



12th International LAB Meeting - Summer Session 2008  
14th International Summer School

European Ph.D. on  
Social Representations and Communication  
At the Multimedia LAB & Research Center, Rome-Italy

Social Representations in Action and Construction  
in Media and Society

"Social Representations, Collective Memory and Socially  
Shared Emotions: narrative and experimental approaches"

From 26th July to 3rd August 2008  
[http://www.europhd.eu/html/\\_onda02/07/14.00.00.00.shtml](http://www.europhd.eu/html/_onda02/07/14.00.00.00.shtml)

Scientific Material

European Ph.D

on Social Representations and Communication

International Lab Meeting Series 2005-2008

[www.europhd.psi.uniroma1.it](http://www.europhd.psi.uniroma1.it)  
[www.europhd.net](http://www.europhd.net)  
[www.europhd.it](http://www.europhd.it)

*Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 63, No. 2, 2007, pp. 405–419*

## **Culture of Peace: Sociostructural Dimensions, Cultural Values, and Emotional Climate**

**Nekane Basabe\* and Jose Valencia**

*University of the Basque Country*

*This article examines how objective measures of sociostructural dimensions of a culture of peace are related to subjective national values, attitudes, and emotional climate. National scores on objective measures of four sociostructural dimensions were correlated with national means from a number of cultural value data sets and national indexes of emotional climate. Liberal Development was congruently associated with egalitarian, individualist values, a low negative emotional climate, and less willingness to fight in a new war. By contrast, Violent Inequality was associated with lower harmony values and less valuing of intellectual autonomy. State Use of Violent Means was strongly associated with low harmony values. Nurturance was associated with horizontal individualism, tolerance, cooperative values, and positive emotional climate. The conclusion discusses how the construction of a culture of peace must be based on values as well as objective sociocultural factors.*

A broad definition of peace requires the consideration of the construct as a system. Peace, however it is conceived, is a characteristic of a system, at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, intrasocial, or intraglobal level. It is a concept applied to a system and it is, therefore, necessarily impregnated with the traditions that in a given civilization are responsible for concept formation and system development (Galtung, 1985, p. 75).

There is increasing agreement that a culture of peace must refer to the meeting of human needs and not simply the absence of war (Kimmel, 1985; Wagner, 1988; White, 1988). It must also be based on societal structures such as democracy,

---

\*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Nekane Basabe, Universidad del País Vasco, Departamento de Psicología Social, Paseo de la Universidad, 7, 01006 Vitoria, Spain [e-mail: nekane.basabe@ehu.es].

This study was supported by the following Basque Country Research Grants 9/UPV00109.231-13645/2001 and MEC-CEJ2005-08849-CO4-Psic.

open communication, and gender equality that are the opposite of the hierarchical structures, secrecy, and male dominance characteristics of a culture of war.

UNESCO (1995) defined a culture of peace as consisting of “. . . a set of values, attitudes and modes of behaviour based on non-violence and respect for the fundamental rights and freedom of all people.” As the concept was developed, it was presumed that such a culture must rest on eight different bases. These were as follows (De Rivera, 2004b): (1) Education for the peaceful resolution of conflict; (2) Sustainable development (viewed as involving the eradication of poverty, reduction of inequalities, and environmental sustainability); (3) Human rights; (4) Gender equality; (5) Democratic participation; (6) Understanding, tolerance, and solidarity (among peoples, vulnerable groups, and migrants within the nation, and among nations); (7) Participatory communication and the free flow of information; (8) International peace and security (including disarmament and various positive initiatives). De Rivera proposed a number of objective indicators that might be used to assess the coherence of the UN model of culture of peace. A factor analysis of these objective indicators found that the variance among the measures requires us to distinguish four orthogonal factors. These may be considered to be four different dimensions of a culture of peace in contemporary nation states (De Rivera, 2004b). The first major structural dimension is Liberal Development (LD), including social development (high literacy, life expectancy, and incomes), democratic development (democratic participation, freedom press, respect for human rights), and gender equality. A second dimension, Violent Inequality (VI), reflects income inequality (Gini's index), homicides rates and human rights violations. A third dimension is the State Use of Violent Means (SUVN), related to military acts as the primary technique for coping with foreign policy crises and military expenditure. And, finally a Nurture dimension (N) is related to tolerance of refugees, education expenditure, and gender equality (see below for a description of these dimensions). It may be argued that the extent to which a nation has a culture of peace may be described by its scores on these factors (De Rivera, 2004b).

Note that the existence of different dimensions implies that conflicts between government and people (related to LD), between haves and have-nots (related to VI), between different groups within a society (related to N), and between societies (associated with SUVN), may each be settled in different ways. Nonviolence may be held as a dominant value in one arena but not in another so that cultures are not uniformly peaceful. Thus, nonviolent solutions to the conflict between government and people may involve development, democracy, open communication, and human rights, but may not result in nonviolent solutions to the conflict between rich and poor, or the conflict with other nations.

The culture of peace is a holistic concept, and each of the bases should theoretically be related to the values, attitudes, and behaviors of a culture of peace (De Rivera, 2004a). This subjective aspect of a culture of peace is defined by Boulding (2000a, p. 196) as “a mosaic of identities, attitudes, values, beliefs, and institutional

patterns that lead people to live nurturantly with one another and the earth itself without the aid of structured power differentials, to deal creatively with their differences, and share their resources.” Thus, assessments of peace should examine cultural beliefs and values as well as societal structures. One presumes that specific beliefs, attitudes, and values will be related to the different structural dimensions. For example, believing one has control and free choice should be positively related to LD, interpersonal trust should be negatively related to VI, valuing peace should be negatively related to SUVVM, and tolerance toward minorities should be related to N.

To measure the subjective dimension of culture, current crosscultural social psychology has focused on beliefs and values. Culture is conceived of as a set of denotative beliefs about what is true, connotative values and norms about what should be, and pragmatic knowledge of procedural rules about how things are done shared by a group of individuals who have a common history and participate in a social structure. Shared values play key roles in subjective culture and measures of important dimensions of cultural values are included in large scale studies by Hofstede (2001), Inglehart, Basañez, Díez-Medrano, Halman, and Luijkx, (2004), and Schwartz (1994).

Hofstede (2001) has found four cultural dimensions. The Individualism–Collectivism (IDV/COL) dimension refers to the priority given to the autonomous individual and voluntary relationships or to the priority given to norms, duties, and loyalty towards ascribed groups (often families). Power Distance (PDI) concerns how power is shared in a society and refers to the extent to which members of a culture emphasize hierarchy and accept power inequalities. Collectivist cultures are usually high PDI cultures. The Masculinity–Femininity (MAS/FEM) dimension reflects the degree to which a society’s men have different values than its women. Masculine cultures stress stereotypical gender behavior, and Hofstede (2001) posits that competition and assertiveness are typically valued as opposed to the cooperation and nurturance more valued in the so-called feminine societies. Thus, Scandinavian individualistic and feminine cultures emphasize personal autonomy and are also extremely noncompetitive, stressing modesty (Fernández, Páez, & González, 2005). The dimension of Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) refers to the extent to which members of a culture feel threatened by unknown situations. Strong uncertainty avoidance cultures stress formal rules and social control.

Schwartz (1994) considers two types of Individualism. He distinguishes societies that promote *Intellectual autonomy* by giving priority to the ideas and thoughts of individuals from those promoting *Affective autonomy* by prioritizing individual’s feelings. Schwartz stresses that the emphasis on autonomy in individualistic societies does not mean that there is no concern for others or the group. Rather, group welfare is met with a different set of expectations. He distinguishes cultures that emphasize *Egalitarian Commitment* and socialize their members to commit themselves voluntarily to cooperating with others and to be concerned for their

welfare from those cultures that give high importance to *Hierarchy* by promoting a hierarchical system of roles and from those that stress *Conservation* of the status quo.

The World Value Survey studies established two important cultural dimensions (Inglehart et al., 2004). Postmaterialist societies give more importance to values of self-expression and tolerance of minorities (social and political participation, freedom, and a more humane society), whereas materialist societies stress survival values. At the same time, the modernization process implies a change from religious authority to state authority through the processes of secularization and bureaucratization, implying, in turn, a change from a traditional society to a legal-rational society.

Hofstede's and Schwartz's individualist and egalitarian values show convergent validity and are related to Inglehart's Postmaterialism and Secular Authority. Hofstede's Individualism correlates positively with Affective and Intellectual Autonomy, Egalitarian Commitment, and the postmaterialist values, and negatively with Conservation and Hierarchy. These results seem to show that Individualism is linked to the development of an autonomous and distinctive self that assumes independent and responsible decisions and is related to others by principles of equality. Hofstede's Power Distance scores are correlated positively with Conservatism and negatively with Affective and Intellectual Autonomy and Egalitarian Commitment, as predicted by Schwartz's theory. Finally, Power Distance is inversely related to Inglehart's Postmaterialism, as might be expected due to postmaterialism's emphasis on equality and tolerance of minorities (Basabe & Ros, 2005).

Schwartz's *Harmony* values emphasize fitting in with nature and the environment and is in opposition to value types that promote actively changing the world through self-assertion and exploitation of people and resources, that is, Mastery and Hierarchy values (Schwartz, 1994, p. 106; see also Basabe & Ros, 2005; Gouveia & Ros, 2000).

Previous studies relating using subjective values to objective indices of well-being have revealed a number of interesting relationships. Thus, societies characterized by more individualistic, less hierarchical, and more postmodern values are related with the highest levels of the UN's Human Development Index (high education, life expectancy, and income) (Basabe & Ros, 2005). Hierarchical values are related to high income inequality as measured by a Gini Index (Hofstede, 2001), and studies also have found that collectivist and power distance values are associated with higher internal political violence (Basabe & Ros, 2005). Nations with high military expenditure as a percentage of GDP share more hierarchical values (Hofstede, 2001).

Studies also suggest that cultural values are related to beliefs and attitudes important to a culture of peace. For instance, individualist societies show higher levels of trust or "social capital" (Allik & Realo, 2004).

Subjective values may also be related to the dimensions of emotional climate relevant to a culture of peace. Past studies suggest that there are cultural determinants of emotional climate. Nations with individualist cultures have been shown to have higher indexes of subjective well-being, such as satisfaction with life, happiness, and affect balance, even when high income, human rights, and equality were controlled (Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995). Hierarchical societies evidence more frequent negative affect (Basabe & Ros, 2005), and the valuing of Masculinity (competitiveness) and Uncertainty Avoidance have been found to be strongly associated with negative affect (Basabe et al., 2002). If we conceive of emotional climate as the predominance of certain emotions in a nation, we may relate aggregate reports of emotions to the objective dimensions of cultures of peace and explore the possibility that positive emotional climate constitutes an important aspect of a culture of peace. We suspect that the cultural values related to a positive emotional climate are the same that are related to low VI and peaceful attitudes. Hence, we will examine the association among culture of peace, positive emotional climate, and disagreement with prowar attitudes.

## The Study

### *Objectives and General Hypothesis*

The aim of this study is to correlate the objective bases of a culture of peace with its subjective components such as a society's values, attitudes, and emotional climate. These variables will be analyzed at the societal level, based on mean scores for countries.

We hypothesize that the structural dimensions of a culture of peace will correlate with individualist, egalitarian, and postmaterialist values. These structural and subjective dimensions of a culture of peace will also correlate with beliefs and attitudes such as interpersonal trust and tolerance towards minorities and with a positive emotional climate. We predict that structural dimensions like low LD and N, high IV and SUVM, will be associated with a favorable attitude towards war or "willingness to fight in a war."

## Method

### *Data and Indicators*

*Data.* For the analysis, a matrix using national data, with national means as unit of analysis (collective data), was created. Based on our previous work matrix (Basabe et al., 2002), several indices were included: Hofstede's (2001) data on the values of 74 nations and regions; Schwartz's (1994) value scores from 31 countries; sociocultural indexes included in Basabe and Ros (2005) and Basabe et al. (2002);

the third wave of data from the World Value Survey obtained from 81 societies or countries (collected from 1995 to 2000, with 118,520 subjects; Inglehart et al., 2004); objective indices from United Nations Reports (UN, 2002, 2003); and the factor scores of 74 nations on four different dimensions of their culture of peace dimensions (De Rivera, 2004b).

Pearson product moment coefficients on collective (national) scores between these variables and indicators were used. In general, the rich and developed countries are overestimated, and the samples necessarily omit some of the poorest and most war-torn nations (such as those of Africa, the continent most affected by conflict in the last 90 years) as a good deal of the data from them is incomplete.

#### *Variables*

*Objective social correlates of a culture of peace.*

*Liberal development (LD).* This score involves indicators for the extent of democracy, press freedom, human rights, adult literacy rate, life expectancy, Gross National Product per capita, and gender equality (UN, 2002). Luxembourg scores highest, whereas Bangladesh has the lowest score.

*Violent inequality (VI).* This is based on a Gini Index of income inequality from the 2002 Human Development Report (UN, 2002), homicide rates, and Human Rights Violations—the average of the political terror scale ratings based on Amnesty International Reports from 1992–2002. Colombia scores highest, whereas Japan has the lowest score.

*State use of violent means (SVM).* This is based on military expenditure as a percentage of GDP (UN, 2002) and the use of military acts as the primary technique for coping with foreign policy crises from 1945 to 2001, according to the Center for International Development and Conflict Management. This measure correlates highly with the percent of the population who are imprisoned. Israel and the United States have the highest scores, with Bangladesh scoring lowest.

*Nurturance (N).* This is based on the percentage of GNP devoted to education, the acceptance of refugees (refugees admitted minus refugees and internally displaced people generated, as a fraction of total population), and, to some extent, by the percentage of women in parliament (UN, 2002). Northern Europe in general and Sweden in particular score high, whereas the lowest score is for Pakistan

#### *Subjective Cultural Values: Cultural Value Data Sets*

*Hofstede's values.* National scores on: Individualism–Collectivism (IDV/COL); Power Distance (PDI); Masculinity–Femininity (MAS/FEM); and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) (Hofstede, 2001).

*Schwartz's values.* The nation's scores from Affective and Intellectual Autonomy, Hierarchy, Conservation, Harmony, Mastery, and Egalitarian Commitment (Schwartz, 1994).

*Inglehart's dimensions.* Materialist versus Postmaterialist dimension (percentage of people with postmaterialist values; Inglehart et al., 2004) and the Traditional versus Secular-Rational Authority Dimension (Inglehart, 1991).

#### *Subjective Dimensions, Beliefs, and Attitudes*

Indicators were taken from WVS (1995–2000) survey questions (Inglehart et al., 2004). The included questions were:

*Sense of control* and freedom in one's life, as a subjective index of democracy: "Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while others feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them." Options ranged from 1, "none at all," to 10, "a great deal" (national means were used).

*Sense of interpersonal trust*, as an index of perceived solidarity: "Would you say that most people can be trusted? (1), or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people? (2)", (national means were used).

*Attitude toward Homosexuality*, as an index of tolerance toward minorities, ranging from 1, "never justifiable," to 10, "always justifiable" (national means were used).

*"Disposition to participate in a war,"* meaning the percentage who said yes to the question "[Would you be] willing to fight in a war for your country?" was used as an index of *peaceful attitudes* related to *International peace and security*.

#### *Emotional Climate*

*Emotional climate.* This was estimated from the national means on Bradburn's positive and negative affect scale. Affect balance is positive emotions minus negative emotions collected in the Second World Value Survey 1990–1992 fieldwork (Basabe et al., 2002; Macintosh, 1998). The 26 nations studied here are those countries from the Macintosh study that are also included in De Rivera's data set.

#### *Criterion and Historical Experience Variables*

*Transparency International* (1998). This is an index of corruption perception that ranges from low transparency (14) for Cameroon to high transparency (98) for Denmark.

*Human Rights violations* (Basabe et al., 2002). This score is related to the extent to which a nation possesses 40 different human rights (HR) (a low score represents more rights).

*Internal political violence* (IPV). This is the number of political riots and armed attacks by and against the government between 1948 and 1977 (Van de Vliert, 1998).

*Country's alignment in World War II*. This signifies allies or victorious nations (2), Neutral countries (1), and Axis Powers or defeated nations (0) (Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, 2006).

### Results

Correlations between the objective dimensions of a culture of peace and subjective measures are shown in Table 1.

#### *Liberal Development (LD) and Subjective Culture Correlates*

LD shows strong positive correlations with individualist values, such as Hofstede's Individualism score, Inglehart's Postmaterialism scores (associated with expressive individualism), and Schwartz's Autonomy scores, and corresponding negative associations with Collectivism indices, such as Conservationism.

LD also reveals strong associations with egalitarian values, correlating positively with Egalitarian Commitment and negatively with Hofstede's valuing of Power Distance and Schwartz's valuing of Hierarchy.

LD also correlates with positive attitudes and beliefs related to a culture of peace. It is associated with a sense of interpersonal trust, perceived control and personal freedom in life, and social tolerance (toward homosexuals). It also correlates with a lower percentage of the population willing to fight for country in a new war. LD correlates with an emotional climate of lower negative affect (for other well-being and happiness indices, see Diener et al. in this issue). Further, it is strongly associated with criterion variables, with high scores significantly associated with less corruption, fewer violations of Human Rights, and less internal political violence. **Q1**

Note, however, that LD is *not* significantly related to Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Harmony, and positive affect.

#### *Violent Inequality (VI) Dimension and Subjective Culture Correlates*

VI scores are negatively related with Schwartz's Intellectual Autonomy and Harmony values. As might be expected, VI is related to mistrust in others. However,

## Culture of Peace, Social Correlates and Values

413

**Table 1.** Correlations between Values, Attitudes, and the Four Dimensions of a Culture of Peacefulness, Indexes Across Nations

	Attitudes and Four Dimensions of Peacefulness				
	War <sup>(1)</sup>	LD <sup>(2)</sup>	VI <sup>(2)</sup>	SUVM <sup>(2)</sup>	N <sup>(2)</sup>
Hofstede's values:					
Individualism <sup>(3)</sup>	-.40** (42)	.57** (64)	-.21 (64)	.22 (64)	.33** (64)
Power distance <sup>(3)</sup>	.37* (42)	-.62** (64)	.08 (64)	-.13 (64)	-.30* (64)
Uncertainty avoidance <sup>(3)</sup>	-.38* (42)	.03 (64)	.00 (64)	-.04 (64)	-.31* (64)
Masculinity <sup>(3)</sup>	-.37* (42)	-.11 (64)	-.00 (64)	-.00 (64)	-.26* (64)
Schwartz's values:					
Affective autonomy <sup>(4)</sup>	-.40 (18)	.37* (27)	-.15 (27)	.09 (27)	.29 (27)
Intellectual autonomy <sup>(4)</sup>	-.33 (18)	.50** (27)	-.38* (27)	-.14 (27)	.06 (27)
Hierarchy <sup>(4)</sup>	.18 (18)	-.69** (27)	.24 (27)	.21 (27)	-.20 (27)
Conservation <sup>(4)</sup>	.50* (18)	-.51** (27)	.29 (27)	.23 (27)	-.07 (27)
Harmony <sup>(4)</sup>	-.15 (18)	.28 (27)	-.41* (27)	-.59** (27)	-.24 (27)
Mastery <sup>(4)</sup>	-.27 (18)	-.36* (27)	.29 (27)	.17 (27)	-.07 (27)
Egalitarian commitment <sup>(4)</sup>	-.37 (18)	.62** (27)	-.23 (27)	-.04 (27)	.12 (27)
Inglehart's values:					
% Postmaterialist values <sup>(1)</sup>	-.42** (54)	.60** (57)	-.05 (57)	-.16 (57)	.13 (57)
Traditional versus secular-rational authority <sup>(1)</sup>	.39 (21)	-.10 (28)	-.13 (28)	-.08 (28)	.08 (28)
Beliefs and attitudes (World Value Survey's indexes):					
Most people should be trusted = 1, or Need to be very careful = 2 (means) <sup>(1)</sup>	.02 (55)	-.36** (59)	.35** (59)	.00 (59)	-.17 (59)
High control and free choice <sup>(1)</sup>	-.08 (54)	.46** (58)	.29* (58)	-.15 (58)	.15 (58)
Homosexuality (High mean = more justifiable) <sup>(1)</sup>	.16 (14)	.54** (22)	.07 (22)	.00 (22)	.54** (22)
WAR: "Are you willing to fight in war for your country?" (yes %) <sup>(1)</sup>	-	-.43** (41)	-.01 (43)	.10 (41)	.10 (41)
Emotional Climate:					
Emotional climate <sup>(5)</sup>	.01 (19)	.42* (27)	.01 (27)	.11 (27)	.62** (27)
Positive affect <sup>(5)</sup>	.15 (23)	.12 (27)	.20 (27)	.12 (27)	.52** (27)
Negative affect <sup>(5)</sup>	.08 (23)	-.44* (27)	.25 (27)	.10 (27)	-.18 (27)
Criterion and historical experience variables:					
Transparency International <sup>(6)</sup>	-.15 (32)	.74** (52)	-.33* (52)	.09 (52)	.52** (52)
Human Rights violations <sup>(7)</sup>	.38* (29)	-.80** (42)	.31* (42)	.07 (42)	-.21 (42)
IPV=Internal political violence <sup>(8)</sup>	.01 (39)	-.40** (61)	.20 (61)	.25* (61)	-.18 (61)
WWII- Alignment (2 Allies 0 Axis Powers) <sup>(9)</sup>	.33* (54)	.02 (73)	.13 (73)	.21 (73)	-.10 (73)

Note. Pearson product-moment coefficients across nations. \*\* $p \leq .01$ , \* $p \leq .05$ , (two-tailed).  $n$  = number of countries included in the analysis.

Values indexes (Hofstede, Schwartz). A high number on each variable denotes a high score on the variable in question.

LD = Liberal Development; VI = Violent Inequality; EVM = External Violent Means, N = Nurture.

Traditional versus secular-rational authority (high number = more traditional). Emotional climate = Bradburn Affect Balance (positive minus negative). IPV = internal political violence (number of political riots and armed attacks by and against the government between 1948 and 1977).

Source Data: <sup>(1)</sup>Inglehart et al., 2004; <sup>(2)</sup>De Rivera, 2004b; <sup>(3)</sup>Hofstede, 2001; <sup>(4)</sup>Schwartz, 1994; <sup>(5)</sup>Macintosh, 1998; <sup>(6)</sup>Transparency International, 1998; <sup>(7)</sup>Diener et al., 1995; <sup>(8)</sup>Van der Vliert, 1998; <sup>(9)</sup>The Free Encyclopedia, 2006.

it is also somewhat related to a higher perception of freedom and control. It was unrelated to peaceful attitudes and our estimates of emotional climate.

Interestingly, for our purposes, VI also correlates to some degree with Human Rights violations and political corruption and shows a nonsignificant trend toward correlating with internal political violence. One of the components of the dimension, income inequality (as measured by a Gini index), is significantly associated with the UNDP's total crime rate (percentage of people victimized from total population, UN, 2003, 2005) ( $r(49) = .33, p \leq .05$ ), and with van de Vliert's index of internal political violence ( $r(69) = .35, p \leq .01$ ). It may be important to observe the absence of significant correlations with our current measures of egalitarian value.

#### *State Use of Violent Means (SUVM) Dimension and Subjective Culture Correlates*

SUVM was strongly associated with low Schwartz Harmony values. Although the dimension was also associated with internal political violence, it was unrelated to beliefs and attitudes, emotional climate, and willingness to fight in a war. Data taken from Fernández's study (in Páez, Fernández, Ubillos, & Zubieta, 2003) suggests that the dimension may also be related to low expressive self-concept (as measured by the BEM Scale),  $r(20) = -.58, p \leq .001$ .

#### *Nurturance (N) Dimension and Subjective Culture Correlates*

The Nurturance dimension was positively associated with Hofstede's Individualism, low Power Distance, low Uncertainty Avoidance and Cultural Femininity (Table 1). N was related to high social tolerance (attitude toward homosexuality) and high political transparency perception. However, it was unrelated to willingness to fight in war. N was associated congruently with a positive emotional climate balance and particularly with Positive Affect.

#### *Cultural Values, Beliefs, Emotional Climate, and Attitudes Toward Participating in War*

As might be expected, the percentage of the population stating that they were willing to fight in a war for their country was positively related to Power Distance, higher Schwartz Conservation values, and negatively related to Individualism (Hofstede), and Postmaterialism. However, contrary to expectations, it was negatively related to Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance.

Favorable attitudes toward participating in war were unrelated to beliefs like trust in others, control of life and emotional climate (but see Diener and Tov in this issue for a multilevel analysis of national happiness and attitudes toward war). Q2

Finally, prowar attitudes were associated with more Human Rights violations and with a victorious outcome in WWII.

### Discussion

It seems clear that the structural bases for a culture of peace are related to important cultural values and attitudes. National scores on each of the four dimensions of a culture of peace, measured with objective indicators, were strongly related to different sets of coherent cultural values measured with questionnaires.

LD was positively associated with individualistic, egalitarian values—the valuing of personal autonomy and nonhierarchical relationships that are characteristic in postmaterialist societies with secular authority structures. It was also associated with a sense of interpersonal trust, perceived control and personal freedom, social tolerance, less willingness to fight for one's nation, and lower negative emotional climate scores. These findings on a national level are congruent with findings on an individual level within Western European countries (Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmenn, 2005).

The fact that low LD societies are collectivist cultures is also in agreement with Ross's (1995) holistic study on the culture of war and peace using ethnographic descriptions of 90 preindustrial societies, in which subjects living in violent cultures were found to belong to a few stable groups. In individualist cultures, subjects had more voluntary social relations, with extensive networks of persons and groups (Hofstede, 2001). As in Ross's study (1995, pp. 140, 169), societies with high levels of VI were associated with collectivist cultures and societies with lower LD were more collectivist, characterized by membership in a few groups and with strong national in-group identification. Societies with complex group membership showed higher levels of trust. Ross's results as well as our own, also found that hierarchical cultures with authoritarian socialization were related to more willingness to fight in a war.

The association between individualist values and a culture of peace seems to be at odds with the historical experience of Anglo-Saxon individualist societies, like the USA and UK. However, these societies emphasize Affective Autonomy and Mastery at the expense of Harmony, and Intellectual Autonomy is relatively unimportant. US Individualism is not a prototypical Individualism, but rather a relative hierarchical and masculine individualism, justifying egotistic self-advancement and the control of the environment—including the use of external violence in international wars. Continental Western Europe Individualism emphasizes Intellectual and Affective Autonomy and de-emphasizes Mastery and Hierarchy, emphasizing Harmony. This individualist culture unifies self-independence and autonomy with concern for the others and does not strive to change the world through assertive actions, like external violence—at least after the Second World War experience (Ros & Schwartz, 1995).

The dimension of VI was associated with lower values for Harmony and Intellectual Autonomy, low interpersonal trust, more political corruption and more Human Rights violations, but also with a greater perceived control and personal freedom in life. However, VI it is not characterized by any unique configuration of values or beliefs. Evidently neither collectivism nor egalitarianism as currently measured relates to this important dimension of a culture of peace. One wonders if we need a somewhat different set of questions that could tap the extent to which people value economic equality and are willing to make sacrifices for its attainment. Although we did not find a significant relationship with internal political violence, an important component of the dimension (a Gini index of income inequality) was associated with UNDP's total crime rate (percentage of people victimized from total population, 1991–1999) (UN, 2003, 2005), and with internal political violence (Van de Vliert, 1998). This suggests that total crime rate, rather than homicide rate, may be a better component of the index for VI. This dimension of VI is not related to willingness to fight for one's country. A similar result was found by Ross: Factors related to external violence were different than factors related to VI, even if both forms of violence were related.

SUVM was strongly associated with low Harmony values, an interesting and unanticipated result. Schwartz's measure for Harmony is derived from questions that ask people how much they value a unity with nature, protecting the environment, a world of natural and artistic beauty, and a world at peace. These values are contrasted with those that promote actively changing the world through self-assertion and the exploitation of people and resources (Schwartz, 1994). It is striking that a people's scores on such a measure strongly predict the extent to which their state uses violence. Boulding (2000b) suggests that cultures of peace involve a harmonious relationship with nature, and perhaps this aspect should be more appreciated.

Although SUVM was significantly related to internal political violence, it was not significantly associated with a willingness to fight for one's country or with any other of the currently measured attitudes and values. The lack of relationship with Cultural Masculinity does not support the Hofstede (2001) hypothesis that the resolution of conflicts will be more peaceful in feminine societies.

Nurturance was the dimension of a culture of peace that was most strongly associated with a positive emotional climate. It was also associated with horizontal Individualism, low values for Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity, low Power Distance, and tolerant attitudes (like tolerance for Homosexuality). The results are convergent with the idea that societies with feminine cooperative cultures are welfare societies that accentuate interpersonal relationships and sympathy and concern for the weak (Hofstede, 2001).

The numbers of a people indicating a willingness to fight in war was positively related to the degree to which people have conservative values, and a society that values Hierarchy and negatively related to cultural Masculinity and Uncertainty

Avoidance. However, it was also influenced by a victorious alignment in WWII. It is important to note that although individual willingness to fight in a war is related to the LD dimension of a culture of peace it is *not* significantly related to SUVM. Evidently the use of violence by modern nation states is not dependent on this particular attitude and this is the *only* attitude concerning peace in the entire world values survey. There are no items inquiring about either domestic or international violence, a flaw that should be remedied in future versions of the survey.

It is noteworthy that the values measured by Hofstede are particularly related to the objective culture of peace dimensions of LD and N. Social correlates of LD support the hypothesis that social development and modernization facilitate a culture of peace and human security, based on individualist, egalitarian and postmodern values, according to the Inglehart et al. (2004) and Hofstede (2001) hypotheses.

By contrast, the Harmony values measured by Schwartz are related negatively to both VI and SUVM. These results may reveal similar patterns in preindustrial and contemporary complex societies in that they seem congruent with Ross's (1995) study showing that the overall degree of violence (both internal and external violence) is better explained by socialization factors than by the structural factors that determine whether violence occurs within the society or is directed outwards.

### Conclusion

Although it is difficult to disentangle cause and effect, we can conclude that the objectively measured sociostructural dimensions of a culture of peace are coherently associated with cultural values, subjective well-being, and trust, thus confirming that structural and collective subjective measures of a culture of peace show convergent validity.

The fact that different sets of values are related to different structural dimensions confirms the complexity of culture of peace. The individualistic and egalitarian values associated with the benefits of LD and N (and with our estimates of emotional climate) are not related to reduced levels of VI or SUVM. Rather, these important aspects of a culture of peace are related to the extent to which the people of a nation value Harmony. Thus, if we wish to foster a complete culture of peace we cannot only encourage autonomy and the valuing of nonhierarchical power structures. We must also encourage harmony and a concern for economic equality and the human security of all nations, and we must devise measures of emotional climate that reflect these concerns.

### References

- Allik, J., & Realo, A. (2004). Individualism-Collectivism and social capital. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(1), 29-49.

- Basabe, N., Páez, D., Valencia, J., González, J. L., Rimé, B., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural dimensions, socio-economic development, climate and emotional hedonic level. *Cognition and Emotion, 16*, 103–126.
- Basabe, N., & Ros, M. (2005). Cultural dimensions and social behavior correlates: Individualism-collectivism and power distance. *International Review of Social Psychology, 18*(1/2), 189–224.
- Boulding, E. (2000a). A new chance for human peaceableness? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 6*, 193–215.
- Boulding, E. (2000b). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of human history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Cohrs, J. Ch., Moschner, B., Maes, J., & Kielmann, S. (2005). Personal values and attitudes toward war. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 11*, 293–312.
- De Rivera, J. (2004a). Introduction: Assessing cultures of peace. *Journal of Peace and Conflict. Peace and Conflict, 10*, 95–100.
- De Rivera, J. (2004b). Assessing the basis for a culture of peace in contemporary societies. *Journal of Peace Research, 41*, 531–548.
- Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 851–864.
- Fernández, I., Páez, D., & González, J. L. (2005). Independent and interdependent self-construals and socio-cultural factors in 29 nations. *International Review of Social Psychology, 18*(1/2), 35–64.
- Galtung, J. (1985). *Sobre la paz*. Barcelona: Fontamara.
- Gouveia, V. V., & Ros, M. (2000). Hofstede's and Schwartz models for classifying individualism at the cultural level: Their relation to macro-social and macro-economic variables. *Psicothema, 12*, 25–33.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Inglehart, R. (1991). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R., Basañez, M., Díez-Medrano, J., Halman, L., & Luijkx, R. (2004). *Human beliefs and values*. Mexico: S.XXI.
- Kimmel, P. R. (1985). Learning about peace: Choices and the U.S. Institute of Peace as seen from two different perspectives. *American Psychologist, 40*, 538–541.
- Macintosh, R. (1998). A confirmatory factor analysis of the affect balance scale in 38 nations: A research note. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*, 83–91.
- Páez, D., Fernández, I., Ubillos, S., & Zubietta, E. (2003). *Psicología social, Cultura y Educación*. Madrid: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Ros, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (1995). Jerarquía de valores en países de la Europa Occidental: una comparación transcultural. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 69*, 9–33.
- Ros, M. H. (1995). *La cultura del conflicto*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon, (Eds.). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 85–119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Transparency International. (1998). *Corruption Perception Index* [On-line]. Available on Internet: <http://www.icgg.org/downloads/FD1998.pdf>
- UNESCO. (1995). *UNESCO and a culture of peace : Promoting a global movement*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations. (2002). Human Development report. Retrieved from the United Nation Statistics Division Web site at <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2002/>.
- United Nations. (2003). Human Development report. Retrieved from the United Nation Statistics Division Web site at <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2003/>.
- United Nations. (2005). Human Development report. Retrieved from the United Nation Statistics Division Web site at <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/>.
- Van De Vliert, E. (1998). Gender role gaps, competitiveness and masculinity. In G. Hofstede (Ed.), *Masculinity and femininity* (pp. 117–129). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wagner, R. V. (1988). Distinguishing between positive and negative approaches to peace. *Journal of Social Issues, 44*, 1–5.
- White, R. K. (1988). Specifics in a positive approach to peace. *Journal of Social Issues, 44*, 191–202.

**Culture of Peace, Social Correlates and Values**

**419**

Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. (2006). The casualties by country of World War II. Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WorldWarIIcasualties#Casualtiesbycountry>.

NEKANE BASABE, PhD, is Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Basque Country in Spain. She has published studies on health psychology, migration, acculturation and health, and culture and emotions.

JOSE F. VALENCIA is Professor of Social Psychology and head of the Department of Social Psychology at the University of Basque Country in Spain. His main research interests involve attitudes, intergroup relations and intergroup conflict, and language use in social representations.

### Queries

- Q1** Author: Please note that “Diener et al., in this issue” is not given in the reference list. Kindly provide details of the same.
- Q2** Author: Please note that “Diener and Tov, in this issue” is not given in the reference list. Kindly provide details of the same.