Measuring Ideology in the Croatian Context: Testing the Left-Right Scale

LEON RUNJE

Ministry of Defence, Republic of Croatia

VALENTINO PETROVIĆ

Institute for Development and International Relations, Zagreb

KOSTA BOVAN

Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Zagreb

Summary

The goal of this paper is to examine the relationship between the unidimensional left-right measure of ideology and more nuanced measures of major political ideologies as well as to ascertain the validity of the left-right measure of ideology as a conceptual tool for analysing ideological preferences within the Croatian context. This was accomplished by deploying an online questionnaire on a convenient, non-representative sample of students from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. The students were recruited via various social media student groups. The paper starts by theoretically exploring the six major ideologies from which it develops a pool of items for measuring said ideologies. The data acquired via the aforementioned questionnaires was then analysed with the goal of assessing the best items to measure each ideology. The paper goes on to assess the relationship between the respondents' support of major ideologies and their self-positioning on the left-right ideology scale. The acquired results demonstrate that the respondents possess a general understanding of the ideological left-to-right scale and are coherent in their preferences with the values of their ideology of choice. They further demonstrate that the correlations between the participants' self-positioning on the left-right continuum and level of support for particular ideologies follow the expected direction. Therefore, while taking the limits of the deployed sample type into account, the paper reaffirms the validity of the left-right measure of ideology as a conceptual tool for analysing ideological preferences within the Croatian context.

Keywords: Ideological Congruence, Left-Right Ideological Scale, Zagreb Student Population, Measures of Ideology, Croatian Context

Introduction

In political science, ideology measurements can best be used to predict and explain election results and individual electoral behaviour. Measuring ideology is most often carried out by the self-positioning of respondents on the left-to-right political scale. Most research of ideological differences is based on the respondent's own judgments and it relies heavily on the left-to-right axis as a tool for measuring ideology (Bauer et al., 2017: 553). However, the question arises if the simple left-to-right scale is best suited for understanding the relationship between the respondents' expressed attitudes or behaviour and the ideology they claim to hold. It is therefore the aim of this paper to examine the conformity between the self-positioning of the respondents on the left-to-right political scale with their self-expressed positions on specific issues that determine their *de facto* ideological affinity. In addition, the aim is to examine the applicability of the standard left-to-right ideological scale in the Croatian context. In its theoretical framework the paper describes the six ideologies historically present in the Croatian context (socialism, social democracy, liberalism, libertarianism, Christian democracy and conservatism) to be investigated and measured within its scope. The theoretical framework also explains the importance of measuring ideology in political science. Following this, the data collection procedure, as well as analysis and results are presented. In the final part of the paper we discuss the results and ideas for future research.

1. Defining Ideology

The word "ideology" was first coined by French philosopher Antoine Louis Claude Destutt de Tracy in the 18th century when he aimed to describe a source from which concepts like grammar, logic and morality come from; a science which would be inherently superior and politically independent of all other forms or practices and would serve as an intellectual platform for ideas that have yet to arise (Kennedy, 1979: 355, in: Hanson, 2012: 3). Contemporary authors such as Kathleen Knight (2006: 619) underline the importance of ideology for political science, and stress that ideology as a concept has its very roots in this discipline. Furthermore, Knight analyses the definition of ideology and its different connotations in light of the several ways in which the term has been used over the past century. She addresses Robert Putnam and his fourteen ways on how ideology can be interpreted and underlines the importance of Gerring's understanding of the concept. She further stresses the three essential attributes he deploys in order to describe what ideology is (*ibid.*). As Knight points out, Gerring argues that the "importance of coherence is virtually unchallenged (...). Ideology, at the very least, refers to a set of idea elements that are bound together (...). One might add, as corollaries, contrast and stability – the one

implying coherence vis-à-vis competing ideologies and the other implying coherence through time" (Gerring, 1997: 980, in: *ibid.*).

From a historical standpoint, ideology was originally used to describe a metaphysical concept, something unaffected by political circumstances or actions undertaken by political and social actors. Soon after such an understanding of ideology arose, however, the term became consumed by late 18th and early 19th century political conflicts in France. This culminated with Napoleon Bonaparte proclaiming "the ideologues" (by which he meant de Tracy and his colleagues at the Institut National) to be the cause of a social and political crisis (Thompson, 1990: 31). Therefore, it is possible to posit the claim that history of modern political ideas or, to be more precise, of the differences between the three main systems of ideas that are today widely recognized (socialism, liberalism, and conservatism), are closely connected to the period of the French Revolution (Cerovac, 2012: 13).

Due to its vague meaning and different connotations throughout history, researchers of ideology find it extremely hard to provide a definition that encompasses all attributes and functions of ideology as a term (Thorisdottir et al., 2009: 4). Furthermore, it can be problematic to even attempt to define the term "ideology". This is especially true if one is looking for a definition which on the one hand is not too broad, while on the other includes something more than a narrow understanding of the main characteristics of the term. Thorisdottir et al. (*ibid.*) offer two definitions of ideology that encompass both top-down and bottom-up approaches. They argue that ideology can be seen as "a set of doctrines or beliefs that form the basis of a political, economic, or other system" or as "the body of ideas reflecting the social needs and aspirations of an individual, group, class, or culture" (*ibid.*). Jost et al. (2009: 309) underline a somewhat neutral definition of ideology, but when it comes to a belief system they refer to Converse who defined it "as a configuration of ideas and attitudes in which the elements are bound together by some form of constraint or functional interdependence" (Converse, 2006: 3). From the perspective of respondents' psychological stances towards certain issues, ideology can be seen as a "shared framework of mental models that groups or individuals possess that provides both an interpretation of the environment and a prescription as to how that environment should be structured" (Denzau and North, 1994: 4).

2. What Does Ideology Include?

When it comes to specific functions of ideology and the way the term is used by different actors, Jost, Federico and Napier (2009: 309) argue that "ideologies also endeavour to describe or interpret the world as it is (...) and to envision the world as it should be, specifying acceptable means of attaining social, economic, and politi-

cal ideals". That being said, ideology cannot simply be generalized as a common set of values held by individuals. One must take into account the different possible ways by which one can understand the political processes, the role of national governments, the economy and the social order. For instance, even if a group of people is recognized as politically coherent, there can be a significant level of disagreement among them when referring to state interference in market policy. It is also possible for someone to advocate for social and individual liberties, but at the same time favour protective economic measures. Whether it is called ideological inconsistency or pluralism of values, conducting research on the topic of ideology requires the careful consideration of a variety of answers generated by respondents. This remains true even when the respondents represent what could be defined as a nominally homogeneous population in terms of ideological affiliation such as a political party.

Recognising that the complete range of attributes characterizing each ideology is beyond its scope, this paper focuses instead on concepts such as the location and subject matter of individual ideologies. These are the concepts that formed the basis of the analysis conducted by John Gerring. In terms of location, Gerring (1997: 966-968) claimed that ideology can be located in thought, behaviour and language. The most widespread approach to viewing ideology, he states, is to consider it as a set of beliefs. Gerring then proceeds to identify its location by stating that, when we put our thoughts into action, ideology becomes our behaviour. Finally, according to Gerring, the broadest category where ideology can be located is the category of language or discourse, which includes both our thoughts and behaviour (*ibid.*). Regarding its subject matter, Gerring believes that ideology can encompass politics, power, or the world at large. He claims politics is "the home turf of ideology, and remains its common referent" (*ibid.*: 968). On power, Campbell at al. (1960, in: *ibid.*) argue that we can "expect an ideology to encompass content outside the political order as narrowly defined – social and economic relationships, and even matters of religion, education...". According to Marx and Engels, we can use the term ideology for describing the world at large which includes "all conscious and relatively organized ideational phenomena" (Gerring, 1997: 969).

Ian MacKenzie claims that each ideology is structured around three inextricably linked layers or dimensions, those being the empirical, normative and practical (MacKenzie, 2014: 2-3). The empirical layer "is the description of the realities of social and political life (...). The normative layer is an account on how that reality could be bettered (...). We find the practical layer when we come across the strategies and policies that relate to transformation of political realities..." (*ibid.*: 3). This argumentation is fundamental to the process of the evolution of our belief systems as well as to the process by which people tend to reshape their initial opinions in a

more practical direction. Furthermore, these dimensions could be associated with the behaviour of political actors once they start to implement their ideas into legislation.

3. How to Differentiate Ideologies?

As was referenced in the introduction, we focus on six primary political ideologies – socialism, social democracy, liberalism, libertarianism, Christian democracy and conservatism. Each of these ideologies implies certain values people can identify or relate with, but the on-going debate is whether we need to address these values from a social perspective that emphasizes individual freedom, the right of minorities and equality, or should we instead underline the importance of economic freedoms, redistribution levels and taxes. Based on the ideals of the French Revolution, we can argue that the values of freedom, fraternity (solidarity) and equality represent a "starting point of a large number of (neo)liberal, conservative and social democratic political parties" (Cerovac, 2012: 14). This is evidenced by the fact that, as Cerovac points out, "they are explicitly mentioned in political programmes and other documents" (*ibid*.). For example, the idea of freedom is closely related to the ideology of liberalism, both in terms of personal (individual) and economic freedom; social democracy sees equality as a main value and advocates for a higher level of state intervention in economics to achieve this goal; conservatism highlights the value of solidarity among a certain group of people, and sees society as being structured as something akin to a family (*ibid*.).

But these values can fluctuate from the left to the right side of the political spectrum and therefore, cause a shift from one ideology to another. Noam Chomsky, referencing Wilhelm von Humboldt, offers a relevant critique of the classic liberal position. As mentioned above, liberalism promotes both individual and economic freedom without state interference which eventually leads to a capitalist society. But Chomsky argues that this will cause greater inequality among people as well as generate possessive individualism. This lies in opposition with classic liberal thought that favours the self-realization of individuals (Chomsky, 2005: 11-21). Furthermore, when discussing the definitions of left- and right-wing liberalism, we should note that if a certain "political option warns about social inequalities and gives a higher importance to the value of equality, that is considered to be left liberalism (...) if it becomes closer with the idea of solidarity as a means of dealing with the problem of the poorest, then we speak of right liberalism" (Cerovac, 2012: 16). Libertarianism, as was described by its main theorist Robert Nozick, introduces the model of the ultra-minimal state which "provides protection and enforcement services only to those who purchase its protection and enforcement policies. People who do not buy a protection contract from the monopoly do not get protected"

(Nozick, 1974: 26). In terms of their economic outlook, libertarians warn about state intervention, they are against taxation and consider people to be the owners of products they have produced (Cerovac, 2012: 24).

When speaking about the role of ideological fluctuations between ideologies, these can be observed within both social democrats on the ideological left as well as conservatives on the ideological right; the former stand for equality as their main value, but can easily be mistaken for left liberals or socialists, depending on the level of freedom (individual and economic) they are perceived to advocate for; the latter encourage solidarity among the in-group and within the local community, but those conservatives traditionally advocating for more in-group equality tend to be more closely aligned with the "older" forms of conservatism, whereas conservatives arguing for less equality along with promoting free market values tend to be described as belonging to a more "progressive" strand of conservatism (*ibid*.: 16-17). In conclusion, it can be stated that the values mentioned above play a key role in defining one's ideological position, but that they also further complicate matters due to the fact that these varying ideological strands tend to hold at least partially overlapping sets of values.

4. The Six Major Ideologies

4.1. *Liberalism*

Liberalism, both a political and a moral philosophy, can be described as a "political doctrine that takes protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central problem of politics" (Minogue et al., 2019). Liberalism believes that "government is necessary to protect individuals from being harmed by others, but also (recognizes) that government itself can pose a threat to liberty" (*ibid*.). The central goal of liberalism is, therefore, to devise a societal order which aims to both endow the government with the tools necessary to protect individual liberty as well as limit its use of such tools in order to prevent abuse of power (*ibid*.). As Wolin points out, the most frequently espoused rights, as far as liberal doctrine is concerned, are "freedom of speech, press, assembly, religion, property, and procedural rights of due process, e.g., fair trial, right to counsel" (Wolin, 2004: 525). Additionally, according to Dunn, regardless of the specific circumstances within which liberalism manifests itself, such as differing time periods and societies, liberalism promotes certain key values which can be ordered into "categories for setting out the main features of liberalism: political rationalism, hostility to autocracy, cultural distaste for conservatism and for tradition in general, tolerance, and (...) individualism" (Dunn, 2000: 33).

Taking all of this into account, one can note that liberalism has indeed manifested itself in ever new and differing ways since its inception during the 17th cen-

tury. One of the main reasons for these transformations has been liberalism's ambivalent relationship with the issue of societal inequality. Such a state of affairs was primarily caused by the fact that inequality tugs at both fundamental liberal impulses, the impulse to limit government power (so as to prevent abuse) as well as the impulse to expand it (so as to increase positive freedoms for individuals), simultaneously. Wolin illustrates this well when he points out that, "Assuming that rights would be accompanied by ample opportunities for their exercise, freedom would naturally enable some individuals to acquire better education, more wealth, and greater power than others. Freedom thus encouraged the translation of equal rights into inequalities that seemingly could not be alleviated or eradicated altogether without restricting the rights of those who had legally acquired greater social advantage or without taking away some of those gains and, in effect, transferring them to those who, for one reason or another, had failed to exploit freedom successfully" (Wolin, 2004: 525). This is one of the reasons why the term liberalism has, in the second half of the twentieth century and particularly in the US context, shifted away from signifying the advocacy of limited government towards signifying a struggle for civil rights, racial, gender as well as social equality (Minogue et al., 2019).

4.2. Social Democracy

Social democracy, as Heywood (2012) argues, has always been "inherently vague" as an ideology (*ibid*.: 128). For Heywood, social democracy as an ideology could best be described as an "ideological stance that supports a broad balance between market capitalism, on the one hand, and state intervention, on the other hand", which reflects the "compromise between the market and the state" inherent to social democracy (*ibid*.). Despite being only loosely defined, the ideology of social democracy possesses certain key tenets. Firstly, it holds capitalism to be "the only reliable means of generating wealth" (*ibid*.), but also to be a "morally defective means of distributing wealth because of its tendency towards poverty and inequality" (*ibid*.). Additionally, as a consequence of such a state of affairs, social democracy seeks to rectify "the defects of the capitalist system (...) through economic and social intervention, the state being the custodian of the public interest" (*ibid*.).

In terms of its historical origins, social democracy was "based on 19th-century socialism and the tenets of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels" (Britannica. com, 2019), and therefore "shares common ideological roots with communism but eschews its militancy and totalitarianism" (*ibid*.). Historically, social democracy was a revisionist ideology and represented a "change in basic Marxist doctrine, primarily in the former's repudiation of the use of revolution to establish a socialist society" (*ibid*.). After World War Two, social democracy underwent profound transformations. This was both a reflection of the modernization of society as well as a reaction to the threat of Soviet totalitarianism Western Europe was facing at the

time. This process had several consequences, primarily that in "addition to abandoning violence and revolution as tools of social change, social democracy took a stand in opposition to totalitarianism. The Marxist view of democracy as a 'bourgeois' facade for class rule was abandoned, and democracy was proclaimed essential for socialist ideals. Increasingly, social democracy adopted the goal of state regulation of business and industry as sufficient to further economic growth and equitable income" (*ibid.*).

Taking all of this into account, it is important to note that social democracy underwent an additional significant transformation during the 1980s and 1990s. This was caused primarily by the "processes of market liberalization, 'transnationalization', and cross-border economic activity (which had) diminished the powers of nation-states" (Lewis & Surender, 2004: 8). All of this led to many social democratic parties in the West embracing the politics of the *Third Way*. Whyman (2006) provides a very clear-cut definition of this term, describing it as "distinct from previous versions of social democracy (...) *Third Way* theorists concentrate upon reforming social and economic policy to enhance competitiveness within a world dominated by globalization and technological change, which they believe renders previous forms of social democratic strategy powerless. Thus, the *Third Way* represents a form of 'new' social democracy, occupying a middle path between neo-liberalism and traditional forms of social democracy itself" (*ibid.*: xi). Finally, social democracy seems to currently be in the throes of another transformation as evidenced by the fact that since the 2010s, the Third Way has generally fallen out of favour, both in terms of its electoral success as well as its policy response to the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008-2009 (Meyer & Rutherford, 2012: 5).

4.3. Socialism

Over the course of its historical development the ideology of socialism has taken on many varying forms and has been implemented in various local societal circumstances. This is one of the reasons why authors such as Newman (2005) find it difficult to provide a unique definition of the ideology. As Newman writes: "One way of discussing so diverse a phenomenon is to claim that all forms of socialism share some fundamental characteristic (...), but this essentialist approach normally degenerates into rather dogmatic assertions about the nature of *true socialism*" (*ibid.*: 2). In order to both address this issue as well as be able to provide a working definition of socialism as an ideology, Newman offers a definition which, rather than searching for the *essence* of socialism, represents the minimal consensus existing among all the various strands of the ideology. Newman defines socialism as an ideology characterized by three primary features. The first feature is socialism's "commitment to the creation of an egalitarian society (...) (because) no socialist would

defend the current inequalities of wealth and power" (*ibid*.). Second comes the so-cialist belief in the "construction of an alternative egalitarian society based on the values of solidarity and cooperation" (*ibid*.: 3). The third feature necessarily follows from the second because it represents "a relatively optimistic view of human beings and their ability to cooperate with one another" (*ibid*.). Socialism, therefore, stems from a tradition of utopian thought married with, as Newman puts it, the 19th-century idea "that human beings may act as subjects of history" (*ibid*.: 4).

Much like Newman, Rieger (2004) has also recognized the stark differences within the socialist tradition but has, nonetheless, provided a more detailed defi-nition of the term. For Rieger, socialism "denotes ideologies which propagate the overcoming of capitalism as well as the liberation of the working class from po-verty and repression". Furthermore, according to Rieger, socialism aims to replace the current system with "a social order oriented towards equality, solidarity and emancipation" (*ibid*.: 295). The definition provided by Rieger is extremely rele-vant because of the fact that the strongest long-term legacy of socialism, thus far, has been its far-reaching critique of capitalism. Finally, a proper synthesis of both of the above mentioned definitions as well as a description of socialism's relation-ship with social hierarchies is provided by Michie (2001). He clarifies that just as "private ownership defines capitalism, social ownership defines socialism" (*ibid*.: 1516), as well as that the "essential characteristic of socialism (...) is that it destroys social hierarchies, and therefore leads to a politically and economically egalita-rian society" (*ibid*.). Most significantly, as Michie elaborates, such a relationship between socialism and hierarchy must have direct consequences for the economic structure of society: "in order to eliminate social hierarchy in the workplace, enter-prises are run by those employed and not by the representatives of private or state capital" (*ibid*.).

4.4. Libertarianism

Libertarianism, according to David Boaz, is a political philosophy that posits indi-vidual freedom as a central societal value. Iterations of this first principle can be seen in libertarianism's support for concepts such as freedom of speech, private property rights as well as freedom from state intervention. It has its origins in, but is still distinct from, classical liberalism which was developed by John Locke, John Stuart Mill and Adam Smith in their works (Boaz, 2017). Libertarians, therefore, tend to believe "that the scope and powers of government should be constrained so as to allow each individual as much freedom of action as is consistent with a like freedom for everyone else. Thus, they believe that individuals should be free to be-have and to dispose of their property as they see fit, provided that their actions do not infringe on the equal freedom of others" (*ibid*.).

As mentioned earlier, libertarianism is closely related to the concepts of minimal and ultra-minimal state. Both terms were introduced by Robert Nozick, the most important theorist of libertarianism. He argues that there are two main attributes every state has and provides: "It must have a monopoly, or close to a monopoly, of legitimate force in a territory, and it must provide protective services for everyone in that territory. It cannot limit its protective services to paying customers, as a private protection agency would do" (Nozick, 1974, in: Hamowy, 2008: 333). This is what Nozick calls a minimal state, where protection is offered to its every citizen. But his understanding is somewhat broader when he claims that most individuals would seek to protect their rights by joining protection agencies. That would lead to a monopoly of the strongest agency because everyone would want to be protected by the single most powerful of them and people would have to pay for it. This has been called the ultra-minimal state where protection is provided only to those who are ready to meet agencies' requirements. But since there are individuals who are not in position to pay for protection services, Nozick believes this situation is unstable and, consequently, the ultra-minimal state needs to be transformed to a minimal state (*ibid*.: 333-334).

But when it comes to rules of a market economy, libertarians are firmly against state interference and taxation, however they are willing to tolerate taxation needed only for police and judiciary requirements (Cerovac, 2012: 24). The market economy is perceived as an imperative "because it inextricably connects liberty and efficiency and enables free exchange and trade, which maximises the welfare of all parties by enabling each to specialise in their areas of competitive advantage" (Turner, 2008: 115). Due to the fact that libertarians underline individual liberty and freedom of people, which are considered in today's terms as left social values, and are opposed to state intervention and regulation, which can be seen as a right-wing economic position, Rothbard claims that libertarians think of their ideological position as the only consistent one (Rothbard, 2006: 27-28).

4.5. Christian Democracy

While libertarianism was considered as political philosophy, Christian democracy was at first described as political movement that emerged during the mid-19th century in Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland, and has originated mostly from Catholic organizations and associations (Grabow, 2011: 7). The historical development of Christian democracy can be broadly described, but since it is not the focus of this article, we will provide a general overview of its main characteristics that emerged in years after World War II. Huntington and Bale argue that at least from the 1940s "Christian Democracy has been not so much the formal re-Christianising of clearly secularising societies as the

application of rather generalised Christian principles and values to their governance" (Huntington & Bale, 2002: 45). According to the Christian view of society, a strong emphasis is given to each individual and his intrinsic values, but Christian democracy sees people both as individuals and social beings with their responsibilities located in community where they can reach their full potential in cohabitation and participation with others (Grabow, 2011: 7). Furthermore, Christian democrats underline humanism as a fundamental value as opposed to totalitarianism, they support non-state organizations, such as Church, and are opposed to growing impact of the state administration (Pombeni, 2000: 297) which does not necessarily mean they are against government influence.

Christian democrats advocate for a similar level of state intervention when it comes to political and economic matters. Politically, they favour a smaller state that needs to intervene only in particular purposes, for example if an individual's or a community's wellbeing are endangered. Therefore, "the public authorities should merely create the necessary conditions for the individual to develop within the community. Government should never act in place of the community (...) State power is necessary, though merely functionally" (Van Hecke, 2008: 304-305). Economically, Christian democrats support market economy, but consider the state to be a mechanism of achieving a socially inclusive and more balanced community life. Van Hecke claims that Christian democrats want to create equal opportunities for members of community to participate in market economy. Humanity should be at the forefront of this process, while capitalism, as such, needs to meet the requirements of community by becoming more socially conscious (*ibid.*: 304). Due to their position towards the market economy, the Christian democrats "favour relatively extensive welfare states not as a means of economic redistribution, but because the alleviation of poverty and the exercise of compassion are believed to mitigate the development of conflict between rich and poor" (Huntington & Bale, 2002: 45-46).

4.6. Conservatism

When discussing conservatism, it is important to notice that it encompasses a variety of different forms that are products of historical changes after the French Revolution. The first conservatives arose in the late 18th century as a reaction to the French Revolution with the imperative of establishing a constitutional monarchy; they differentiate from modern conservatives primarily in their opposition to free markets, whereas today, conservatives are in favour of market forces and are opposed to the welfare state (Cerovac, 2012: 29). Michael Freeden highlights Huntington's explanation and approach to conservatism when he argues that "it is a response to an attack mounted against established institutions (...) Its life pattern is more like a series

of sudden births and sudden deaths, activated when provoked, dormant or absent when not" (Freeden, 1996: 329). The most common attribute of conservatism that is widely understood as its backbone is its unwillingness to accept any kind of social or political change. But O'Hara claims that conservatives are not necessarily against any kind of change in the private or public spheres. On the contrary, they are willing to accept the level of social, political or economic change that can elevate existing arrangements in creating a more sustainable system (O'Hara, 2011, in: Andreasson, 2014: 48).

There are three definitions or theories of conservatism, according to Huntington (1957). The first one Huntington calls the aristocratic theory, which describes conservatism as a product of social clashes during the French Revolution or, to be more precise, as a reaction to liberalism and its understanding of social order, with conservatism being closely related to the feudal system and *ancien regime* (*ibid*.: 454). The autonomous definition sees conservatism as independent and free of belonging or being connected to any social group, thus highlighting "universal values such as justice, order, balance, moderation" (*ibid*.: 455). The last theory is situational and sees conservatism as a product of a "historical situation in which a fundamental challenge is directed at established institutions and in which the supporters of those institutions employ the conservative ideology in their defence" (*ibid*.). In the general sense, conservatives favour Church and family as a means of transcending human fallibility, they emphasize the authority of traditional institutions and consider humans to be flawed by their nature; in economic terms they emphasize private ownership, coherent fiscal policies, lower taxes and decentralisation (Cerovac, 2012: 30-34).

5. On Measuring Ideology

In addition to the different ways of defining the term ideology, there are also different approaches on how to measure and categorize it. The most commonly known approaches are the conceptual, the discursive and the quantitative approach (Maynard, 2013, in: Laméris, 2015: 6). The conceptual approach underlines "the ideas and beliefs that form the basis for an ideology. The way we communicate and formulate our political preferences is the main focal point of the discursive approach. The goal of the quantitative approach is to measure ideology (...) ordinarily, or either (via) a left-right or liberal-conservative scale" (*ibid*.).

It is this left-right scale, based on the left-right dichotomy of politics, which serves as a framework of understanding ideologies and, consequently, the political spectrum. This dichotomy originates from the seating schedule in the French Assembly during the time of the French Revolution. During this time, the status quo supporters were positioned on the King's right side, while the opposition occupied

the benches to the left (Jost et al., 2009: 310). According to Jost, such a division had several implications, the most important of which came about due to "two interrelated aspects, namely (a) advocating versus resisting social change (as opposed to tradition), and (b) rejecting versus accepting inequality" (Jost et al., 2009: 310). Hence, the most common scale used to measure political ideology became the one-dimensional left-right scale where people self-position themselves in terms of their attitudes and behaviour. However, this kind of measure of political ideology suffers from many limitations and there have been several notable criticisms of it over the years.

Kim and Fording, for instance, considered the left-to-right political scale to be far from ideal when it came to measuring one's ideological position. They argued that the left-to-right scale implied the existence of an identical perception of the political centre among all of the respondents participating in a survey. This problem is further exacerbated when dealing with respondents stemming from different countries, cultures and time periods (Kim & Fording, 1998: 75). Therefore, Kim and Fording expressed their doubts about the prospect of the self-placement on a left-to-right scale enabling an individual to express his/her true preferences. The Eurobarometer survey, which is conducted in every European Union member state, displays the same methodological issues (*ibid.*). This is primarily due to the fact of one of its main components being the unidimensional left-to-right ideological scale. This unidimensional character of the left-right scale is another important factor that needs to be addressed. Namely, it prevents the scale from authentically reflecting the different attitudes of respondents or their individual positions because said attitudes can be easily manipulated, influenced or compromised. Furthermore, said attitudes could be comprised of heterogeneous ideas or further still hold principles that a unidimensional reading of ideology would find to be inherently contradictory (Jennings, 1992, in: Laméris, 2015: 6-7). Thus, the unidimensional left-right scale cannot include all the characteristics and attributes of ideology that were discussed in the previous chapter.

This problem was also analysed by Catherine de Vries, Armen Hakhverdian and Bram Lancee (2013) in their article on the dynamics of voters' identification. They conducted a research among voters from the Netherlands and gathered information for the time period from 1980 to 2006. The results demonstrated that cultural factors such as anti-immigration attitudes became dominant over economic factors in the self-positioning process of identification. This served to further illuminate the complex and multifaceted nature of the left-right ideological divide which is usually left ignored by a unidimensional interpretation of ideology provided by the left-right ideological scale. An additional example of the problems generated by the unidimensionality of the scale is demonstrated by the research that

"contrasts individuals' preferences for redistribution with their stated political positions. Such research regularly demonstrates that there are important and consistent differences associated with ageing, gender, income and education" (Rockey, 2015: 1). These are the reasons why there is a need for additional mechanisms of measuring ideology that could provide more nuanced and credible results overall.

An interesting view of the left-right scale and its use in modern politics is given by Jonathan White. He claims that there is a very small number of people, mostly political students, who can provide somewhat unbiased accounts of left- and right-wing ideologies as well as the terms left and right themselves. As White further claims, for political actors, the left-right differentiation is deployed only in tactical terms as political leverage over their opponents (White, 2010: 3). This is done by political actors in order to legitimize their actions in the eyes of the electorate and can then serve as a basis for both political and democratic legitimacy (*ibid*.). This has proven to be true, especially in Croatia, where the electoral behaviour is often based on territorial, historical and cultural cleavages rather than on the specific programmes of political parties (Henjak et al., 2013: 453).

6. Methodology and Findings

The goal of this paper is to examine the relationship between the unidimensional left-right measure of ideology and more nuanced measures of specific political ideologies. In order to do so, we took the following steps. First, based on the theoretical exploration of six major ideologies presented above, we developed a pool of items for measuring each ideology. Second, we conducted an online questionnaire on a convenient, non-representative sample of students from the University of Zagreb, Croatia. Students were recruited via various social media student groups; data was collected between January 16th, 2018 and February 16th, 2018. Third, data was analysed with the goal of assessing the best items to measure specific ideologies. Finally, we assessed the relationship between the support of major ideologies and the self-positioning on the left-right ideology scale.

Analysis was done in R 3.6.1., using package *psych* (Revelle, 2018). The sample included 369 participants with average age 22,62 (SD=2,62); 39,83% were male; 47,4% were social science students, followed by 14,9% of humanities, 13% biotechnical, 12,3% technical and 6,2% of both natural and biomedical sciences students. The average score for the left-right ideology scale (0-10) was 4,48 (SD=2,33). Items measuring particular ideologies were measured on a 0-10 scale. In order to assess the quality of proposed items for each ideology measure, the following steps were taken. First, inter-item correlations were checked and items with correlation less than 0,3 with at least one other item were removed from further analysis. Second, Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of

sampling adequacy were used for evaluating the factorability of the proposed items. Third, the suggested number of factors was determined by a parallel analysis and a visual inspection of the scree plot. Fourth, a factor analysis was conducted, followed by the evaluation of the factor structure. When an appropriate factor structure was found, mean score based on included items was calculated which represented the participants' support for a particular ideology.

6.1. Christian Democracy

Table 1 contains the initial pool of items for measuring Christian democracy and their correlations. Two items concerning taxes for wealthy citizens and the usage of humanitarian non-governmental organizations were excluded from further analysis because of their low inter-item correlations.

Table 1. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Christian Democracy

	Wealthier members of society should pay more taxes.	Marriage should be a union between a woman and a man, everything else is a contract.	In political life, the Church should have the right to freely express its opinion as any other social actor.	Religious education should be a compulsory subject in primary school as it teaches children moral behavior and ethics.	Marriage is the most important unit of a society.	Society should take care of its weakest members (poor, sick, elderly) via humanitarian NGOs.	Healthcare professionals should be able to make a conscientious objection to all aspects of abortion.
Wealthier members of society should pay more taxes.	1,00	0,11	0,14	-0,03	0,14	0,00	0,13
Marriage should be a union between a woman and a man, everything else is a contract.		1,00	0,38	0,72	0,59	0,00	0,52
In political life, the Church should have the right to freely express its opinion as any other social actor.			1,00	0,32	0,21	0,04	0,41
Religious education should be a compulsory subject in primary school as it teaches children moral behavior and ethics.				1,00	0,51	0,04	0,37
Marriage is the most important unit of a society.					1,00	0,11	0,45

Society should take care of its weakest members (poor, sick, elderly) via humanitarian NGOs.						1,00	0,06
Healthcare professionals should be able to make a conscientious objection to all aspects of abortion.							1,00

The rest of the items were analysed via parallel analysis and we visually inspected the scree plot. Only the first factor had an eigenvalue greater than one, and it was followed by a sharp drop in eigenvalue for the second factor. Thus, an exploratory factor analysis with one factor was conducted. Results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Factor Structure for Christian Democracy

Items	Loadings
Marriage should be a union between a woman and a man, everything else is a contract.	0,904
In political life, the Church should have the right to freely express its opinion as any other social actor.	0,448
Religious education should be a compulsory subject in primary school as it teaches children moral behavior and ethics.	0,743
Marriage is the most important unit of a society.	0,662
Healthcare professionals should be able to make a conscientious objection to all aspects of abortion.	0,609
N	
% variance explained	47,6
Bartlett's test of sphericity	654,15***
KMO	0,77

***p<0,001

6.2. Conservatism

Table 3 contains inter-item correlations for items measuring conservatism. Based on our criteria, we excluded the item related to the relation between rationalism and social order. The rest of the items were included in the factor analysis.

Table 3. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Conservatism

	Since Croatia is a majority Catholic country, the Catholic Church should be funded from the state budget at the current or even greater level.	Religion and institutional constraints are necessary to obscure a person's weaknesses and get him on the right track.	Rationalism, that is, the idea of a free mind, is the teaching on which every social order is based.*	The use of marijuana for medical purposes in severe patients is justified.*	Unless a woman's life is in danger, abortion should not be legal.	Logic and reason are more reliable in decision making than experience and tradition.*	Family, friends, business, community and nation are groups into which an individual is rooted and which give his life security and meaning.
Since Croatia is a majority Catholic country, the Catholic Church should be funded from the state budget at the current or even greater level.	1,00	0,64	0,20	0,42	0,62	0,41	0,22
Religion and institutional constraints are necessary to obscure a person's weaknesses and get him on the right track.		1,00	0,15	0,27	0,56	0,37	0,30
Rationalism, that is, the idea of a free mind, is the teaching on which every social order is based.*			1,00	0,09	0,23	0,27	0,09
The use of marijuana for medical purposes in severe patients is justified.*				1,00	0,27	0,31	0,05
Unless a woman's life is in danger, abortion should not be legal.					1,00	0,28	0,28
Logic and reason are more reliable in decision making than experience and tradition.*						1,00	0,22

Family, friends, business, community and nation are groups into which an individual is rooted and which give his life security and meaning.								1,00

*Recoded items

Parallel analysis and scree plot suggested that only one factor should be extracted from the remaining items. Results of the factor analysis (Table 4) point to a satisfactory factor structure for measuring conservatism.

Table 4. Factor Structure for Conservatism

Items	Loadings
Since Croatia is a majority Catholic country, the Catholic Church should be funded from the state budget at the current or even greater level.	0,88
Religion and institutional constraints are necessary to obscure a person's weaknesses and get him on the right track.	0,74
The use of marijuana for medical purposes in severe patients is justified.*	0,44
Unless a woman's life is in danger, abortion should not be legal.	0,69
Logic and reason are more reliable in decision making than experience and tradition.*	0,48
Family, friends, business, community and nation are groups into which an individual is rooted and which give his life security and meaning.	0,33
N	
% variance explained	39
Bartlett's test of sphericity	603,73***
KMO	0,79

***p<0,001

6.3. Liberalism

Based on the inter-item correlations (Table 5) we excluded items regarding workers' unionization rights and minority rights. The rest of the items were included in the analysis.

Table 5. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Liberalism

	All people should be equal before the law.	The right to an abortion should be a woman's personal right concerning her body and the government should protect that right.	The state and the church should be completely separate and independent of one another.	Workers should be entitled to unionization.	All individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation, should be entitled to marriage.	Minorities should not have the opportunity of equal education and employment as the majority.*
All people should be equal before the law.	1,00	0,19	0,30	0,12	0,26	0,25
The right to an abortion should be a woman's personal right concerning her body and the government should protect that right.		1,00	0,54	0,27	0,70	0,18
The state and the church should be completely separate and independent of one another.			1,00	0,20	0,59	0,26
Workers should be entitled to unionization.				1,00	0,18	0,20
All individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation, should be entitled to marriage.					1,00	0,27
Minorities should not have the opportunity of equal education and employment as the majority.*						1,00

*Recoded items

Results of the factor analysis point to a satisfactory measure of liberalism and can be seen in Table 6 (on the next page).

Table 6. Factor Structure for Liberalism

Items	Loadings
All people should be equal before the law.	0,32
The right to an abortion should be a woman's personal right concerning her body and the government should protect that right.	0,78
The state and the church should be completely separate and independent of one another.	0,71
All individuals, regardless of their sexual orientation, should be entitled to marriage.	0,87
N	
% variance explained	49,1
Bartlett's test of sphericity	467,96***
KMO	0,72

***p<0,001

6.4. Libertarianism

Unfortunately, as can be seen in Table 7, inter-item measures of libertarianism were too low to conduct a meaningful factor analysis, and the measure of this ideology was removed from further analysis.

Table 7. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Libertarianism

	An individual has complete freedom of action if his or her actions threaten his or her own safety.	An individual has complete freedom of action if his or her actions threaten his or her individual interest if it leads to the common good.	An individual should sacrifice his or her actions threaten the security of the state.	An individual has complete freedom of action if his or her actions threaten the security of the state.	The state has the right not to publish information it deems important.*	The free market is the best path to development and prosperity.	Civil society group and non-governmental organizations are more effective than state institutions.	Drug use should be fully decriminalized.	Every person has absolute freedom and ownership of the resources he or she appropriates through his own work.
An individual has complete freedom of action if his or her actions threaten his or her own safety.	1,00	0,13	0,10	-0,03	0,01	0,05	0,24	0,19	

An individual should sacrifice his or her individual interest if it leads to the common good.	1,00	0,05	0,15	0,19	0,03	0,02	0,10
An individual has complete freedom of action if his or her actions threaten the security of the state.		1,00	-0,01	-0,02	0,05	0,12	0,00
The state has the right not to publish information it deems important.*			1,00	-0,09	0,26	0,01	-0,01
The free market is the best path to development and prosperity.				1,00	0,00	-0,03	0,35
Civil society group and non-governmental organizations are more effective than state institutions.					1,00	0,10	0,16
Drug use should be fully decriminalized.						1,00	-0,09
Every person has absolute freedom and ownership of the resources he or she appropriates through his own work.							1,00

6.5. Social Democracy

Two items regarding taxation and health insurance, as well as integration of migrants into society were removed from further analysis.

Table 8. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Social Democracy

	Health insurance should be organized in such a way that all citizens are flat-rate taxed.	The state should take care of the socially disadvantaged residents.	Migrants should be fully integrated into society.	There should be mandatory women's quotas in political parties.	College education should be free for all.
Health insurance should be organized in such a way that all citizens are flat-rate taxed.	1,00	0,22	0,06	0,09	0,21
The state should take care of the socially disadvantaged residents.		1,00	0,02	0,26	0,44
Migrants should be fully integrated into society.			1,00	0,09	0,06

There should be mandatory women's quotas in political parties.				1,00	0,32
College education should be free for all.					1,00

Scree plot and parallel analysis pointed to a single factor. The results of the factor analysis can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9. Factor Structure for Social Democracy

Items	Loadings
The state should take care of the socially disadvantaged residents.	0,59
There should be mandatory women's quotas in political parties.	0,43
College education should be free for all.	0,74
N	
% variance explained	36,3
Bartlett's test of sphericity	125.57***
KMO	0,61

6.6. Socialism

Inter-item correlations for socialism can be seen in Table 10. All items have satisfactory correlations and they were all included in the factor analysis.

Table 10. Inter-item Correlations of Items Measuring Socialism

	Large corporations are harmful to our society.	Private companies cannot be trusted to work in the interests of their employees.	All citizens must have an equal life outcome.	Corporations should never be allowed to profit from education, healthcare, drinking water sources or traffic routes.	It is better for society that the main drivers of the economy are state-owned.	Resources required for production must be state-owned.	No one should claim ownership of natural resources.
Large corporations are harmful to our society.	1,00	0,44	0,28	0,45	0,34	0,34	0,27
Private companies cannot be trusted to work in the interests of their employees.		1,00	0,20	0,30	0,36	0,28	0,22

Items							
All citizens must have an equal life outcome.			1,00	0,32	0,27	0,35	0,39
Corporations should never be allowed to profit from education, healthcare, drinking water sources or traffic routes.				1,00	0,35	0,35	0,44
It is better for society that the main drivers of the economy are state-owned.					1,00	0,68	0,32
Resources required for production must be state-owned.						1,00	0,33
No one should claim ownership of natural resources.							1,00

Both parallel analysis and scree plot pointed to a single factor structure, which was confirmed with satisfactory results of the factor analysis (Table 11).

Table 11. Factor Structure for Socialism

Items	Loadings
Large corporations are harmful to our society.	0,59
Private companies cannot be trusted to work in the interests of their employees.	0,5
All citizens must have an equal life outcome.	0,5
Corporations should never be allowed to profit from education, healthcare, drinking water sources or traffic routes.	0,63
It is better for society that the main drivers of the economy are state-owned.	0,68
Resources required for production must be state-owned.	0,69
No one should claim ownership of natural resources.	0,55
N	
% variance explained	0,35
Bartlett's test of sphericity	686,18***
KMO	0,78

Mean support for each ideology was calculated as a simple mean of items included in the final solutions of factor analyses. Next, we divided the sample into three groups based on participants' self-positioning on the left-right ideology continuum – leftist (0-3), centrist (4-6), rightist (7-10). We compared these groups in their support for ideologies using Kruskal-Wallis test and post-hoc Dunn test. Results can be seen in Table 12 (on the next page).

Table 12. Mean Support for Ideologies Based on Position on the Left-Right Ideological Continuum

	Christian Democracy	Conservatism	Liberalism	Social Democracy	Socialism
Total	4,55 (2,77)	3,25 (1,92)	8,12 (2,34)	7,09 (2,23)	5,96 (1,98)
Leftist	2,67 (1,68)	2,07 (0,99)	9,57 (0,73)	7,82 (1,48)	6,58 (1,69)
Centrist	4,7 (2,34)	3,2 (1,53)	8,28 (1,94)	7,18 (2,26)	5,86 (1,95)
Rightist	7,75 (2,03)	5,54 (1,85)	5,09 (2,17)	5,56 (2,59)	5,01 (2,16)

Standard deviation in parenthesis; all differences between groups are statistically significant ($p < 0,05$)

At level of the total sample we can see that participants exhibit highest support for liberalism and social democracy, and lowest support for conservatism. Leftist and centrist follow this pattern, while rightist have, compared to the whole sample, above average support for Christian democracy and conservatism, and below average support for social democracy and socialism. Looking at the data differently, we present correlations between particular ideologies and the left-right self-positioning (Table 13).

Table 13. Correlations Between Left-Right Self-positioning and Particular Ideologies

	Left-Right	Christian Democracy	Conservatism	Liberalism	Social Democracy	Socialism
Left-Right	1,00	0,68	0,66	-0,70	-0,40	-0,34
Christian Democracy		1,00	0,80	-0,82	-0,22	-0,13
Conservatism			1,00	-0,83	-0,24	-0,16
Liberalism				1,00	0,33	0,20
Social Democracy					1,00	0,61
Socialism						1,00

We can see that that the correlations between the participants' self-positioning on the left-right continuum and support for particular ideologies is in the expected direction. The more participants position themselves on the right ideological spectrum, the more they support Christian democracy and conservatism and less liberalism, social democracy and socialism.

Conclusion

The goal of this study was to go deeper than a simple examination of the applicability of the L-R ideological scale within the Croatian context. Instead, the paper sought to examine the relationship between the L-R ideological scale and the individual measures of major political ideologies. The data gathered was analysed with the goal of assessing the best items to measure these specific ideologies. The paper then went on to assess the relationship between the support for major ideologies and the self-positioning on the L-R ideological scale. In this regard, the paper represents an original scientific contribution within the research of ideology in the Croatian context. While the L-R scale has previously been applied to the Croatian context by authors such as Šram (2008: 209) and Milas & Rihtar (1997: 663), they have consistently limited the starting positions of their research to the perception of ideology as a bipolar construct of which the L-R ideological scale is one variant and to which ideological factors/determinants can be ascribed. While Čulig (2004: 287) did not fall in a similar trap, he chose to focus on "latent dimensions of ideology" and avoided exploring the relationship between ideology and the L-R scale in the Croatian context altogether. Therefore, in terms of the results and original contribution generated by the study, the connections between the respondents' self-positioning on the L-R ideological scale and their affinity for individual ideologies have been found to fit the expected patterns but with varying degrees for the different pools of items associated with different ideologies. Thus, the findings of this study confirm the usefulness of using L-R measurement of ideological self-positioning (e.g. Čular, 1999; Mair, 2007). However, they also point to the importance of being aware of the limits of that measure (e.g. Bauer et al., 2017), and, if needed, of using more nuanced measures of ideological thought.

It's important to note the limitations of this study. First, the examined student sample of 369 participants (students of the University of Zagreb), besides being relatively small, is also not representative either of the student population of the University of Zagreb, the wider student population of Croatia or the national population. In addition to this fact, previous studies have demonstrated that, overall, the student population generally tends to exhibit a greater knowledge of topics associated with ideology and politics than the general population as well as tending to be significantly more left leaning than the national average (Cambpell & Horowitz, 2015: 41). This study can therefore be seen as a pilot study, serving as a basis for further research on a larger, nationally representative sample as well as for fully developing measures of the major political ideologies by undertaking a more delicate and detailed scale creation process. Finally, it is also necessary to inspect each of the pools of items associated with the ideologies which were deployed during the study in order to seek out potential connecting factors between individual ideologies, such as economic issues or common relationships to the concept of liberty.

REFERENCES

Andreasson, Stefan. 2014. Conservatism, in: Geoghegan, Vincent and Wilford, Rick (eds.): *Political Ideologies: An Introduction – Fourth Edition*. Routledge. London and New York: 47-70.

Bauer, Paul C., Barberá, Pablo, Ackermann, Kathrin and Venetz, Aaron. 2017. Is the Left-Right Scale a Valid Measure of Ideology? *Political Behaviour*, (39), 3: 553-583.

Boaz, David. 2017. Libertarianism. Britannica.com. https://www.britannica.com/topic/libertarianism-politics (accessed 19.8.2019).

Britannica.com. 2019. Encyclopedia Britannica. "Social democracy" (accessed 28.8.2019).

Campbell, Colin and Horowitz, Jonathan. 2015. Does College Influence Sociopolitical Attitudes? *Sociology of Education*, (89), 1: 40-58.

Cerovac, Ivan. 2012. Trebaju li nam političke ideje, in: Živković, Milan F. (ed.): *Političke ideje i javne politike: priručnik za političke aktiviste*. National Democratic Institute. Washington: 13-60.

Chomsky, Noam. 2005. *Vlada u budućnosti*. Naklada Jesenski i Turk. Zagreb.

Converse, Philip E. 2006. The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Public (1964). *Critical Review*, (18), 1-3: 1-74.

Čular, Goran. 1999. Koncept lijevog i desnog u empirijskoj političkoj znanosti: značenje, razumijevanje, struktura, sadržaj. *Politička misao*, (36), 1: 153-168.

Čulig, Benjamin. 2004. Analiza političkih stavova stanovništva Hrvatske. *Socijalna ekologija*, (13), 3-4: 287-304.

De Vries, Catherine E., Hakhverdian, Armen and Lancee, Bram. 2013. The Dynamics of Voters' Left/Right Identification: The Role of Economics and Cultural Attitudes. *Political Science Research and Methods*, (1), 2: 223-238.

Denzau, Arthur T. and North, Douglass C. 1994. Shared Mental Models: Ideologies and Institutions. *Kyklos*, (47), 1: 3-31.

Dunn, John. 2000. *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Freeden, Michael. 1996. *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Gerring, John. 1997. Ideology: A Definitional Analysis. *Political Research Quarterly*, (50), 4: 957-994.

Grabow, Karsten. 2011. What is Christian Democracy, in: Grabow, Karsten (ed.): *Christian Democracy: Principles and Policy Making*. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung e.V. Berlin: 7-12.

Hamowy, Ronald. 2008. *The Encyclopedia of Libertarianism*. SAGE Publications. Los Angeles.

Hanson, Jon. 2012. Ideology, Psychology and Law, in: Hanson, Jon (ed.): *Ideology, Psychology and Law*. Oxford University Press. Oxford and New York: 3-32.

Henjak, Andrija, Zakošek, Nenad and Čular, Goran. 2013. Croatia, in: Berglund, S., Ekman, J., Deegan-Krause, K. and Knutsen, T. (eds.): *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. Northampton: 443-481.

Heywood, Andrew. 2012. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Huntington, Nicholas and Bale, Tim. 2002. New Labour: New Christian Democracy? *The Political Quarterly*, (73), 1: 44-50.

Huntington, Samuel. 1957. Conservatism as an Ideology. *American Political Science Review*, (51), 2: 454-473.

Jost, John T., Federico, Christopher M. and Napier, Jaime L. 2009. Political Ideology: Its Structure, Functions, and Elective Affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, (60): 307-337.

Kim, Heemin and Fording, Richard C. 1998. Voter Ideology in Western Democracies, 1946-1989. *European Journal of Political Research*, (33): 73-97.

Knight, Kathleen. 2006. Transformations of the Concept of Ideology in the Twentieth Century. *American Political Science Review*, (100), 4: 619-626.

Laméris, Maite. 2015. *On the Measurement and Validation of Political Ideology*. University of Groningen. Groningen.

Lewis, Jane and Surender, Rebecca. 2004. *Welfare State Change: Towards a Third Way?* Oxford University Press. New York.

MacKenzie, Iain. 2014. The Meaning of Ideology, in: Geoghegan, Vincent and Wilford, Rick (eds.): *Political Ideologies: An Introduction – Fourth Edition*. Routledge. London and New York: 1-19.

Mair, Peter. 2007. Left-Right Orientations, in: Dalton, R. J. and Klingemann, Hanns-Dieter (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. Oxford University Press. Oxford: 207-222.

Meyer, Henning and Rutherford, Jonathan. 2012. *The Future of European Social Democracy: Building the Good Society*. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Michie, Jonathan. 2001. *Reader's Guide to the Social Sciences*. Fitzroy Dearborn. London.

Milas, Goran, and Rihtar, Stanko. 1997. Ideološke odrednice stranačke naklonosti i namjere glasovanja. *Društvena istraživanja: Časopis za opća društvena pitanja*, (32), 6: 663-676.

Minogue, Kenneth, Dagger, Richard, Ball, Terence and Girvetz, Harry K. 2019. Liberalism. Britannica.com. https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism (accessed 29.8.2019).

Newman, Michael. 2005. *Socialism: a very short introduction*. Oxford University Press. Oxford and New York.

Nozick, Robert. 1974. *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd. Oxford.

Nunes, Ray. 1991. What Is Socialism? https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/new-zealand/nunes-socialism.pdf (accessed 8.1.2018).

Pombeni, Paolo. 2000. The Ideology of Christian Democracy. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, (5), 3: 289-300.

Revelle, William. 2018. *Psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research*. Northwestern University. Evanston, Illinois.

Rieger, Günter. 2004. Sozialismus, in: Nohlen, Dieter (ed.): *Kleines Lexikon der Politik*. C. H. Beck. München: 595.

Rockey, James. 2015. *Who is Leftwing and Who Just Thinks They Are?* University of Leicester. Leicester.

Rothbard, Murray N. 2006. *For A New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto*. Ludwig von Mises Institute. Auburn.

Šram, Zlatko. 2008. Ideologijska strukturiranost socijalno-ekonomskih orijentacija. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, (15), 2: 209.

Thompson, John B. 1990. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Polity Press. Cambridge.

Thorisdottir, Hulda, Jost, John T. and Kay, Aaron C. 2009. On the Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification, in: Thorisdottir, Hulda, Jost, John T. and Kay, Aaron C. (eds.): *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification*. Oxford University Press. New York: 3-27.

Turner, Rachel S. 2008. *Neo-Liberal Ideology: History, Concepts and Policies*. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

Van Hecke, Steven. 2008. Christian Democracy and Conservatism on Demography: Some Explorations. *European View*, (7), 2: 303-307.

White, Jonathan. 2010. Left, Right and Beyond: the Pragmatics of Political Mapping. *London School of Economics and Political Science 'Europe in Question' Discussion Paper Series*. Paper No. 24.

Whyman, Philip. B. 2006. *Third Way Economics: Theory and Evaluation*. Palgrave Macmillan. Hampshire and New York.

Wolin, Sehldon S. 2004. *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey.

Mailing Addresses:

Leon Runje, Ministry of Defence, Republic of Croatia, Trg kralja Petra Krešimira IV br. 1, 10 000 Zagreb. *E-mail:* leonrunje91@gmail.com

Valentino Petrović, Institute for Development and International Relations, Ul. Ljudevita Farkaša Vukotinovića 2, 10 000 Zagreb. *E-mail*: valentinopetrovic23@gmail.com

Kosta Bovan, Faculty of Political Sciences, Lepušićeva 6, 10 000 Zagreb. *E-mail*: kosta.bovan@fpzg.hr