — 4.3%; Mironov — 2.2%. Also, 32.2% stated they did not vote and 0.3% said that they damaged the ballots.

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics of Russian values. An analysis of the statistical significance of the differences was not the aim of the current study, which is why it was not conducted.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics

Values	M	б
Benevolence–caring	4.52	0.56
Benevolence–dependability	4.52	0.54
Face	4.46	0.58
Security–societal	4.41	0.68
Security–personal	4.4	0.58
Self-direction–thought	4.23	0.54
Self-direction–action	4.23	0.63
Universalism–concern	4.17	0.65
Tradition	4.12	0.69
Conformity–rules	3.9	0.78
Conformity–interpersonal	3.89	0.76
Universalism–tolerance	3.84	0.7
Humility	3.81	0.71
Universalism–nature	3.79	0.76
Achievement	3.78	0.79
Hedonism	3.75	0.88
Power–resources	3.56	0.93
Stimulation	3,54	0,82
Power–dominance	3,05	1,16

The values of Self-transcendence (benevolence–caring and benevolence-dependability) and Conservation (security-societal and security-personal) are on the upper levels of the value hierarchy of Russians. The bottoms of the hierarchy are the values that mainly included in the block Self-enhancement values (power – dominance, power – resources, and achievement).

The quality indicators of multinomial logistic model are satisfactory: Nagelkerke's $R^2 = .12$ and Likelihood Ratio Test $\chi^2 = 182,7$ (p<0.01).

Table 3

Multinomial logistic regression analysis with "Didn't vote" as reference

Value priority	Predictors (values)	*Putin*			*Zyuganov*		
		Estimate	SE	OR (95% CI)	Estimate	SE	OR (95% CI)
Open. to change	SDT	-.05	.11	.95 (.76-1.18)	-.17	.20	.84 (.56-1.25)
	SDA	-.01	.10	.99 (.81-1.21)	.20	.19	1.22 (.84-1.78)
	ST	-.13	.08	.88 (.74-1.04)	.02	.16	1.01 (.74-1.38)
	HE	.01	.07	1.01 (.86-1.16)	-.11	.14	.88 (.67-1.17)
Self – Enh.	AC	-.095	.09	.91 (.76-1.08)	-.18	.17	.834 (.598-1.163)
	POD	-.01	.06	.98 (.87-1.11)	.01	.11	1.00 (.8031.26)
	POR	.11	.07	1.11 (.96-1.29)	-.02	.14	.97 (.73-1.28)
	FAC	-.05	.11	.94 (.75-1.18)	-.27	.20	.76 (.51-1.13)
Cons.	SEP	-.06	.11	.93 (.75-1.16)	-.01	.21	.98 (.65-1.48)
	SES	.13	.09	1.14 (.95-1.36)	**.58****	**.19**	**1.79 (1.23-2.58)**
	TR	**.29*****	**.09**	**1.33 (1.12-1.59)**	.22	.17	1.24 (.89-1.74)
	COR	.09	.08	1.10 (.93-1.30)	.05	.15	1.05 (.77-1.44)
	COI	**.24****	**.09**	**1.26 (1.06-1.51)**	.12	.16	1.12 (.81-1.56)
	HUM	-.14	.09	.86 (.72-1.02)	-.11	.16	.89 (.64-1.23)
Self-Trans.	UNN	.11	.13	1.12 (.85-1.46)	-.25	.25	.773 (.474-1.262)
	UNC	-.16	.13	.84 (.64-1.10)	.12	.25	1.12 (.68-1.85)
	UNT	-.14	.10	.86 (.70-1.05)	**-.36***	**.18**	**.69 (.49-.98)**
	BEC	-.03	.08	.96 (.82-1.13)	-.02	.15	.97 (.72-1.31)
	BED	.03	.09	1.03 (.86-1.23)	-.22	.16	.80 (.58-1.10)

SDT - Self-direction–thought; SDA - Self-direction–action; ST – Stimulation; HE – Hedonism; AC – Achievement; POD - Power–dominance; POR - Power–resources; FAC – Face; SEP - Security–personal; SES - Security–societal; TR – Tradition; COR - Conformity–rules; COI - Conformity–interpersonal; HUM -Humility; UNN - Universalism–nature; UNC - Universalism–concern; UNT - Universalism–tolerance; BEC - Benevolence–caring; BED - Benevolence–dependability.

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table 3 (cont.)

Value priority	Predictors (Values)	*Prokhorov*			*Zhirinovsky*		
		Estimate	SE	OR (95% CI)	Estimate	SE	OR (95% CI)
Open. to change	SDT	.17	.25	1.19 (.72-1.95)	.10	.24	1.10 (.68-.79)
	SDA	.03	.23	1.03 (.65-1.62)	.14	.23	1.15 (.73-.82)
	ST	.05	.19	1.05 (.71-1.54)	-.14	.19	.86 (.59-1.26)
	HE	.06	.18	1.06 (.74-1.52)	.26	.18	1.30 (.90-.86)
Self – Enh.	AC	-.11	.20	.89 (.59-1.31)	-.30	.20	.73 (.49-1.09)
	POD	-.23	.13	.79 (.60-1.03)	-.08	.14	.91 (.69-1.20)
	POR	**.38***	**.18**	**1.45 (1.01-2.09)**	.23	.17	1.26 (.89-.79)
	FAC	-.31	.21	.72 (.47-1.11)	**-.43***	**.22**	**.65 (.42-1.01)**
Cons.	SEP	-.32	.21	.72 (.47-1.10)	-.24	.22	.78 (.51-1.21)
	SES	.28	.20	1.33 (.89-1.96)	**.34***	**.20**	**1.40 (.94-2.09)**
	TR	.15	.19	1.16 (.80-1.69)	-.17	.18	.83 (.58-1.20)
	COR	**-.34***	**.17**	**.71 (.50-.99)**	.00	.18	1.0 (.69-1.4)
	COI	.10	.18	1.11 (.77-1.60)	-.20	.19	.81 (.55-1.18)
Self-Trans.	HUM	-.12	.18	.87 (.61-1.26)	.21	.20	1.24 (.84-1.84)
	UNN	.25	.28	1.29 (.74-2.25)	.21	.28	1.24 (.71-2.15)
	UNC	-.24	.28	.78 (.44-1.37)	**-.56****	**.27**	**.57 (.34-.97)**
	UNT	-.27	.20	.75 (.51-1.13)	.20	.22	1.22 (.78-1.90)
	BEC	-.09	.17	.91 (.647-1.28)	.22	.18	1.25 (.86-1.81)
	BED	.04	.19	1.04 (.71-1.53)	-.28	.19	.75 (.51-1.09)

SDT - Self-direction–thought; SDA - Self-direction–action; ST – Stimulation; HE – Hedonism; AC – Achievement; POD - Power–dominance; POR - Power–resources; FAC – Face; SEP - Security–personal; SES - Security–societal; TR – Tradition; COR - Conformity–rules; COI - Conformity–interpersonal; HUM -Humility; UNN - Universalism–nature; UNC - Universalism–concern; UNT - Universalism–tolerance; BEC - Benevolence–caring; BED - Benevolence–dependability.

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table 3 (cont.)

Value priority	Predictors (Values)	Mironov		
		Estimate	SE	OR (95% CI)
Open. to change	SDT	-.31	.32	.72 (.38-1.38)
	SDA	.08	.32	1.08 (.57-2.06)
	ST	.40	.28	1.49 (.85-2.61)
	HE	-.44	.28	1.53 (.82-.1.66)
Self – Enh.	AC	-.43	.29	.58 (.32-1.04)
	POD	.16	.21	1.17 (.77-1.77)
	POR	**.67****	**.27**	**1.96 (1.16-.32)**
	FAC	**-.62***	**.32**	**.54 (.29-1.01)**
Cons.	SEP	-.48	.24	.59 (.35-.97)
	SES	**.71****	**.32**	**2.03 (1.09-3.78)**
	TR	.03	.29	1.03 (.58-1.84)
	COR	.46	.30	1.59 (.88-2.86)
	COI	-.34	.27	.71 (.41-1.21)
	HUM	.05	.28	1.05 (.60-1.86)
Self- Trans.	UNN	-.05	.42	.94 (.43-2.16)
	UNC	-.30	.38	.74 (.35-1.56)
	UNT	**.71***	**.36**	**2.03 (.99-4.14)**
	BEC	.00	.26	1.00 (.59-1.70)
	BED	-.49	.25	.60 (.36-.99)

SDT - Self-direction–thought; SDA - Self-direction–action; ST − Stimulation; HE − Hedonism; AC − Achievement; POD - Power–dominance; POR - Power–resources; FAC − Face; SEP - Security–personal; SES - Security–societal; TR − Tradition; COR - Conformity–rules; COI - Conformity–interpersonal; HUM -Humility; UNN - Universalism–nature; UNC - Universalism–concern; UNT - Universalism–tolerance; BEC - Benevolence–caring; BED - Benevolence–dependability.

$*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001$.

Table 3 shows that voting for the candidate from the ruling government (Putin) is positively related to the values of tradition (.29***) and interpersonal conformity (.24**). Additionally, a negative relation was found with the humility value (−.18*). This vote related to the values of Conservation (conformity-interpersonal and tradition) which is consistent with the second hypothesis.

Voting for the Communist party candidate (Zyuganov) is positively related to security-societal values (.58**), which are also included in the block of "Conservation" values (Schwartz et al. 2012). In other words, these voters are motivated by security, in particular, societal security, meaning that these people feel that there is a threat to social patterns. A preference for Zyuganov is also negatively related to the universalism – tolerance values (-.36*), and these values belong to the block of Self-Transcendence values (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Table 3 presents the connections between values and voting for Prokhorov. Prokhorov was a self-nominated candidate in the Russian presidential election who positioned himself well and was considered by the majority to be a representative of the "right" opposition. A trend became apparent that contrasted that which emerged for Putin and Zyuganov: the Conservation values (conformity-rules) were negatively related with voting for this candidate. In other words, voting for Prokhorov meant voting against the Conservation values more than anything else; hence, voting for this candidate perhaps served as a form of protest.

The analysis of the values related to voting for Zhirinovsky shows that these are also the values included in the block of Conservation values, in particular, the security – societal value (.34*). Voting for this candidate is also negatively associated with face value (-.43*) and benevolence – caring value (-.56*), the latter value belonging to the block of Self-Transcendence values.

Mironov received votes of 2.2% of the respondents in our sample. As above, these votes match the values of Conservation, in particular, security - societal value (.71). Voting for this candidate is negatively related to the face value (-.62), similar to voting for Zhirinovsky, and positively to the power - resources value (.67**), similar to voting for Prokhorov. There is also a high positive relation with the values of universalism – tolerance (0.71*). This value characterizes pursuance of equality and acceptance, i.e. it is very close to the values declared by a "Fair Russia" party led by Mironov.

The value structure of the few voters of Mironov is vague, but, similar to the previous four cases, the values of the Conservation block will inevitably appear among those values that stimulate people to vote for this particular candidate.

Discussion

The results confirm the hypothesis that the values of Russians are related to their political preferences, in particular, their voting for a particular presidential candidate (Hypothesis 1). In general, people abstain from voting when their individual values are not congruent with those expressed by political parties or politicians (Caprara et al., 2012). Only when the values conveyed by political parties or candidates match an individual's values, do people vote. In this study, a

number of values were shown to be significantly related to respondent voting results. A positive relation between voting for a particular candidate and a certain value indicated the significance of that value in motivating people to vote for that particular candidate in the belief that this candidate would support the attainment of the needs related to these values. A negative relation between voting for a particular candidate and a certain value indicated that rejecting this value motivated people to vote for a certain candidate.

Based on these assumptions, let us consider the psychological role of values in the political choices of Russians. The results of the present study indicate that people voted for the candidate from the ruling government of centrist orientation (Putin) mainly to preserve the current political situation.

People voting for the communist leader Zyuganov were primarily motivated by their need for security. However, this value is also included in the Conservation and values of tradition and conformity - interpersonal are associated with voting for Putin.

It may be assumed that voting for the "right oppositional" candidate Prokhorov meant not only that people were "for" him, but they were also "against" the ruling government and its supporters. Voting for Prokhorov turned out to be negatively associated with the conformity – rules value (compliance with the rules, laws, and constructive obligations), included in the block of Conservation values.

The respondents that voted for the nationalistically inclined opposition (Zhirinovsky) have a somewhat selfish motivation (adverse relation to the universalism-concern value) and are focused on societal security (the security – societal value).

The research shows that respondents who voted for Mironov were primarily concerned with others rather than material benefits and pleasure. However, they also expressed a wish to exert influence, as indicated by the positive relation found between these voters and the power-resources value.

The values of Conservation are positively associated with voting for 4 out of 5 candidates and adversely with the voting for the 5th candidate - Prokhorov. This means that the reasons for voting for 4 out of 5 candidates have similar elements.

However, it may not be categorically stated that these relations are what influenced political choices; these relations are more likely to be reciprocal. There are studies demonstrating that not only do values influence political choices, but that political choices also impact human values (Sturgis, 2003), as shown in empirical longitudinal research (McCann, 1997). This research showed that people's choices impact their future values more than their values impact their political choices. In other words, people form their values based on their own behaviour. Furthermore, McCann (1997) discovered that people who voted for a particular candidate changed their core political

values during future elections, adjusting them to the party or candidate they chose. People do not only express their values through voting; voting forms and strengthens their values. Therefore, if such values as tradition and conformity-interpersonal underpinned people's main political choice in 2012 (Putin), then by the time of the 2018 elections, these values may be even further ingrained, increasing support for the ruling government and its policies.

The main value opposition related with the Russian presidential elections in 2012 was between the Openness to change and the Conservation values. Notably, most connections were with the Conservation values, confirming the second hypothesis of this study. The literature shows that two basic measurements combine all the values related to certain political orientations (Barnea & Schwartz, 1998; Caprara et al., 2006). Openness to change–conservation corresponds to the measurement of "Libertarianism–Authoritarianism" in politics, while the self-enhancement–self-transcendence opposition corresponds to the opposition between "the right" (in the USA these are the conservatives) and "the left" (in the USA these are the liberals) of political coalitions. In Russia, however, "the right" is mainly liberal, while "the left" mainly refers to communists.

Voting for Putin (centrist orientation) was found to be positively related to the Conservation values. Voting for Zyuganov (communist party of left-wing opposition) also was found to be positively related to the Conservation values and rejection of the Self-Transcendence values. The preference for Prokhorov (rightist opposition) is positively associated with the values of Self-Enhancement and rejection of the values of Conservation, i.e. indirectly associated with the values of Openness to change. Voting for Zhirinovsky (patriotically inclined opposition) is positively associated with Conservation values and rejection of Self-Transcendence values. Preference for Mironov as the president is driven by different groups of values. These are the values of Conservation, Self-Transcendence, and Self-Enhancement.

Therefore, although five political candidates participated in the 2012 Russian elections, voting for four of them (except for Prokhorov) was mainly related to the Conservation and Self-Transcendence values, which in terms of political views suggests an orientation towards conservatism. Hence, four of the five political candidates, despite their seemingly diverse ideas and political platforms, in fact conveyed similar values. The only exception was Prokhorov, who was not a professional politician, but rather a businessman and a new figure on the political arena, and the values related to voting for him were radically different.

Limitations

The aim of the current study was to uncover links between the basic values of Russians and their voting results during the 2012 presidential elections. Although this aim was achieved, values are not sufficient to predict political behaviour. Values provide a general orientation, directing an individual's choices. Political behaviour can be influenced by additional means such as group pressure or the mass media. However, such changes are most likely to remain within the framework of a person's existing value opposition. For example, if individuals are motivated by their adherence to the Conservation values, they will possibly hesitate between the various candidates expressing the Conservation values. It is unlikely that these voters will consider a candidate conveying Openness to change values.

Another limitation relates to the role of political values. Previous studies have shown that political values mediate the link between basic values and political behaviour (Schwartz et al., 2010; Leimgruber, 2011). However, political values are more sensitive to changes in society. That is why any dramatic political or socio-economic changes may lead to changes in political values that directly determine political preferences. Further studies are necessary to understand this issue.

Conclusion

The current study contributes to understanding the connection between individual values and political choices. Based on the assumption that individuals vote for politicians whose values match their own, it may be deduced which values were conveyed by the various presidential candidates, based on their electorate's values.

The most important finding of the current study was that the Russian electorate's choices during the presidential elections mostly related to the Conservation-Openness to change value opposition. These results correspond to data obtained in other countries. The most notable finding was that the selection of 4 out of 5 candidates related to the Conservation values (sometimes accompanied by the Self-Transcendence values). The choice related with the openness to change values was shown only for one candidate and this too was only indirect (a negative relation with the Conservation values was revealed). It may be concluded that disregarding differences in political positions, views, and policies, most of the Russian presidential candidates during the 2012 elections conveyed the Conservation and Self-Enhancement values. The results of the election show that at present the political choice of the Russian population is motivated by these values, yet if the motivation of the Russian electorate changes and the candidates remain the same, the election turnout will be low.

The current study is valuable in understanding the value-motivational basis for the political choices of individuals, perhaps encouraging politicians to communicate more effectively with their potential voters.

References

Bardi, A. & Schwartz, S. (2003) Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29 (10), 1207–1220. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203254602

Barnea, M. & Schwartz, S. (1998) Values and voting. *Political Psychology,* 19 (1), 17–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00090

Bilsky, W., Janik, M. & Schwartz, S. (2011) The structural organization of human values – Evidence from three rounds of the European Social Survey (ESS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42 (5), 759-776. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110362757

Braithwaite, V. (1997) Harmony and Security Value Orientations in Political Evaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, (4) 401-414. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297234006

Caprara, G. (2007) The personalization of modern politics. *European Review*, 15 (2), 151-164. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798707000178

Caprara, G., Schwartz, S., Capanna C., Vecchione M., & Barbaranelli C. (2006) Personality and politics: Values, traits, and political choice. *Political psychology*, 27 (1), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00447.x

Caprara, G., Vecchione, M. & Schwartz, S. (2012) Why People Do Not Vote: The Role of Personal Values. *European psychologist,* 17 (4), 266-278. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000099

Caprara, G. & Zimbardo, P. (2004) Personalizing politics. *American Psychologist,* 59 (7), 581-594. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.581

Conover, P. & Feldman, S. (1981) Origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications. *American Journal of Political Science,* 25 (4), 617–645. https://doi.org/10.2307/2110756

Devos, T., Spini, D. & Schwartz, S. (2002) Conflicts Among Human Values and Trust in Institutions. *British Journal of Social Psychology,* 41 (4), 481-494. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466602321149849

Feldman, S. (2003) *Values, ideology, and structure of political attitudes*. In Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology, edited by D. Sears, L. Huddy and R. Jervis. 477–508. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jacoby, W. (1995) The structure of ideological thinking in the American public. *American Journal of Political Science,* 39 (2), 314–335. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111615

Lebedev, I. (1999) Politicheskie tsennosti kak slozhnyi i mnogomernyi ob'ekt [Political values as a complex and multidimensional object]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*, 12 (2), 38-49.

Leimgruber, P. (2011) Values and votes: the indirect effect of personal values on voting behavior. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17 (2), 107-127. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2011.02009.x

McCann, J. (1997) Electoral choices and core value change: The 1992 presidential campaign. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41 (2), 564–583. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111777

Pain, E. and Gudkov, L. (2012) Protestnye mitingi v Rossii kontsa 2011–nachala 2012 gg.: zapros na demokratizatsiyu politicheskikh institutov [Protest rallies in Russia in the late 2011 - early 2012: calls for democratization of political institutions]. *Vestnik obshchestvennogo mneniya,* 112 (2), 73-86.

Petukhov, V. (2000) Politicheskie tsennosti i povedenie srednego klassa [Political values the behavior of the middle class]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 3, 23-32.

Schwartz, S. (1992) Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in experimental social psychology,* 25 (1), 1-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Schwartz, S. (1994a) Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications, edited by Uichol Kim, Harry C. Triandis, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, Sang-Chin Choi, and Gene Yoon. 85-119. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. (1994b) Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues,* 50 (4), 19–45. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x

Schwartz, S. (2006) Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications. Revue Française de Sociologie, 47 (4), 249–288.

Schwartz, S. & Butenko T. (2014) Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia. *European Journal of Social Psychology,* 44 (7), 799-813. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2053

Schwartz S., Caprara G. & Vecchione M. (2010) Basic personal values, core political values and voting: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology,* 31 (3), 421–452. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00764.x

Schwartz, S., Cieciuch J., Vecchione M., Davidov E., Fischer R., Beierlein R., Ramos A., Verkasalo M., Lönnqvist J.-E., Demirutku K., Dirilen-Gumus O. & Konty M. (2012) Refining the Theory of Basic Individual Values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103 (4), 663-688. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393

Sturgis, P. (2003) Party allegiance and core political value change. ESRC Research Methods Programme Working Paper. URL: http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/1865/1/fulltext.pdf (10.02.2016)

Vecchione, M., Caprara G., Dentale F. & Schwartz S. (2013) Voting and values: Reciprocal effects over time. *Political Psychology,* 34 (4), 465-485. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12011

Alexander Tatarko

National Research University Higher School of Economics. International Laboratory of Socio-Cultural research. Senior Researcher; E-mail: atatarko@hse.ru.