Empirical Research Paper

The Resistance to Change-Beliefs Scale: Validation of a New Measure of Conservative Ideology

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
1–16

DOI: 10.1177/0146167219841624
journals.sagepub.com/home/pspb
SAGE

Katherine R. G. White[1], Dakota Kinney[1], Rose H. Danek[2], Brandt Smith[3], and Charles Harben[1]

Abstract

The motivated social cognition (MSC) model of conservative ideology posits there are two core facets of conservative political ideology—endorsement of hierarchies and resistance to change. The present research tested the validity and reliability of a scale developed to measure resistance to change. Five studies support the validity, reliability, and factor structure of the Resistance to Change-Beliefs (RC-B) scale. Scores on the RC-B scale correlated with social and cognitive motivations as well as self-identified conservatism. RC-B also predicted more conservative stances on political issues and factor analyses supported the predicted internal structure of the RC-B scale. This provides the field with a validated instrument that avoids problems inherent in previous measures, can be used to test predictions from the MSC model, and has potential applications beyond political psychology.

Keywords

resistance to change, conservatism, motivated social cognition, political ideology

Received August 9, 2018; revision accepted February 6, 2019

Ideologies have three primary goals—(a) help us understand the world, (b) help us envision how the world should be, and (c) provide guidance regarding how best to achieve those ideals (Jost, Federico, & Napier, 2009). One of the most impactful ideologies in modern society is political ideology. Political ideology includes attitudes, values, and beliefs regarding the best way to order society and means for achieving this order (Erikson & Tedin, 2003). Due to its broad impact, political ideology is an important research topic in psychology.

According to Jost and colleagues (2009), political ideology can be conceptualized as "a system of interrelated beliefs" (p. 342) that possesses both a discursive superstructure and a functional substructure. The discursive superstructure contains the values, beliefs, and attitudes that define the ideology and its stances. It is built by and communicated in a top-down fashion from political elites to the general public. In contrast, the functional substructure contains various motivations (e.g., need for closure) held by individuals. It operates in a bottom-up fashion in that people gravitate toward the ideological system (superstructure) that best satisfies the individuals' dominant motivations (substructure). Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, and Sulloway (2003) refer to this as the *motivated social-cognition (MSC) model* of political ideology because social and cognitive motives (in the substructure) guide individuals to embrace the political ideology (superstructure) that best satisfies those motivations.

Jost and colleagues (2003) argue that conservative ideology contains a core of beliefs concerning the desirability of change versus stability and the acceptability of inequality, referred to as "resistance to change" and "endorsement of inequality," respectively. Resistance to change captures beliefs that societal stability is desirable and that radical change should be avoided. Endorsement of inequality captures the belief that hierarchies in society are inevitable and natural. These clusters of beliefs represent two critical factors in the study of conservative ideology. Accurate measurement of these factors is therefore of great importance. Jost and colleagues (2003) argue that endorsement of inequality is captured by measures of social dominance orientation (SDO), and SDO measures have been used successfully in

[1]Kennesaw State University, GA, USA
[2]Lyon College, Batesville, AR, USA
[3]Columbus State University, GA, USA

Corresponding Author:
Katherine R. G. White, Department of Psychology, Kennesaw State University, 1000 Chastain Road, Kennesaw, GA 30144, USA.
Email: kwhit162@kennesaw.edu

this capacity in past research (e.g., Brandt & Reyna, 2017). The focus of the present research was therefore to develop and validate a measure of the other core component of conservative ideology—resistance to change.

Several scales have been used to measure resistance to change in past research. Jost and colleagues (2003) identified Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scales (e.g., Altemeyer, 1988) and the Conservatism Scale (C-Scale; Wilson & Patterson, 1968) as measures that most closely capture resistance to change. However, they also acknowledged several problems with these measures. The C-Scale is contaminated with political content and RWA scales measure a combination of both resistance to change and endorsement of inequality (Jost et al., 2003). More recent versions of the RWA scale (e.g., Funke, 2005) distinguish between three dimensions of RWA (aggression, submission, conventionalism), with corresponding subscales for these dimensions. The conventionalism dimension most closely approximates resistance to change, but two items used to measure this dimension contain references to a specific religion or social issue. This leaves only two items without contamination, which is typically insufficient for accurate measurement. These scales are therefore not optimal for measuring resistance to change.

An alternative to these scales is the Resistance to Change (RTC) scale developed by Oreg (2003). Oreg's RTC scale measures an individual's dispositional tendency to resist change and is both valid and reliable across cultural contexts (Oreg, 2003; Oreg et al., 2008). However, the scale measures individual predispositions rather than personal beliefs about change; acknowledging that you do not change your mind very often is different from believing that change is bad and undesirable. This is an important distinction to make given that political ideology is an interrelated system of *beliefs*. While it is reasonable to assume that individuals who are predisposed to resist change are also more likely to believe that stability is better than change, the correlation is unlikely to be perfect. Individuals may dislike change but still believe that change can be good and necessary. Within the context of the *MSC model* of political ideology, Jost and colleagues (2003) note that predispositions play an important role in the ideology individuals gravitate toward (e.g., an individual who is predisposed to experience greater levels of anxiety when faced with uncertainty is more likely to gravitate toward conservative ideology). However, this initial predisposition is not the same as the political beliefs the individual comes to embrace (e.g., that societal stability is preferable over change). Thus, while Oreg's RTC scale represents a valuable tool for the study of individual differences in resistance to change, we do not believe it optimally captures the resistance to change facet of conservative *ideology*.

The purpose of the present research was to develop and validate a survey scale that measures the resistance to change facet of conservative ideology, as conceptualized in Jost and colleagues' (2003) *MSC model* of political ideology. Underscoring the need for this type of measure, three other scales were developed and validated at the same time as the present research. Brandt and Reyna (2017) developed and used a 10-item measure of "resistance to social change" to examine perceptions of system legitimacy. In addition, Sarıbay, Olcaysoy-Ökten, and Yılmaz (2017) developed a scale to measure both resistance to change and endorsement of inequality in Turkish participants, and Yilmaz and Saribay (2018a) developed a briefer scale to measure these constructs in English-speaking participants. The merits of these scales, and comparisons to the current scale, are more fully discussed in the General Discussion.

Study 1

In describing the resistance to change facet of conservative ideology, Jost and colleagues (2003) highlight several definitions of conservative ideology, including, "a tendency to preserve what is established," "a disposition in politics to maintain the existing order," "an attitude of opposition to disruptive change," and "a fear of change, which becomes transformed in the political arena into the fear of radicalism" (p. 342). The first two descriptions communicate a preference for that which is already in place (i.e., tradition). The last two descriptions reinforce this preference, but with an added nuance. "Opposition to *disruptive* change" and "fear of *radicalism*" highlight that conservative ideology is particularly opposed to radical, disruptive change. In other words, conservative ideology does not label all types of change inherently bad. Instead, if change must occur, it is best if the change is slow and organic rather than quick and dramatic.

Based on these descriptions, we identified two primary subfactors of resistance to change—preference for tradition and preference for gradual change. Scale items were then generated and selected by the authors to match these subfactors. To test the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale, we examined its relationships with various traits and motivations identified as related to conservative ideology.

Two types of motivations may predispose an individual toward conservatism—motivations to reduce uncertainty and threat (Jost et al., 2003). The motivation to reduce uncertainty is more directly related to resistance to change than motivations to reduce threat (Jost et al., 2007), so we included measures of uncertainty-related motives to test for convergent validity. We expected higher scores on resistance to change to correlate negatively with the Big Five personality trait of openness to experience and positively with dogmatism and the order, predictability, ambiguity intolerance, and closed-mindedness subscales of need for closure. Although belief in a dangerous world is labeled a threat motive, we included it in the present study because prior research shows it correlated with RWA, which Jost and colleagues (2003) identify as one of the closest existing measures to resistance to change. To this point, we also measured RWA and expected the correlation between RWA and resistance to change to be the

strongest correlation. To establish discriminant validity, we predicted that resistance to change would *not* correlate with the decisiveness subscale of need for closure.

Study 1 also tested the criterion validity, concurrent validity, and factor structure of the resistance to change scale. We expected resistance to change to correlate with more conservative social and economic political self-identification, thus establishing criterion validity. We also expected scores on resistance to change to predict more conservative stances on political issues, establishing concurrent validity. Finally, we expected items on the resistance to change scale to load onto two correlated factors—preference for tradition and preference for gradual change.

Method

A sample of 250 participants was sought. We identified the weakest applicable correlation from Jost and colleagues (2003) as $r = .27$. Using G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009), we estimated that a sample size of 136 would be needed to detect a correlation of this magnitude with a power of .90 (alpha set to .05, two-tailed test). However, Guilford (1954) recommends a sample size no smaller than 200 for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Out of an abundance of caution, a final sample size of 250 was set. A similar procedure was used to identify the target sample size for all other reported studies.

Participants. A total of 247 undergraduate students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology courses at a large, southeastern university in the United States participated in exchange for partial course credit. In accordance to criteria set in a preregistration of the study,[1] participant data were removed from the sample if the participant completed the survey more than once (the first completion was retained, $n = 3$), failed the attention checks ($n = 5$),[2] completed the survey in under 10 min ($n = 8$), had an NFC Lie Score that was 3 standard deviations or more above the sample mean ($n = 1$), or more than 40% of their data were missing ($n = 11$). This left a final sample of 219 participants ($M_{age} = 20.28$, $SD = 4.48$). The sample was predominantly female (68%, $n = 149$), European American/White (57.5%, $n = 126$), and non-Hispanic/Latino (86.8%, $n = 190$).[3] The self-reported political orientation of the sample was slightly socially liberal ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.61$) and slightly economically conservative ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.52$).

Materials

Resistance to Change-Beliefs (RC-B) scale. The RC-B scale consisted of 11 items designed to capture two subfacets of the conservative tendency to resist change—preference for tradition (e.g., "Approaches used by people in the past are generally the most effective") and preference for gradual change (e.g., "If society is going to change, it should occur slowly and naturally"). Level of agreement with each item was indicated on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 *(strongly agree*).

To create the scale, three of the authors independently created items to assess both subfacets of the resistance to change construct. The authors met on several occasions to discuss and revise the items generated in the independent sessions. Items deemed to possess the best face validity were selected for inclusion in the scale.

Dogmatism (DOG). The 20-item DOG (Altemeyer, 2002) scale measures the extent to which individuals consider their beliefs to be indisputably true. The scale demonstrated strong internal reliability in the current sample (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$).

Need for Closure (NFC). The 47-item NFC scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994) measures five facets of need for closure (need for order, need for predictability, decisiveness, tolerance of ambiguity, and closed-mindedness). Some items (e.g., "I have never hurt another person's feelings") are used to calculate a "lie" score, which reflects social desirability. Internal reliability estimates for the order ($\alpha = .68$), predictability ($\alpha = .70$), decisiveness ($\alpha = .79$), and ambiguity ($\alpha = .71$) subscales were all in the acceptable range for the current sample, but the internal reliability of the closed-mindedness subscale was low ($\alpha = .60$).

Big Five Inventory (BFI). The 44-item BFI measures the personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (John & Srivastava, 1999). The personality trait of interest for this research was openness to experience, and this subscale demonstrated acceptable internal reliability in the current sample ($\alpha = .70$).

RWA. The 20-item RWA scale measures submission to authorities, preference for conventions, and punitive attitudes toward those who break conventions (Altemeyer, 1988). The RWA scale demonstrated strong internal reliability in the current sample ($\alpha = .94$).

Belief in a Dangerous World (BDW). The 10-item BDW scale captures the extent to which an individual thinks society is safe versus unsafe (Duckitt, 2001). The internal reliability for this scale was strong in the current sample ($\alpha = .82$).

Political stances. Participants responded to 11 political topics—abortion, the death penalty, firearm regulation, fossil fuels, gay marriage, market regulation, the minimum wage, affirmative action, charter schools, health care, and immigration. Support or opposition to each political issue was indicated on a scale from 1 (*strongly against*) to 6 (*strongly support*).

Table 1. RC-B Scale Exploratory Factor Analysis With Direct Oblimin Rotation Item Loadings From Study 1.

	Factor		
RC-B scale item	(1) Preference for tradition	(2) Reverse-worded items	(3) Preference for gradual change
1	.63		
3	.72		
6	.72		
9	.53		
5		−.86	
10		−.32	
2			.47
4			.67
7			.78
8			.51
11	.30		.36

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs.

Table 2. Zero-Order Spearman's Correlation Coefficients (r_s) for Correlation Between RC-B Scores and Other Individual Factors in Study 1.

	r_s	*p*
RWA	.47	<.001
BDW	.21	.002
DOG	.31	<.001
$NFC_{predict}$	.28	<.001
NFC_{order}	.29	<.001
$NFC_{decisive}$	.04	.562
$NFC_{ambiguity}$	.13	.062
NFC_{closed}	.28	<.001
Openness	−.15	.025
Social conservatism	.30	<.001
Economic conservatism	.26	<.001

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; BDW = Belief in a Dangerous World; DOG = Dogmatism; NFC = Need for Closure.

Demographics and political orientation. Participants reported their gender identity, age, whether they identify as Hispanic/Latino, and their self-identified racial group(s). They also indicated the extent to which they identify as liberal or conservative for both social issues and economic issues using a scale ranging from 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*).

Procedure. All study materials were delivered online via Qualtrics. Participants first completed the RC-B scale and then completed the DOG, NFC, BFI, RWA, and BDW scales in a randomized order. The presentation order of items within all scales was also randomized for each participant. Next, participants indicated their stances on various political issues. Finally, participants provided demographic information, including political orientation.

Results and Discussion

Internal reliability and factor structure. The RC-B scale demonstrated good internal reliability as a whole ($\alpha = .76$, $\omega = .76$). The two subscales ($\alpha_{tradition} = .61$, $\alpha_{change} = .62$) were less internally reliable. The factor structure of the RC-B scale was next tested using an EFA). The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy showed the data were sufficient for further analysis, KMO = .80, and Bartlett's test of sphericity showed that items were significantly correlated, $\chi^2s(55) = 533.12$, $p < .0001$. We used the maximum likelihood extraction method with a direct oblimin (oblique) rotation. Examination of eigenvalues (≥ 1.0) and the scree plot (Gorsuch, 1983) suggested the presence of three meaningful factors. Four items loaded onto Factor 1, which accounted for 30.76% of the observed variance and corresponds most closely with the hypothesized "preference for tradition" factor (see Table 1). Four items loaded onto Factor 3, which accounted for 11.89% of the observed variance and corresponds most closely with the hypothesized "preference for gradual change" factor. Item 11 loaded fairly equally onto Factors 1 and 3. Finally, both of the reverse-worded items loaded together on Factor 2, which accounted for 14.55% of the observed variance. Thus, the hypothesized two-factor structure of the RC-B scale was largely supported. Factors 1 and 3 shared a correlation of .32, which is just strong enough to warrant use of an oblique rotation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), but not as strong as anticipated.

Scale validity. There was evidence of significant normality violations in a number of variables (NFC-ambiguity, NFC-closed-mindedness, RWA, political stances), including RC-B scores (negative skew). Since all correlations of interest involved RC-B, we calculated Spearman's correlation coefficients (r_s) in place of Pearson's. All correlations therefore reflect the strength of a monotonic relationship between variables, as opposed to purely linear relationships.

Convergent and discriminant validity. We calculated zero-order correlations between scores on the RC-B scale and RWA, BDW, DOG, NFC, and Openness (see Table 2). Scores on the RC-B scale correlated significantly and positively with scores on RWA, BDW, DOG, and all the NFC dimensions except decisiveness and ambiguity (ambiguity was marginally significant). Scores on the RC-B scale also correlated significantly and negatively with scores on Openness. The strongest correlation was between RC-B scores and RWA, which aligns with results from Jost and colleagues (2003).

Criterion validity. We calculated correlations between scores on the RC-B scale and participants' self-identified political orientation (see Table 2). Supporting criterion validity, higher RC-B scores correlated significantly with greater social and economic conservatism.

Concurrent validity. We used a simple linear regression to examine whether RC-B scores predicted more conservative positions on political issues (e.g., immigration). RC-B scores accounted for a significant amount of the observed variability in participants' political stances, $R^2 = .10$, $F(1, 215) = 22.61$, $p < .001$, and was a significant predictor of more conservative stances ($\beta = .34$, $t = 4.76$, $p < .001$).

Given the stronger correlation between RC-B scores and self-reported social conservatism versus economic conservatism, we conducted two exploratory simple regression analyses—one for stances on social political issues and one for economic political issues.[4] While higher RC-B scores significantly predicted more conservative stances on both social ($R^2 = .10$, $\beta = .31$, $p < .001$) and economic ($R^2 = .05$, $\beta = .22$, $p = .001$) issues, RC-B scores appeared to be a stronger predictor for stances on social issues. However, a slope comparison did not reveal a significant difference, $t(431) = .90$, $p = .37$.

Results from Study 1 provide initial evidence for the validity of the RC-B scale. Scores on the RC-B correlated with variables connected to conservative ideology (e.g., DOG, NFC). Scores on the RC-B also correlated most strongly with RWA and did not correlate with the decisiveness subscale of NFC. This suggests that the RC-B scale possesses good convergent and discriminant validity. Evidence for the criterion and concurrent validity of the scale was also observed. Participants who scored higher on the RC-B self-identified as more socially and economically conservative, and higher scores on the RC-B predicted more conservative stances on social and economic political issues. In both instances, there appeared to be a stronger connection between RC-B and social conservatism than economic conservatism. This aligns with results reported by Saribay and Yilmaz (2018).

Study 1 provided less robust support for the reliability and proposed factor structure of the RC-B scale. While the Cronbach's α value for the RC-B scale was acceptable, the EFA yielded a three-factor solution. Two of these factors corresponded with the initially proposed "preference for tradition" and "preference for gradual change" factors. The third factor consisted of only two items, both reverse-worded. One item loaded equally onto the two preference factors. Adjustments were made to these three items before testing the scale with a community sample in Study 2.

Study 2

Results from Study 1 demonstrated the need to make adjustments to three items in the RC-B scale. On closer inspection, it appeared that the two reverse-worded items did not tap into either the preference for tradition or preference for gradual change factors as directly as other items in the scale. They were therefore reworded. The third item loaded equally onto the preference for tradition and preference for gradual change factors. The item was created for the preference for tradition factor, but included the word "change," which may explain the divided loading of this item in the EFA. It was reworded to more clearly assess preference for tradition.

The purpose of Study 2 was to test the validity, reliability, and factor structure of the revised RC-B scale. In addition to revising three items on the RC-B, Study 2 added a measure of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), which corresponds with the second core facet of conservative ideology identified by Jost and colleagues (2003)—endorsement of hierarchies. We expected scores on the RC-B to correlate positively with scores on SDO, but that this correlation would be weaker than the correlation between RC-B and RWA (since RWA more closely captures resistance to change than endorsement of hierarchies). This would further support the discriminant validity of the RC-B scale. We also included SDO in the concurrent validity tests to examine the unique predictive ability of RC-B scores. Results from exploratory analyses in Study 1 suggested that RC-B scores better predict conservative stances on social than economic issues. The inclusion of SDO in Study 2 allowed us to also test the possibility that RC-B scores better predict stances on social issues while SDO better predicts stances on economic issues. To facilitate this comparison, we replaced some of the issues on the political stances survey to create an even number of social and economic issues. Finally, to boost external validity, Study 2 used a national sample consisting of community members. All other measures and predictions were the same as in Study 1.

Method

Participants. A total of 274 community members from across the United States participated in Study 2 in exchange for compensation each participant agreed upon in accordance to their Qualtrics Panels account. Qualtrics Research Services recruits participants from various sources, including website intercept recruitment, member referrals, targeted email lists, gaming sites, customer loyalty web portals, permission-based networks, and social media. Names, addresses, and dates of birth are validated by third-party verification measures prior to joining a panel. Panel members that meet a study's qualifying criteria are sent an email invitation or invited via a survey platform to participate in the study. Individuals had to live in the United States and speak English to participate. Participants were removed from the study using criteria identical to Study 1, as specified in the study's preregistration. Three participants completed the survey in less than 10 min, and two had an NFC Lie Score that was 3 standard deviations or more above the sample mean. This left a final sample of 269 participants. Of these, 51.3% were female (47.6% male) and 83.3% were non-Hispanic/Latino. Quota sampling was used to obtain a representative distribution of participants from various racial backgrounds (70.6% European American/White, 13.8% African American/Black, 4.1% Asian, 3.0% multiracial, 5.9% other, and 1.9% who selected "prefer not to say"). Ages ranged from 18 to

85 years, with an average of 50.57 years. The political orientation of the sample was slightly socially conservative ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.87$) and slightly economically conservative ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 1.78$).

Materials. The DOG, NFC, Big Five, RWA, BDW, political orientation, and demographic surveys were the same as those used in Study 1.

RC-B scale. Three items were revised in the RC-B scale for Study 2. Item 5 was changed from, "It is important to shake things up and try different angles when solving problems" *(R)*, to "Making slow changes in society prevents innovation and progress" *(R)*. Item 10 was changed from, "Doing things differently from others often leads to positive results" *(R)*, to "Following traditions tends to create a closed-minded society" *(R)*. Finally, item 11 was changed from, "If something is working well, there is no need to change it," to "Established traditions are the best way to run society." All other items were the same as those used in Study 1.

Social Dominance Orientation. The SDO scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) consists of 14 items that capture the extent to which an individual prefers or accepts inequalities, especially among social groups. This scale captures the endorsement of inequality facet of conservative ideology (Jost et al., 2003).

Political stances. Participants indicated their stances on five social (abortion, death penalty, firearm regulation, gay marriage, immigration – $\alpha = .69$) and five economic (taxing fossil fuels, market regulation, minimum wage, deficit spending, corporate tax rates – $\alpha = .57$) political topics.

Procedure. All study materials were delivered online via Qualtrics. Participants first completed the RC-B scale. Participants next completed the DOG ($\alpha = .90$), NFC (αs = .80, .77, .79, .65, and .59 for order, predictability, decisiveness, ambiguity, and closed-mindedness, respectively), Big Five (α for Openness items = .71), RWA ($\alpha = .94$), BDW ($\alpha = .86$), and the SDO ($\alpha = .88$) scales. Scale order was randomized for each participant, as was the order of items within each scale. Next, participants indicated their stances on various political issues. Finally, participants provided demographic information, including political orientation.

Results and Discussion

Internal reliability and factor structure. The RC-B scale demonstrated good reliability as a whole ($\alpha = .78$, $\omega = .80$). The reliabilities for the subscales ($\alpha_{tradition} = .75$, $\alpha_{change} = .60$) were somewhat less reliable. Removing Item 5 improved the internal reliability of the overall scale ($\alpha = .81$), but this item was retained in all further analyses except where otherwise indicated. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy showed the data were sufficient for further analysis, KMO = .85, and Bartlett's test of sphericity showed that items were significantly correlated, $\chi^2(45) = 792.07$, $p < .001$. The internal factor structure of the RC-B scale was next tested using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test a two-factor model with correlated factors, preference for tradition and preference for gradual change, Model $\chi^2(43) = 142.05$, $p < .001$. Model fit was assessed using Hu and Bentler's (1999) combined criteria (comparative fit index [CFI] $\geq .90$, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] $\leq .06$, standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] $\leq .08$). Indices of model fit, CFI = .88, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .07, showed a questionable fit for CFI and RMSEA. Another CFA was conducted, allowing for the two hypothesized factors to remain orthogonal. This resulted in poorer fit, $\chi^2(44) = 210.76$, $p < .001$, CFI = .80, RMSEA = .12, SRMR = .17.

Additional analyses were conducted after removing Item 5. When the two hypothesized factors were correlated, an improved fit was demonstrated, with only RMSEA outside the criteria, $\chi^2(34) = 71.62$, $p < .001$, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .05. Finally, we conducted a final CFA, removing Item 5 and keeping the hypothesized factors orthogonal. This analysis evidenced a weaker model fit, $\chi^2(35) = 140.67$, $p < .001$, CFI = .86, RMSEA = .11, SRMR = .18. These results show that the best model fit involves removing Item 5 and allowing the two hypothesized factors to correlate.

Convergent and discriminant validity. We calculated zero-order correlations between scores on the RC-B scale subfactors (including item 5) and RWA, BDW, DOG, NFC, SDO, and Openness (see Table 3). Scores on the RC-B Tradition subscale correlated positively with scores on RWA, BDW, DOG, SDO, and all the NFC dimensions except decisiveness and closed-mindedness. Scores on the RC-B Tradition subscale did not correlate significantly with scores on Openness. Openness did, however, correlate significantly and negatively with the RC-B Gradual Change subscale. Scores on this subscale also correlated positively with RWA, BDW, SDO, and all the NFC dimensions except decisiveness.

Criterion validity. We calculated correlations between scores on the RC-B subscales and participants' social and economic political orientation. Supporting criterion validity, higher scores on both RC-B subscales correlated significantly with greater social and economic conservatism (Table 3).

Concurrent validity. To establish the concurrent validity of the RC-B scale, we ran a multiple linear regression analysis to examine whether scores on the RC-B subscales predicted more conservative positions on political issues with SDO included in the model. Together, the RC-B subscales and SDO scores accounted for a significant amount of the observed variability in political stances, $R^2 = .41$, $F(3, 265) = 61.5$, $p < .001$, and all three variables were predictors of more conservative stances

Table 3. Zero-Order Spearman's Correlation Coefficients (r_s) for Correlation Between RC-B Subfactors and Other Individual Factors in Study 2.

	Preference for tradition r_s	Preference for gradual change r_s
RWA	.61***	.34***
BDW	.33***	.27***
DOG	.34***	.09
SDO	.19**	.16**
$NFC_{predict}$	.20**	.21**
NFC_{order}	.38***	.18**
$NFC_{decisive}$	.12†	−.10†
$NFC_{ambiguity}$	.17**	.20**
NFC_{closed}	−.01	.16**
Openness	−.11†	−.24***
Social conservatism	.42***	.33***
Economic conservatism	.37***	.28***

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; BDW = Belief in a Dangerous World; DOG = Dogmatism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; NFC = Need for Closure.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

($\beta_{Tradition} = .27$, $t = 5.09$, $p < .001$; $\beta_{Gradual} = .14$, $t = 2.70$, $p = .007$; $\beta_{SDO} = .47$, $t = 9.77$, $p < .001$).

Mirroring study 1, we conducted two additional multiple regression analyses—one for stances on social political issues and one for economic political issues. While both RC-B subscales and SDO scores predicted stances on social political issues ($\beta_{Tradition} = .31$, $p < .001$; $\beta_{Gradual} = .15$, $p = .007$; $\beta_{SDO} = .39$, $p < .001$), RC-B Gradual Change scores were a nonsignificant predictor of stances on economic political issues ($\beta_{Tradition} = .14$, $p = .02$; $\beta_{Gradual} = .10$, $p = .11$; $\beta_{SDO} = .43$, $p < .001$).

Results from Study 2 reinforced initial evidence for the validity of the RC-B scale. Supporting convergent validity, scores on the RC-B Tradition subscale correlated with higher scores on RWA, BDW, DOG, the need for order, need for predictability, and need to avoid ambiguity. Scores on the RC-B Gradual Change subscale correlated with higher RWA, BDW, all NFC dimensions except decisiveness as well as lower openness. Supporting discriminant validity, scores on both RC-B subscales correlated positively with scores on SDO, but this correlation was weaker than correlations with RWA and did not correlate with scores on the need for decisiveness. Supporting criterion validity, higher scores on both RC-B subscales correlated with greater social and economic conservative self-identification. Regarding concurrent validity, RC-B and SDO scores were predictors of more conservative stances on political issues. While both RC-B subscale and SDO scores significantly predicted conservative stances on social political issues, SDO scores were a stronger predictor of conservative stances on economic political issues than the Tradition subscale scores, and the Gradual Change subscale did not significantly predict stances on economic issues. Study 2 also found support for the RC-B scale's internal reliability and factor structure. The scale's reliability was acceptable, but could be improved by removing a single item. Finally, the CFA with two correlated latent factors provided a good model fit when Item 5 was removed from the analysis.

The results from Study 2 provide additional support for the validity and reliability of the RC-B scale. The purpose of Studies 3 and 4 was to test a final version of the scale in both student and community samples.

Studies 3 and 4

Results from Study 2 suggested that removal of Item 5 would boost the reliability and model fit of the RC-B scale. An additional problem with this item is that it is double-barreled ("It is important to shake things up and try different angles when solving problems"). This item was therefore removed from the scale for Studies 3 and 4. This resulted in a 10-item RC-B scale, with five items per subfactor and one reverse-worded item (see the appendix for final scale version). We collected data from one student and one community sample to test the final version of the RC-B scale. All measures and predictions for convergent, discriminant, and criterion validity as well as reliability were the same as in Study 2. To test concurrent validity, we performed hierarchical regression analyses to identify the amount of unique variance in political stances associated with RC-B subscale scores while controlling for age, gender, and SDO levels. CFAs were performed to assess the factor structure of the scale. We expected the CFAs to confirm the presence of two correlated latent variables—preference for tradition and preference for gradual change.

Method

Participants

Student sample. A total of 317 undergraduate students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology courses at a large university in the southeastern United States participated in Study 3 in exchange for partial course credit. Participant data were removed from the sample using the same criteria from Study 1 (32 participants removed), as specified in the study's preregistration. This left a final sample of 285 participants ($M_{age} = 19.98$, $SD = 4.47$). The sample was predominantly female (69.8%, $n = 199$), European American/White (65.3%, $n = 186$), and non-Hispanic/Latino (86.7%, $n = 247$). The political orientation of the sample was slightly socially liberal ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.61$) and slightly economically conservative ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.41$).

Community sample. A total of 289 community members from across the United States participated in Study 4 in exchange for compensation each participant agreed upon in accordance to their Qualtrics Panels account. A total of 13 participants were removed from the sample using the

Table 4. Zero-Order Spearman's Correlation Coefficients (r_s) for Correlation Between RC-B Subfactors and Other Individual Factors in Studies 3 and 4.

	Student sample (study 3)		Community sample (study 4)	
	Tradition	Gradual change	Tradition	Gradual change
RWA	.59***	.26***	.53***	.25***
BDW	.33***	.06	.18**	.16**
DOG	.36***	.10†	.36***	.02
SDO	.39***	.18**	.16**	.07
$NFC_{predict}$	.13*	.11†	.10†	.21***
NFC_{order}	.26***	.11†	.35***	.32***
$NFC_{decisive}$	.06	−.01	.20**	.13*
$NFC_{ambiguity}$	.07	.06	.06	.14*
NFC_{closed}	.21***	.11†	.08	−.07
Openness	.01	−.02	.04	.01
Social conservatism	.50***	.18**	.28***	.09
Economic conservatism	.32***	.13*	.26***	.07

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; BDW = Belief in a Dangerous World; DOG = Dogmatism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; NFC = Need for Closure.
†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

criteria identical to Study 1, leaving a final sample of 276 participants. Of these, 50.7% were female (48.6% male) and 82.6% were non-Hispanic/Latino. Quota sampling was used to obtain a representative distribution of participants from various racial backgrounds (75% European American/White, 9.8% African American/Black, 4.3% Asian, 7.6% other or multiracial, and 2.2% who selected "prefer not to say"). Ages ranged from 18 to 83 years, with an average of 47.32 years. The political orientation of the sample was slightly socially conservative ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.70$) and slightly economically conservative ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.58$).

Materials. Item 5 was removed from the RC-B scale for Studies 3 and 4. All other items were the same as those used in Study 2. All other materials were identical to those used in Study 2. In the student sample, all scale internal reliabilities were above .70, except for the Ambiguity and Closed-mindedness subscales of the NFC scale (αs = .64 and .60, respectively). In the community sample, all scale internal reliabilities were above .70, except for BDW (α = .56) and the Ambiguity and Closed-mindedness subscales of the NFC scale (αs = .61 and .66, respectively).

Procedure. All procedures were identical to Study 2.

Results and Discussion

Internal reliability and factor structure. The RC-B scale demonstrated good internal reliability in both the student (α = .77, ω = 78) and community (α = .76, ω = .78) samples. The internal reliabilities for the subscales were slightly less reliable in the student ($\alpha_{tradition} = .75$, $\alpha_{change} = .69$) and community ($\alpha_{tradition} = .73$, $\alpha_{change} = .68$) samples, but still acceptable. The internal factor structure of the RC-B scale was next tested using CFA with two latent factors (preference for tradition and preference for gradual change).

The student sample was adequate for further analysis, KMO = .81, and Bartlett's test of sphericity showed that items significantly correlated, $\chi^2(45) = 698.04$, $p < .001$. CFA confirmed two latent factors accounting for 51.01% of the variance. Model fit, allowing the latent factors to correlate, was just below adequate, CFI = .88, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .09, S-B $\chi^2(34) = 116.77$, $p < .001$. An additional CFA was conducted in which the latent factors were orthogonal. Mirroring results from Study 2, this resulted in a poorer fit, CFI = .81, RMSEA = .11, SRMR = .15, S-B $\chi^2(35) = 160.96$, $p < .001$. There was a significant correlation between preference for tradition and preference for gradual change, $r(282) = .39$, $p < .001$.

The community sample was also adequate for further analysis, KMO = .81, and Bartlett's test of sphericity showed that items significantly correlated, $\chi^2(45) = 683.65$, $p < .0001$. Confirming results from the student sample, two latent factors were shown accounting for 51.17% of the variance. Model fit, allowing the two latent factors to correlate, was similar to Study 3, CFI = .88, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .09, S-B $\chi^2(34) = 112.99$, $p < .001$. An additional CFA in which the latent factors were orthogonal resulted in a poorer fit, CFI = .80, RMSEA = .12, SRMR = .16, S-B $\chi^2(35) = 168.94$, $p < .001$. There was a significant correlation between preference for tradition and preference for gradual change, $r(274) = .39$, $p < .001$.

Convergent and discriminant validity. We calculated correlations between scores on the RC-B subscales and RWA, BDW, DOG, NFC, SDO, and Openness for both samples (Table 4). Scores on the RC-B Tradition subscale correlated positively with scores on RWA, BDW, DOG, SDO,

Table 5. Unique Variability Captured by RC-B Subfactors in Student Sample From Study 3.

	Variables	$R^2\Delta$	$F\Delta$	p
All political issues	Age, Gender	.04	5.29	.006
	SDO	.25	97.54	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.10	23.08	<.001
Social political issues	Age, Gender	.03	4.76	.009
	SDO	.25	98.73	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.10	21.68	<.001
Economic political issues	Age, Gender	.02	2.60	.076
	SDO	.10	31.16	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.05	7.83	<.001

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation.

Table 6. Unique Variability Captured by RC-B Subfactors in Community Sample From Study 4.

	Variables	$R^2\Delta$	$F\Delta$	p
All political issues	Age, Gender	.03	4.71	.010
	SDO	.27	104.78	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.10	21.42	<.001
Social political issues	Age, Gender	.04	4.87	.008
	SDO	.26	99.51	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.10	21.25	<.001
Economic political issues	Age, Gender	.02	2.15	.118
	SDO	.15	48.61	<.001
	RC-B subfactors	.05	8.47	<.001

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation.

and three of the NFC dimensions (predictability, order, and closed-mindedness). Scores on the RC-B Gradual Change subscale correlated significantly with higher RWA and SDO, and marginally with three of the NFC dimensions (predictability, order, and closed-mindedness). Unlike Studies 1 and 2, scores on the RC-B subscales did not correlate significantly with the ambiguity NFC dimension or with Openness. The correlations between RC-B scores and RWA were stronger than the correlation between RC-B scores and SDO, which aligns with arguments in Jost and colleagues (2003).

Criterion validity. We calculated correlations between scores on the RC-B subscale scores and participants' political orientation on both social and economic matters. Supporting the RC-B scales' criterion validity, higher RC-B subscale scores correlated significantly with greater social conservatism and economic conservatism (Table 4).

Concurrent validity. We ran a hierarchical regression analysis with age and gender entered as predictors in the first block, SDO scores in the second block, RC-B subscale scores in the final block, and positions on political issues as the outcome variable. The RC-B subscale scores accounted for a significant amount of observed variability in political stances above and beyond that explained by age, gender, and SDO scores (Tables 5 and 6). In the final model, the RC-B Tradition subscale and SDO scores predicted more conservative stances on political issues, but the RC-B Gradual Change subscale was a nonsignificant predictor (Tables 7 and 8).

We conducted two additional hierarchical regression analyses—one for stances on social political issues (αs = .65) and one for economic political issues (αs = .46 and .58). In both analyses, the RC-B subscale scores accounted for a significant amount of observed variability in political stances beyond that explained by age, gender, and SDO scores (Tables 5 and 6). Both the RC-B Tradition subscale and SDO scores were significant predictors of more conservative stances in the final model, but the RC-B Gradual Change subscale was a nonsignificant predictor (Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7. Hierarchical Regression Coefficients in Student Sample From Study 3.

	Predictor	β	t	p
All political issues	Age	−.01	−0.19	.85
	Gender	−.06	−1.17	.24
	SDO	.38	7.26	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.34	6.23	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	.02	0.32	.75
Social political issues	Age	−.01	−0.14	.89
	Gender	−.05	−0.95	.35
	SDO	.39	7.35	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.34	6.09	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	.01	0.17	.86
Economic political issues	Age	−.01	−0.17	.86
	Gender	−.05	−0.91	.37
	SDO	.23	3.79	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.23	3.57	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	.02	0.32	.75

Note. SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs.

To more rigorously test the concurrent validity of the RC-B scale, we conducted the same hierarchical regression analyses with RWA included along with SDO in the second block. Results were mixed. In the student sample, RC-B scores accounted for a marginally significant amount of the observed variability for all issues and economic issues but was nonsignificant for social issues. In all three analyses, scores on the gradual change subscale did not predict political stances, but scores on the tradition subscale did predict stances for all issues and economic issues (see Tables 9 and 10). In the community sample, RC-B scores did not account for a significant amount of unique

Table 8. Hierarchical Regression Coefficients in Community Sample From Study 4.

	Predictor	β	*t*	*p*
All political issues	Age	.03	0.48	.63
	Gender	.02	0.33	.74
	SDO	.49	10.08	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.33	6.20	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	−.02	−0.31	.76
Social political issues	Age	.03	0.53	.60
	Gender	.01	0.28	.78
	SDO	.48	9.80	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.32	6.06	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	.00	−0.01	.99
Economic political issues	Age	.01	0.19	.85
	Gender	.01	0.21	.83
	SDO	.37	6.58	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.24	4.00	<.001
	RC-B—Gradual change	−.03	−0.54	.59

Note. SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs.

Table 9. Unique Variability Captured by RC-B in Student Sample With RWA in Second Block.

	Variables	$R^2\Delta$	$F\Delta$	*p*
All political issues	Age, Gender	.04	5.29	.01
	SDO, RWA	.47	131.30	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.01	2.79	.06
Social political issues	Age, Gender	.03	4.76	.01
	SDO, RWA	.53	168.52	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.003	0.96	.39
Economic political issues	Age, Gender	.02	2.60	.08
	SDO, RWA	.14	23.96	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.02	2.74	.07

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation.

Table 10. Hierarchical Regression Coefficients in Student Sample With RWA in Second Block.

	Predictor	β	*t*	*p*
All political issues	Age	.02	0.62	.54
	Gender	−.05	−1.00	.32
	SDO	.21	4.16	<.001
	RWA	.49	9.29	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.12	2.08	.04
	RC-B—Change	.02	0.41	.68
Social political issues	Age	.03	0.69	.49
	Gender	−.04	−0.84	.40
	SDO	.18	3.75	<.001
	RWA	.59	10.82	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.06	1.20	.23
	RC-B—Change	.01	0.28	.78
Economic political issues	Age	.00	0.004	.99
	Gender	−.05	−0.85	.39
	SDO	.17	2.62	.01
	RWA	.17	2.23	.03
	RC-B—Tradition	.15	2.10	.04
	RC-B—Change	.02	0.33	.74

Note. RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs.

Table 11. Unique Variability Captured by RC-B in Community Sample With RWA in Second Block.

	Variables	$R^2\Delta$	$F\Delta$	*p*
All political issues	Age, Gender	.03	4.71	.01
	SDO, RWA	.52	157.94	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.003	0.93	.40
Social political issues	Age, Gender	.04	4.87	.01
	SDO, RWA	.57	196.56	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.00	0.14	.87
Economic political issues	Age, Gender	.02	2.15	.12
	SDO, RWA	.23	41.71	<.001
	RC-B subscales	.01	1.34	.26

Note. RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation.

variability in any of the analyses and only RWA and SDO were significant predictors of political stances in the final models (see Tables 11 and 12).

Results from Studies 3 and 4 largely confirm the validity of the final version of the RC-B scale. With regard to convergent and discriminant validity, higher scores on the RC-B subscales correlated with higher scores on RWA, BDW, DOG, SDO, need for predictability and need for order in both samples. The correlations between the RC-B subscales and RWA were stronger than the correlations with SDO, supporting discriminant validity. Less consistent results were observed for the correlations between RC-B and need to avoid ambiguity, closed-mindedness, and need for decisiveness. Criterion validity was once again supported, with those who self-identify as socially and economically conservative scoring higher on the RC-B scale, particularly the Tradition subscale. The RC-B scale's concurrent validity was partially affirmed. When controlling for age, gender, and SDO, RC-B scores captured a significant amount of unique variance in political stances for both samples. However, only scores on the Tradition subscale significantly predicted political stances. This was true for both social and economic political issues, but RC-B Tradition subscale scores were a stronger predictor of stances on social issues than economic issues. When RWA was added to the model, however, RC-B Tradition subscale scores only predicted more conservative stances in the all issues and economic issues analyses for the student sample. We explore possible explanations for these results in the General Discussion.

Studies 3 and 4 also confirmed the internal reliability and two-factor structure of the RC-B scale. The final scale

Table 12. Hierarchical Regression Coefficients in Community Sample With RWA in Second Block.

	Predictor	β	*t*	*p*
All political issues	Age	−.02	−0.35	.73
	Gender	−.01	−0.24	.81
	SDO	.30	6.50	<.001
	RWA	.54	9.79	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.07	1.33	.19
	RC-B—Change	−.03	−0.70	.48
Social political issues	Age	−.02	−0.47	.64
	Gender	−.02	−0.43	.67
	SDO	.26	5.92	<.001
	RWA	.63	12.15	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.02	0.43	.67
	RC-B—Change	−.02	−0.43	.67
Economic political issues	Age	−.01	−0.16	.87
	Gender	−.001	−0.03	.98
	SDO	.27	4.50	<.001
	RWA	.27	3.82	<.001
	RC-B—Tradition	.11	1.63	.11
	RC-B—Change	−.04	−0.70	.49

Note. RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; RC-B = Resistance to Change-Beliefs.

continued to demonstrate acceptable internal reliability and the CFA suggested a nearly adequate fit of the two-factor model in both samples. While these results build a case for the reliability of the RC-B scale, we wanted to also test the scale's test–retest reliability. This was the purpose of Study 5.

Study 5

While the MSC model (Jost et al., 2003) acknowledges that situational and contextual variables are likely to impact the motivations an individual experiences at any given moment (thus affecting the attractiveness of different political ideologies), it also acknowledges that some individuals are more likely to experience the model's motivations to a greater level than others. This suggests that political ideology should exhibit some level of stability across time. By extension, we reasoned that scores on the RC-B scale should also exhibit *moderate* stability across time. This was tested by administering the RC-B scale to a sample of individuals twice, three months apart.

Method

Participants. Seventy-two undergraduate students (M_{age} = 19.68, SD = 1.49) enrolled in psychology courses at a small, liberal arts university in Arkansas participated in Study 5 in exchange for course extra credit. The sample had more female than male participants (56.9%), was predominantly European American/White (70.8%), and mostly non-Hispanic/Latino (88.9%).

Materials and procedure. Participants completed the finalized, 10-item RC-B scale twice—once in September 2017 and again in December 2017. They also completed the brief demographic survey used in Studies 1 through 4 each time.

Results and Discussion

The RC-B demonstrated acceptable test–retest reliability, as evidenced by the positive correlation between pretest and posttest scores in the sample (r = .67, p < .001). While this correlation may not be particularly strong, it is not surprising given that resistance to change is theorized to be influenced by various social-cognitive motivations, which are partly situation and context-dependent (Jost et al., 2003). It would be useful for future research to use longitudinal designs and models (e.g., STARTS; Kenny & Zautra, 2001) to examine the conditions when resistance to change beliefs do and do not appear to shift.

General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to validate a new measure of the resistance to change facet of conservative political ideology. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses partially supported the predicted internal structure of the RC-B scale, consisting of two correlated subfactors that correspond with preference for tradition and preference for gradual change. The test–retest reliability and internal reliability values of the final scale were also in the acceptable range. Supporting convergent validity, scores on the Preference for Tradition subscale correlated with other variables associated with conservatism in past research (e.g., belief in dangerous world, need for closure). Scores on the Preference for Gradual Change subscale also correlated with many of these variables, particularly in community samples. Correlations between the RC-B subscales and RWA were consistently stronger than correlations between the subscales and SDO, supporting discriminant validity. Criterion validity was supported by correlations between the subscales and self-reported social and economic conservatism. Results were more mixed for concurrent validity. In general, the Preference for Tradition subscale predicted more conservative stances on political issues, even when controlling for SDO. The Preference for Gradual Change subscale, however, was typically not a significant predictor of political stances.

Previous measures of resistance to change possessed limitations the RC-B scale was designed to avoid. For example, Jost and colleagues (2003) identify the Conservatism scale (C-Scale; Wilson & Patterson, 1968) and scales measuring RWA (Altemeyer, 1988) as the closest measures of resistance to change. However, the C-Scale confounds the construct of resistance to change with stances on specific political issues and RWA scales measure other constructs in addition to a

general tendency to resist change. Oreg (2003) developed a scale to measure resistance to change, but it measures an individual's predisposition to resist change, as opposed to *beliefs* regarding the value of change versus stability. The RC-B scale was designed to avoid these limitations. Items in the RC-B scale make no reference to political issues, measure only the resistance to change construct, and focus on beliefs rather than predispositions. We therefore consider the RC-B scale a more valid measure of resistance to change than measures used in past research.

Several other resistance to change scales were developed at the same time the present research was being conducted. One scale—the Resistance to Social Change scale—was developed by Brandt and Reyna (2017), and results from a student sample confirmed the convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity of the 10-item scale. In four additional studies on perceptions of system legitimacy, the scale demonstrated good reliability and predictive validity (Brandt & Reyna, 2017). The main difference between Brandt and Reyna's scale and the RC-B is that most items in their scale assess individual predispositions rather than beliefs. This is because the scale consists mostly of items adapted from Oreg's (2003) RTC scale. In creating items for our scale, we focused on beliefs because political ideology consists of interrelated beliefs rather than interrelated personal dispositions. Two other scales recently developed by Yilmaz and Saribay share this focus on beliefs rather than dispositions.

Yilmaz and Saribay developed two measures to capture both facets of conservative ideology—resistance to change and endorsement of hierarchies. The first scale was developed by Sarıbay et al. (2017) for use with Turkish participants. The resistance to change subscale of the measure consists of nine items from other related scales (e.g., RWA, F-Scale). The scale's reliability, factor structure, and predictive validity have been established in several Turkish samples (Sarıbay et al., 2017; Yilmaz & Saribay, 2016, 2018a, 2018b). The scale has been translated into English, but the translated version has not been validated in English-speaking samples. Another limitation concerns the content of the items. The scale contains items that are contaminated with political content, measure authoritarian aggression and/or morality concerns in addition to resistance to change, or are culture-specific. However, the second scale developed by Yilmaz and Saribay (2018b) avoids these limitations.

The eight-item scale developed by Yilmaz and Saribay (2018b) measures both resistance to change and endorsement of hierarchies. The reliability, factor structure, and predictive validity of the four-item resistance to change subscale were validated by Yilmaz and Saribay (2018b), but only with a single American sample. It would be beneficial to test the validity of the scale with additional samples, but overall it appears to hold more promise than their previous scale. The next logical step is to compare the performance of the RC-B scale with the scales developed by Yilmaz and Saribay (2018b) and Brandt and Reyna (2017) in future research.

A unique feature of the RC-B scale is the two subfactors of resistance to change—preference for tradition and preference for gradual change. As previously argued, conservatives generally adopt an, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" position. This corresponds with the preference for tradition subfactor and is well represented in other measures of resistance to change. However, there are times when it becomes impossible to deny that change in needed, when a particular system or policy is indeed "broken." In these situations, conservatives prefer a gradual, organic approach to implementing change. For example, both liberal and conservative individuals recognize that the immigration system in the United States needs significant revisions. However, conservative legislators support small, incremental changes to existing laws, whereas liberal legislators have advocated for more sweeping and comprehensive revisions (e.g., Byrnes, 2015). In these circumstances, scores on preference for gradual change might best predict policy positions, particularly if the issue is of a social rather than economic nature. This is also one possible reason the predictive utility of this subscale was not consistently observed in the present research. The political stances measure asked participants to indicate the level of their support for various political issues (e.g., deporting undocumented immigrants) rather than their support for different approaches to implementing changes (e.g., piecemeal adjustments to existing immigrant policy versus a complete overhaul). Future research with the RC-B scale should directly examine this possibility.

Three interesting patterns emerged from the current results which merit further investigation. First, scores on the RC-B correlated more strongly with social than economic conservatism, and RC-B scores better predicted stances on social than economic political issues. This partly replicates results reported by Saribay and Yilmaz (2018) and suggests resistance to change is more closely tied to sociocultural than economic concerns. Indeed, Saribay and Yilmaz (2018) note that social conservatism is concerned with preserving traditions and established societal order, while economic conservatism is more concerned with competition and personal responsibility. As a result, Saribay and Yilmaz (2018) argue that resistance to change predicts social conservatism better than endorsement of hierarchies, and vice versa for economic conservatism. This has implications for research on conservative shift, which is the tendency to become more conservative following exposure to threat (e.g., Bonanno & Jost, 2006; Nail, McGregor, Drinkwater, Steele, & Thompson, 2009). To the extent that threat influences resistance to change, the present results suggest that conservative shift may be more likely to occur following exposure to sociocultural versus economic threats.

The second pattern concerns the ability of RC-B to uniquely predict conservative positions on political issues. In Study 3, Preference for Tradition remained a significant predictor of conservative economic stances after adding RWA to the model along with SDO, but not social issues. In Study 4, neither subscale predicted stances on political issues once

RWA was included in the model. One potential explanation for these results concerns the significant overlap in content between items in the RWA measure and the political stances items. For example, several items in the RWA scale explicitly mention issues such as abortion, marriage, and sexual orientation (a key limitation of this scale as a measure of resistance to change). These topics correspond with several issues covered in our political stances measure, creating a potentially inflated correlation between scores on these measures.

A second explanation concerns the U.S. political climate during the data collection time period. Resistance to change and endorsement of hierarchies may form the core of classical conservative ideology, but the past several years have witnessed increasing rejection of classical conservatism in favor of more anti-establishment and authoritarian positions. This is epitomized by the success of the Tea Party as well as the election of Donald Trump and similar candidates to prominent political positions. For example, the authoritarian facet of RWA, but not the traditionalism or conventionalism facets, predicted support for Donald Trump and Ted Cruz during the most recent presidential primaries (Ludeke, Klitgaard, & Vitriol, 2018). Similarly, the authoritarian and traditionalism (but not the conventionalism) facets of RWA predicted intentions to vote for Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton (Crowson & Brandes, 2017). As a result, resistance to change may be less central, and authoritarianism more central, to conservative ideology at this point in time. This would be particularly true for older conservatives. The Roper Center at Cornell University reports that 52% of individuals 45 years of age and older voted for Donald Trump, whereas only 36% of individuals between 19 and 36 years of age voted for Trump (How groups voted in 2016, 2016). Similarly, a Pew Research survey found that Donald Trump's approval ratings among individuals 65 years of age and older is 49%, but only 32% among 18 to 29 year olds ("Wide Differences in Trump Approval by Race, Education, Religious Affiliation," 2018).

These findings may help explain the results observed in Studies 3 and 4. The average age of Study 3's student sample (19.98 years) was much lower than the average age of Study 4's community sample (47.32 years). Support for Donald Trump and his particular brand of conservatism may be lower in the student sample, meaning that conservatives in this sample may identify more closely with traditional conservatism than the community sample. This could explain why RC-B was a significant predictor of political stances in the student sample, but not in the community sample. Authoritarianism does still play a prominent role in political stances on social issues across age groups, though, suggesting that conservative positions on these topics are more universally motivated by authoritarianism than positions on economic issues.

Does this mean that resistance to change is no longer relevant in the study of conservative ideology? We think not. It is likely that resistance to change predicts conservatives' stances in addition to authoritarianism, but the present research is unable to observe this result. RWA measures contain content that captures preference for tradition as well as authoritarianism, creating some redundancy between RWA and the RC-B scale. However, the authoritarian and tradition constructs were often combined in single items in the particular RWA scale we used. We were thus unable to separately examine the predictive ability of authoritarianism and traditionalism, nor were we able to remove the redundancy prior to running analyses. To remedy this, future research should use a RWA measure that separately measures the various facets of this construct (e.g., Funke, 2005).[5]

The third interesting pattern concerns the Preference for Gradual Change subscale. Correlations between the Tradition and Gradual Change subscales (between .30 and .40) were lower than expected, and scores on the Gradual Change subscale did not predict stances on political issues in Studies 3 and 4. We have already proposed one explanation for why gradual change did not predict political stances, but the low correlations between the subscales might suggest they measure different constructs. That is, one might wonder whether preference for gradual change is an aspect of resistance to change, or simply a related (but separate) construct. To test this possibility, we conducted additional CFAs on data from Studies 3 and 4, in which we compared model fit when the two subscales loaded onto a common higher-order construct (resistance to change) to a model where the two subscales were correlated but did not load onto a common construct. Fit indices were virtually identical in all cases. In other words, model fit did not improve when the subscales were treated as separate (albeit correlated) factors. These results support that gradual change is indeed an aspect of resistance to change, but the answer to our inquiry may also depend upon the reason for preferring gradual change. One commonly cited reason concerns a desire to avoid or minimize unintended consequences. However, there may be a less commonly articulated, but equally motivating reason, for preferring gradual change—to avoid, postpone, or minimize change in general. In other words, lobbying for gradual change may actually function as a foot-dragging technique that aims to minimize any necessary change. Regardless, it is clear from the present results that additional research is needed to clarify the utility of the Preference for Gradual Change subscale of the RC-B.

If we were to assume that preference for gradual change is a separate construct from resistance to change, the RC-B would consist of preference for tradition items exclusively. It would then be reasonable to ask why the scale might be more useful than other measures of traditionalism. As previously mentioned, Wilson and Patterson's (1968) C-Scale includes items that tap into traditionalism, but these items are contaminated with political content. The same problem applies to two out of the four items in the Traditionalism subscale of Funke's (2005) RWA scale. Duckitt, Bizumic, Krauss, and Heled's (2010) Authoritarianism-Conservatism-Traditionalism (ACT) Scale also contains a traditionalism subscale, but eight

out of the 10 items are contaminated with political content or concerns about morality. The Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ; Schwartz et al., 2001) contains a four-item Traditionalism subscale, but only one item explicitly relates to a preference for tradition. Finally, all 10 items of the Traditional Values subscale of the Jackson Personality Inventory–Revised (Jackson, 1994) are contaminated by either political or religious content. The Preference for Tradition subscale of the RC-B avoids all these problems.

The utility of the RC-B scale can extend beyond research on individual political ideology. One research area that might fruitfully incorporate resistance to change is cultural inertia. Cultural inertia refers to tendencies to oppose changes when one's culture is perceived to be static and/or stable, but embrace changes when one's culture is perceived to be dynamic and evolving (Zárate, Shaw, Marquez, & Biagas, 2012). In other words, resistance to change is greater when culture is perceived to be static versus dynamic. Cultural inertia has been shown to predict reactions to immigration issues, showing that when people believe that their culture is stable they prefer assimilation to the concept of multiculturalism (Zárate & Shaw, 2010). It is possible that resistance to change mediates the relationship between these variables. That is, perceptions of cultural stability predict greater resistance to change, which then predicts preference for assimilation over multiculturalism. Alternatively, resistance to change may act as a moderator. Individuals who score low on resistance to change may prefer assimilation when culture is perceived as stable, but embrace multiculturalism when culture is perceived as dynamic. In contrast, individuals who score high on resistance to change may express an even greater preference for assimilation when culture is perceived as dynamic because cultural change is perceived as threatening to these individuals (i.e., conservative shift). These and other predictions could be tested in future research on cultural inertia to further our understanding of this interesting phenomenon.

Several important limitations should be noted for the current research. First, while the reliability of the final scale was primarily in the acceptable range, it was not as high as would be desired or as high as the reliabilities observed for the Brandt and Reyna (2017) and Yilmaz and Saribay (2018b) scales. Model fit, as assessed by CFAs in Studies 3 and 4, also yielded suboptimal results, although model fit was better in Study 2 when Item 5 was removed from the analysis. Second, the RC-B scale should be directly tested against the Brandt and Yilmaz scales, as well as Oreg's (2003) RTC scale, to more rigorously test its utility. Third, the sample size for Study 5 was smaller than desired and may have contributed to the somewhat low test–retest reliability estimate. Finally, all of the present studies were conducted with samples drawn from the United States. While these samples consisted of both university students and community members, further research is needed to validate the scale in samples from other nations.

In conclusion, five separate studies yielded support for the validity and reliability of the RC-B scale. The scale is grounded in the MSC model of conservative ideology and avoids the limitations inherent in measures used to assess resistance to change in past research. We therefore recommend use of this scale in future research on conservative ideology as well as other areas of scientific inquiry (e.g., cultural inertia).

Appendix

Final Resistance to Change-Beliefs (RC-B) Scale

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers!

Response scale for each item:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. Approaches used by people in the past are generally the most effective.
2. If society is going to change, it should occur slowly and naturally.
3. The established way of doing things should be protected and preserved.
4. Fast or radical changes are unwise and dangerous.
5. Traditions reflect wisdom and knowledge.
6. Making sudden changes tends to create more problems than solutions.
7. Slow, gradual change helps prevent catastrophes and mistakes.
8. Quick changes are acceptable if they restore things to how they were before.
9. Following traditions tends to create a closed-minded society (R).
10. Established traditions are the best way to run society.

Preference for tradition: Items 1, 3, 5, 9, 10
Preference for gradual change: Items 2, 4, 6, 7, 8

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was supported in part by a Small Research Grant from the Society for Personality and Social Psychology.

Notes

1. All studies reported in this article were preregistered on the Open Science Framework (dois: 10.17605/OSF.IO/M4CB6, 10.17605/OSF.IO/BCTJG, 10.17605/OSF.IO/7RSJ6).
2. Three items were included in varied locations that asked the participant to "leave this question blank to show you are paying attention." Participants that provided answers on two or more of these questions were removed from the sample.
3. Race and ethnicity were presented as two separate items.
4. The social political issues concerned abortion rights, the death penalty, firearm legislation, gay marriage, affirmative action, charter schools, and immigration ($\alpha = .60$). The economic issues concerned regulating fossil fuels, regulating the free market, the federal minimum wage, and a single-payer health care system ($\alpha = .46$).
5. Recall that two out of the four items in the traditionalism subscale of the Funke (2005) RWA measure are contaminated with political content and thus are not optimal for the measurement of resistance to change.

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material is available online with this article.

References

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B. (2002). Dogmatic behavior among students: Testing a new measure of dogmatism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*, 713-721. doi:10.1080/00224540209603931

Bonanno, G. A., & Jost, J. T. (2006). Conservative shift among high-exposure survivors of the September 11th terrorist attacks. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *28*, 311-323. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp2804_4

Brandt, M. J., & Reyna, C. (2017). Individual differences in the resistance to social change and acceptance of inequality predict system legitimacy differently depending on the social structure. *European Journal of Personality*, *31*, 266-278. doi:10.1002/per.2100

Byrnes, J. (2015, April 19). Rubio: Piecemeal immigration approach only option. Retrieved from https://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/239350-rubio-piecemeal-immigration-approach-only-option

Crowson, H. M., & Brandes, J. A. (2017). Differentiating between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton voters using facets of right-wing authoritarianism and social-dominance orientation: A brief report. *Psychological Reports*, *120*, 364-373. doi:10.1177/0033294117697089

Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Krauss, S. W., & Heled, E. (2010). A tripartite approach to Right-Wing Authoritarianism: The authoritarianism-conservatism-traditionalism model. *Political Psychology*, *31*, 685-715. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00781.x

Erikson, R. S., & Tedin, K. L. (2003). *American public opinion* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*, 1149-1160.

Funke, F. (2005). The dimensionality of right-wing authoritarianism: Lessons from the dilemma between theory and measurement. *Political Psychology*, *26*, 195-218. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00415.x

Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

How groups voted in 2016. (2016, December 9). Retrieved from https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/polls/us-elections/how-groups-voted/groups-voted-2016/

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Jackson, D. N. (1994). *Jackson Personality Inventory - Revised Manual*. Port Huron, MI: Sigma Assessment Systems, Inc.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five Trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M., & Napier, J. L. (2009). Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 307-337. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163600

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 339-375. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339

Jost, J. T., Napier, J. L., Thorisdottir, H., Gosling, S. D., Palfai, T. P., & Ostafin, B. (2007). Are needs to manage uncertainty and threat associated with political conservatism or ideological extremity? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 989-1007. doi:10.1177/0146167207301028

Kenny, D. A., & Zautra, A. (2001). Trait–state models for longitudinal data. In L. M. Collins & A. G. Sayer (Eds.), *Decade of behavior: New methods for the analysis of change* (pp. 243-263). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10409-008

Ludeke, S. G., Klitgaard, C. N., & Vitriol, J. (2018). Comprehensively-measured authoritarianism does predict vote choice: The importance of authoritarianism's facets, ideological sorting, and the particular candidate. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *123*, 209-216. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.019

Nail, P. R., McGregor, I., Drinkwater, A. E., Steele, G. M., & Thompson, A. W. (2009). Threat causes liberals to think like

conservatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 901-907. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.013

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 680-693. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.680

Oreg, S., Bayazit, M., Vakola, M., Arciniega, L., Armenakis, A., Barkauskiene, R., . . . van Dam, K. (2008). Dispositional resistance to change: Measurement equivalence and the link to personal values across 17 nations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 935-944. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.935

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Sarıbay, S. A., Olcaysoy-Ökten, I., & Yılmaz, O. (2017). Kişisel ve toplumsal düzeylerde eşitliğe karşıtlık ve değişime direnmenin muhafazakârlıkla ilişkisi [The relationship between conservatism and opposition to equality and resistance to change at the personal and societal levels]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları/Turkish Psychological Articles*, *39*, 24-41.

Saribay, S. A., & Yilmaz, O. (2018). Relationships between core ideological motives, social and economic conservatism, and religiosity: Evidence from a Turkish sample. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*, 205-211. doi:10.1111/ajsp.12213

Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 519-542. doi:10.1177/0022022101032005001

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 1049-1062. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1049

Wide differences in Trump approval by race, education, religious affiliation. (2018, March 15). Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/15/disagreements-about-trump-widely-seen-as-reflecting-divides-over-other-values-and-goals/ft_18-03-15_trumpvalues_demographic/

Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *7*, 264-269. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8260.1968.tb00568.x

Yilmaz, O., & Saribay, S. A. (2016). An attempt to clarify the link between cognitive style and political ideology: A non-western replication and extension. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *11*, 287-300.

Yilmaz, O., & Saribay, S. A. (2018a). Lower levels of resistance to change (but not opposition to equality) is related to analytic cognitive style. *Social Psychology*, *49*, 65-75. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000328

Yilmaz, O., & Saribay, S. A. (2018b). Moral foundations explain unique variance in political ideology beyond resistance to change and opposition to equality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1368430218781012

Zárate, M. A., & Shaw, M. (2010). The role of cultural inertia in reactions to immigration on the U.S./Mexico border. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*, 45-57. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01632.x

Zárate, M. A., Shaw, M., Marquez, J. A., & Biagas, D. (2012). Cultural inertia: The effects of cultural change on intergroup relations and the self-concept. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 634-645. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.12.014