

APPENDIX 5

WAY OF LIFE THEORY

TYPES WITHOUT DIMENSIONS

Overview

Many thinkers have identified social types intuitively, i.e., without deriving them from theoretical dimensions. Their types are inferred from reality or based on academic literature. This appendix attempts to provide a comprehensive overview of such typologies. It is an inherently unsystematic exercise. I know of only two comparable attempts: Wicks (2008) who collected authors who specified the three pro-active types, and Kemper and Collins (1990) who collected authors who found the Z and X axes across a broad range of disciplines.

Four lists are set out herein:

- Table A5.1 Types (numbers) derived, like WOLT, *from* dimensions which repeats Table A4.6 for completeness and comparison.
- Table A5.2 Some types (numbers) intuited *without* dimensions being typologies that fit well to WOLT.
- Table A5.3 All types (names) *with and without* dimensions being: categorisations that fit less well with WOLT, the good fits of Table A5.2, and the very good fit of the types from dimensions of Table A5.1.
- Rick Wicks's (2008) list of tripartite typologies.

In addition there is a note on the countless dimension schemes without types.

Table A5.1. Eight theorists' types (numbers) and dimensions

Bowles 1998	1	2	3	4		X	Y		economics
Marriott 1976	1	2	3	4		X	Y	(Z)	anthropology
Douglas 1970	1	2	3	4	5	X		Z	anthropology
Ouchi 1980	1	2	3			X	Y		organisation theory
Knoke 1990	1	2	3	4			Y	Z	political science
Merton 1938	1	2		4		X	Y		sociology
Triandis 1995	1	2	3			X	Z		psychology
Swanson 1969	1	2	3	4		X	Z		sociology

The above repeats Table A4.6; the eight theorists are discussed in Appendix 4.

Intuited types

Table A5.2 lists theorists who invented types without dimensions which conform well to WOLT.

Table A5.2 Types (numbers) intuited without dimensions

Plato 400BC	2	4	5?	philosophy	
Montesquieu 1752	2	3		law (society)	
Comte 1840	2			sociology	
Marx 1848	1	2	3	4	political economy
Maine 1861	1	2			law (society)
Peirce 1867	1	2	3		philosophy
Tönnies 1887	1	2/3			sociology
Spencer 1896	1	2			sociology
Weber 1902	1	2			economics, sociology
Pareto 1916	1	2			economics, sociology
Linton 1936	1	2			anthropology
Becker 1942	1	2			anthropology
Elazar 1960	1	2	3		political science
Etzioni 1961	1	2	3		sociology
Lipset 1963	1		3		political science
Rigby 1964	1	2			political science
Bakan 1966	1		3		sociology
Miller 1975	1	2	3		law (justice)
Maruyama 1980	1	2	3		anthropology
Fiske 1991	1	2	3		anthropology
Colebatch 1993	1	2	3		organisation theory

Table A5.2. Dates indicate chronology; for reference citations see text or Table A5.3. The types of Marx and earlier are inferred. Weber and Pareto describe 3s but include them in 1s.

Of the modern¹ non-dimensional typologies in Table A5.2 those of Elazar, Etzioni, Miller, and Colebatch & Larmour are fairly close to WOLT, Peirce's categories² are comparable to WOLT as are the schemes of Maine, Tönnies, Spencer, Weber, Pareto,³ Linton, Becker (1942), Lipset, Rigby, Bakan, Maruyama and Fiske.

It is, of course, a matter of judgement as to what fits into Table A5.2 but nothing critically depends upon it. *Not* included Table A5.2 are Durkheim's and Little's schemes, which could be claimed as partly compatible with WOLT, and

¹ For a comparison of grid-group theory with the categorisations of Montesquieu, Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, and Elazar see Thompson, M., R. Ellis, et al. (1990). *Cultural theory*. Boulder, Westview Press. For a comparison of grid-group theory and Inglehart's theory see Grendstad, G. (1999). "A political cultural map of Europe: a survey approach." *GeoJournal* **47**: 463-475. For comparison of grid-group theory with Swanson and Marriott see Ostrander, D. (1982). One- and two-dimensional models of the distribution of beliefs. *Essays in the sociology of perception*. M. Douglas. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul..

² The comparative table at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peirce> is a lot easier to read than Peirce's abstract and dense papers.

³ See <https://jkalb.freeshell.org/misc/pareto.html> , <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/it/pareto.htm>

nor are Robert Redfield's (1947) rural-urban division or Inglehart's materialism-post-materialism distinction.

Durkheim's organic-mechanical distinction is equated to Types 1 and 2 in Table A5.3 but there are many discrepancies. For a discussion of Durkheim and comparison with GG theory, see Thompson et al (1990: 129-146). Little's (1985) division is also not in huge disagreement but is too idiosyncratic to fit into Table A5.2. He lumps the 1s and the 2s together, notes the 3s and identifies another group which is possibly Type 5. (He is quite abstract.) Robert Redfield's folk/urban distinction is somewhat related to Tönnies's *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* but it is developmental and generally not relevant. Inglehart distinguishes "materialists" from the "post-materialists" who grew up in the affluent post-WW2 West so it, too, is developmental. Since WOLT knows no time or place, Inglehart also seems irrelevant, however WOLT is to an extent a materialist theory and inasmuch as there are overlaps, the two theories disagree. For a comparison of Inglehart's theory with GG theory see Grendstad (1997; 1999). For a comparison with WOLT see Pepperday (2009: Ch 7) where an empirical test shows WOLT to be a much stronger discriminator even though the test questions were designed by Inglehart specifically to detect his categories.

In effect, the non-dimensional schemes of Table A5.2 are subsets of WOLT. Organisation theorists Streeck and Smitter (1985: 1) remark on the widespread identification of 3-ism, 1-ism, and 2-ism:

Three [models] seem to have virtually dominated philosophical speculation and social science thought. They tend to be identified by the central institution which embodies (and enforces) their respective and distinctive guiding principles: the *community*, the *market*, and the *state* (or the *bureaucracy*)—although it might be more accurate to label them according to the principles themselves: *spontaneous solidarity*, *dispersed competition* and *hierarchical control*. (italics original)

Of the post-Marx theorists listed in Table A5.2, seven agree with this tripartite division while ten see a binary division. Since the theorists come from a range of fields and mostly conjure their types out of independent argument, the general agreement is some assurance that they are on the right track; a theory which contradicted such a cluster of concurring opinion should be viewed with reservation. It says something for the power of learned intuition that it should show such consistency and that there should be such agreement with the types rigorously deduced from dimensions.⁴

⁴ The theorists listed in Table A5.3 are all the ones I considered relevant, with a tendency to err toward inclusion. There are others, for example, Presthus, R. V. (1958). "Toward a theory of organizational behavior." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 3(1): 48-72, Presthus, R. (1978). *The organizational society, revised edition*. New York, St Martin's Press. and Downs,

On the other hand, comparison of Tables A5.1 and A5.2 reflects poorly on the intuitive approach. There are two problems: blindness and insignificance. The first problem is the overlooking of Type 4. Six of the eight dimensional schemes include Type 4 whereas none of the 12 non-dimensional theorists since Marx notice the 4s.⁵ Deduction of four types from two dimensions is itself no guarantee the four exist but the systematic approach draws attention to the logical possibility of Type 4 and if it does not exist, then that needs to be shown. No one does so.

The non-dimensional theorists are oblivious to the 4s. The strange thing is that they were perfectly well aware of them: (i) Marx, far the most widely known of all social scientists, focused on the proletariat, and epoch-making revolutions took place in their name in the lifetimes of most of those theorists; (ii) The practice of social science is allied to social work and social work is targeted at the 4s. Do the guests on the Jerry Springer show and the callers to talkback radio not exist? Li'l Abner and Homer Simpson are recognised by hundreds of millions of people—but not by the professionals.⁶ That the most respected thinkers in the field should fail so comprehensively is an indictment of the intuitive approach to social theory.⁷

The second problem is to detect the contribution of this intuitive typologising. Knowledge is supposed to accumulate but as a rule each of the listed theories argues for its own universe of types and does not recognise any other. Is not the justification for a new theory its superiority over old theory? Not only do they not build on, or critique, each other but all of them can be seen as ruminations on something that is almost a commonplace. Streeck and Smitter (1985: 1), quoted above, say the perception of three models has dominated social science. Herbert Kitschelt (1994: 9) says it, too:

The universe of possible political demands and programs in the modern age is captured in the slogan of the French Revolution, 'liberty, equality, fraternity.' This slogan identifies three ultimate values endorsed by most

A. (1957). An economic theory of democracy. New York, Harper and Row. but their typologies are quite restricted in scope—and do not conflict with anything here.

⁵ A sort of exception is Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, voice, and loyalty: responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. These were Y, X and 4-ism in his terms (but should be Y, X, and Z—see Pepperday 2009: 97).

⁶ The scholarly obliviousness testifies to the effectiveness of the Type 4 life-strategy of keeping one's head down. Organisation theorists could claim that 4-ism is not a kind of organisation (Hood, C. (1998). The art of the state: culture rhetoric and public management. Oxford, Clarendon Press.) however none do so.

⁷ Hindess Hindess, B. (1991). "Review of *Cultural Theory*." Australian Journal of Political Science 26(2): 390-391., criticising GG theory, asks, "Why is an unexplained two by two typology better than an *ad hoc* typology that does without the pretence?" The answer should now be clear.

Table A5.3 Approximate types (names) with and without dimensions

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
Colloquial	middle class / entrepreneurial	middle class / bureaucratic	middle class / US "liberal"	working class/ blue collar	
Left/right	new right (free market)	old right (traditional)	(new) left (professional)	old left (unionised)	
US colloquial	'(neo-)conservative'		'liberal'	(blue collar)	
US Intl rel.	realism	realism	idealism		
Polit. science	individualism	conservatism	egalitarianism	populism	existentialism
Rat. choice	individualism				
Plato 400BC		guardians		hoi polloi	?guardians?
Montesquieu 1752		monarchy	republic	?despotism	
Comte 1840		hierarchy			
Marx 1848	capitalist	aristocracy	communist	proletariat	
Maine 1861	contract	status			*1
Peirce 1867	secondness; fact	thirdness; thought	firstness; quality		*2
Tönnies 1887	Gesellschaft	Gemeinschaft	Gemeinschaft		*3
Durkheim 1893	'organic'	'mechanical'			*4
Spencer 1896	individualism	hierarchy			*5
Weber 1902	market	bureaucracy	sects (seen as Type 1)		*6
Weber 1902	individualist, capitalism, adventurer	traditional society	convent, monastery, bishopric	peasants	*7
Pareto 1916	Class I (foxes)	Class II (lions)	Class I (foxes)		*8
Linton 1936	achieved status	ascribed status			*9
*Merton 1938	innovation	conformism		retreatism	*10
Becker 1942	secular	sacred			*11
Polanyi 1944	reciprocity	redistribution	householding		*36
Elazar 1960	individualist	traditionalist	moralist		*12
Etzioni 1961	remunerative, economic, utilitarian	coercive (force) + normative-esteem	normative-acceptance		*13
Lipset 1963	achievement		equality		*14
Rigby 1964	contract	command, custom	custom?		*15
Bakan 1966	agency (individual)	communion	communion		*16
*Swanson 1969	heterarchy	centralism	commensalism	heteronomy	*17
*Douglas 70	individualist	hierarchist	egalitarian	fatalist	hermit
Inglehart 71	materialist?	security materialist	post materialist?	materialist	*18
Miller 1976	rights/ Spencer/market	deserts/ Hume/ hierarchical	needs/ Kropotkin/ primitive		*19
*Marriott 1976	Hindu merchant	Brahman	accountant / weaver / potter	leatherworker /barber	*20
Lindblom 1977	market	command	persuasion		*28
Boulding 1978	exchange	threat	love		*29
Baltzell 1979	Philadelphia Quaker	Boston puritan			*30
Maruyama 80	individualist	hierarchist	mutualist		*21
*Ouchi 1980	markets	bureaucracies	clans		*22
Little 1985	'structure'	'structure'	'group'	*23	'ensemble'
Frankel 1987	economy	state	civil society		*31
Rasinski 1987	proportionality		egalitarianism		*32
Epping-A. 90	liberal	corporist-statist	social democratic		*33
*Knoke 1990	persuasive power	authoritative power	egalitarian 'power'	coercive power	
Fiske 1991	Market Pricing	Authority Ranking	Equality Matching		*24
Colebatch 1993	market	bureaucracy	community		*25
*Triandis 1995	vertical individual	vertical collective	horizontal collective	*26	hor. individ?
Schweder 97	autonomy	community	divinity		*34
*Bowles 1998	ideal markets	bureaucracies	communities	ascriptive markets	*27
Markus 2003	indep. self-construal		interdepend. self-construal		*35

Dates above give chronology, not reference citations. *These are typologies formed from dimensions; they are discussed in Appendix 4.

*1 (Macfarlane 1991) *2 <http://www.helsinki.fi/science/commens/terms/categories.html> *3 (Tönnies 1974 [1887]) *4 (Durkheim 1984 [1893]) *5 (Bolender 2004) *6 (Thompson, Ellis et al. 1990: 162ff) *7 Inferences by Douglas (1996 [1979]: 24) *8 (Thornton 1997; New School) *9 (Linton 1936) *10 (Merton 1938) *11 (Becker and Myers 1942) *12 (Elazar 1972; Miller, Barker et al. 2006) *13 (Etzioni 1975) *14 (Lipset 1963) *15 (Rigby 1964) *16 (Bakan 1966) *17 (Swanson 1969) *18 (Inglehart 1971) *19 (Miller 1976) *20 (Marriott 1976) *21 (Maruyama 1974) *22 (Ouchi 1980) *23 (Little 1985) *24 (Fiske 1991; 1992) *25 Colebatch and Larmour (1993) is a short textbook setting out the standard organisation theory *26 (Triandis 1995: 44; Triandis and Gelfand 1998; 2001) *27 (Bowles 1998: 86) *28 *29 Boulding *30 (Baltzell 1996 [1979]) *31 Frankel *32 (Rasinski 1987) *33 Epping-Andersen *34 (Shweder, Much et al. 1997) *35 (Markus and Kitayama 2003) *36 (Polanyi 1944)

citizens, but which are difficult to combine in a single viable social institution... In many ways, the programmatic content of political competition in contemporary democracies constitutes nothing but the perpetual struggle to cope with the trade-off among these three ultimate values...

A hundred years ago American philosopher Charles Peirce said it:

It rather annoys me to be told that there is anything novel in my three categories; for if they have not, however confusedly, been recognized by men since men began to think, that condemns them at once.⁸

Since Peirce dozens of earnest academics have thought there was something novel in the three categories. Table A5.3 lists more of them. This table includes the types generated from dimensions of Tables A5.1 and A5.2 expanded to include typologies that fit less well. The types perceived by the non-dimensional theorists of Table A5.3 vary in myriad detail; WOLT encompasses them all and identifies the underlying structure they are groping for.

The three pro-active types are also found in almost casual places. Comte's motto: "Love as principle and order as basis; progress as goal"⁹ is 3, 2, 1. C Wright Mills takes for granted that the political world consists of 2s, 1s and 3s in the opening words of a 1960 essay: "It is no exaggeration to say that since the end of World War II in Britain and the United States smug conservatives, tired liberals and disillusioned radicals have carried on..." (Mills 1972 [1960]: 247). In his textbook on ideology, Macridis unselfconsciously titles three successive Chapters: Liberalism, Socialism and Conservatism. And then: "There are three elements within liberalism. One is *moral*, the second is *political*, the third is *economic*." (Macridis 1982: 23, italics original).¹⁰

Rick Wicks's tripartite typologies.

Economist Rick Wicks observes that "social scientists—including economists—as well as journalists, advertisers, and others, often refer to 'the economic, political, and social conditions'" (Wicks 2008: 2) and he has collected examples, some of the most illustrative of which, with his references as footnotes, follow. It is curious that in most of the examples the WOLT numerical order obtains: Types 1, 2, 3.

The collection illustrates the variety of the vocabulary and the variety of perspectives on the three pro-active types. A fourth socially non-active category is not mentioned; I offer suggestions for Type 4 in square brackets.

⁸ Peirce 1903 <http://www.helsinki.fi/science/commens/terms/categories.html>

⁹ L'amour pour principe et l'ordre pour base; le progrès pour but.

¹⁰ Note the fractal property that *within* liberalism (1-ism) Macridis finds the three types again.

Kenneth Boulding:¹¹ “economic, political, and social” spheres; three modes of resource transfer: trade with you, take from you and give to you. [4: use you]

Mackey:¹² “economic, political, and social problems”; “the new political, social, and economic paradigm”; “political, economic, and... cultural control.” [4: incidental or accidental problems, paradigms, and control]

Thomas Friedman:¹³ “corporate-led coalitions to create commercial value...; government-led coalitions to create geopolitical value...; activist-led coalitions to create, or preserve, human values.” [4: coalitions for sport]

Friedland and Alford:¹⁴ “logics of action”: in the marketplace, individual utility and efficiency; in the polity, democracy and justice; and in the family, mutual support. [4: inefficient, unjust, unsupported, erratic action]

Irene van Staveren:¹⁵ “three values appear time and again in economic analysis: liberty, justice, and care. Markets tend to express freedom, states to express justice, and unpaid labor to express care among human beings” [4: masses milling on the periphery]. She notes (p. 213) that C. E. Ayres¹⁶ asserted a similar set of core human values: “freedom, equality, and security” [4: inevitability]. Van Staveren distinguishes: *forms*: exchange, redistribution, and giving [4: grabbing]; *locations*: market, state, and the care-economy [4: ghetto]; *virtues*: prudence, propriety, and benevolence [4: prowess]; *development aid*: self-reliance, rights, or emergency aid; *symbols*: Lady Liberty, Joan of Arc, and Mother Teresa. [4: Lady Luck]

Waterman:¹⁷ “three freedoms: economic, political, and religious (conscience)” [4: lottery].

¹¹ Boulding, Kenneth (1978), *Ecodynamics, A New Theory of Societal Evolution*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills. Boulding, Kenneth (1985), *The World as a Total System*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills. Boulding, Kenneth, Elise Boulding, and Guy M. Burgess (1980), *The Social System of the Planet Earth*, Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.

¹² Mackey, Sandra (2002), *The Reckoning: Iraq and the Legacy of Saddam Hussein*, W.W. Norton: New York, (384, 217).

¹³ Friedman, Thomas L. (1999/2000), *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Harper Collins, London, (202).

¹⁴ Friedland, Roger, and Robert Alford (1991), “Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions”, in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Powell & DiMaggio (eds.), (39), cited in DiMaggio (1994).

¹⁵ van Staveren, Irene (2001), *The Values of Economics: An Aristotelian Perspective*, Routledge: London, (24).

¹⁶ Ayres, C. E. (1961), *Toward a Reasonable Society: The Values of Industrial Civilization*, University of Texas Press: Austin, (170).

¹⁷ Waterman, A.M.C. (1986), “Christian Political Economy: Malthus to Margaret Thatcher”, pp. 99-124 in Block & Hexham (eds.), (123).

Hobson:¹⁸ “the democratic triad of liberty, equality, fraternity.” [4: luck]

Bowles:¹⁹ “states, communities, and markets” [4: lucky dip]

Wright:²⁰ “governance, moral codes, and markets” [4: luck]

Steedman:²¹ “potatoes, politics, and prayer”. Steedman quotes Philip H. Wicksteed’s 1885 “business, politics, and the pulpit” [4: lottery] in his book of sermons *Is Christianity Practical?*

Minowitz’s²² book title: *Profits, Priests, and Princes: Adam Smith’s Emancipation of Economics from Politics and Religion*. Minowitz quotes Trotsky:²³ “God, kings, and capital” [4: petty crime].

Wicks gives a number of other examples that employ variable vocabulary and which are less clear though readily defensible. His examples include only one overlap with the theorists listed in Table A5.3 (Bowles).

These examples of the three types vary in their level of detail and none are anywhere near as detailed and specific as WOLT but the division into three is clear. Whatever their differences and confusions, they all see the same thing

Dimensions without types

It seems there are even more theorists of dimensions than there are typologists. The serious student can consult my PhD. An impression of the extent might be gained from the following list of sub-headings.

3.4.1 Psychology—empirical findings

Social psychology

Hexagon of vocational interests

Hofstede

Cross cultural psychology

Neurology

3.4.2 Kemper and Collins: Z and X across the disciplines

Summary of Kemper and Collins’s findings

Assessment of Kemper and Collins’s findings

¹⁸ Hobson, J. A. (1938/1976), *Confessions of an Economic Heretic: Autobiography*, Harvester Press: Brighton, (52).

¹⁹ Bowles, Samuel (1998), “Endogenous Preferences: The cultural consequences of markets and other economic institutions”, *Journal of Economic Literature* 36:1 (March):75-111, (105).

²⁰ Wright, Robert (2000), *Nonzero: The logic of human destiny*, Pantheon Books, New York, (99).

²¹ Steedman, Ian (1994), “Wicksteed: Economist and prophet”, in Brennan & Waterman (eds.) (211).

²² Minowitz, Peter (1993), *Profits, Priests, and Princes: Adam Smith’s Emancipation of Economics from Politics and Religion*, Stanford University Press, (240).

²³ Trotsky, Leon (1957), *Literature and Revolution*, Russell & Russell: New York, (255).

These dimensional classifications contain insights but are heavily dependent on word meanings. They offer no disagreement with WOLT let alone refutation.

Conclusion to Appendix 5

A lot of people have attempted to categorise human values or ideologies and they have come to the same categories, though with discrepancies and under countless names. We can say “the same” because we have WOLT as a datum, as a standard to encompass them and to gauge them against.

The results are so similar that we have no comparative perspective. For example, no one divides social interactions into surly, jolly and circumspect; no one divides ways of life into difficult, thorough and condescending. Apparently, there is no other way to divide up the pro-active social world than into Types 1, 2, and 3. Despite this universal agreement and the absence of a rival scheme, the three types are actually not generally recognised—within the academy or outside it—so thinkers keep working out the same thing.

The Type 4 is perceived only by researchers who adopted a scientific—i.e., relational—approach. The 4s, so obvious when pointed out, are invisible to usual intuitive academic investigation. The 5s are less visible and since they are non-social by definition it is understandable that they are unseen; still, they are a universal social presence.

The lists in this appendix are surely incomplete but make it clear that there has been a lot of duplicated effort. That’s social science: all discussion, no conclusion; knowledge does not accumulate. The lists indicate that this subject is exhausted at the intuitive level; nothing new can be learnt by the usual academic scrutiny.

WOLT is thoroughly, almost endlessly, confirmed: society is made up of four social types along with one non-social. WOLT is straightforwardly falsifiable but this appendix is evidence it never will be falsified.

References

- Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence: an essay on psychology and religion. Chicago, Rand McNally.
- Baltzell, E. D. (1996 [1979]). Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia. New Brunswick NJ, Transaction Publishers.
- Becker, H. and R. C. Myers (1942). "Sacred and secular aspects of human sociation." Sociometry 5(4): 355-370.
- Bolender, R. (2004). The sociology of Herbert Spencer, <<http://www.bolender.com/Sociological%20Theory/Spencer,%20Herbert/The%20Sociology%20of%20Herbert%20Spencer/The%20Sociology%20of%20Herbert%20Spencer.htm>> accessed August 2007.

- Bowles, S. (1998). "Endogenous preferences: the cultural consequences of markets and other economic institutions." Journal of Economic Literature **XXXVI**: 75-111.
- Colebatch, H. and P. Larmour (1993). Market, bureaucracy and community: a student's guide to organisation. London, Pluto Press.
- Douglas, M. and B. Isherwood (1996 [1979]). The world of goods: towards an anthropology of consumption London, Routledge.
- Downs, A. (1957). An economic theory of democracy. New York, Harper and Row.
- Durkheim, E. (1984 [1893]). The division of labour in society. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Elazar, D. (1972). American federalism: a view from the states, 2nd ed. New York, Crowell.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations, revised edition. New York, Macmillan.
- Fiske, A. P. (1991). Structures of social life: the four basic forms of human relations. New York, The Free Press.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). "The four elementary forms of sociality: framework for a unified theory of social relations " Psychological Review **99**(4): 689–723.
- Grendstad, G. (1999). "A political cultural map of Europe: a survey approach." GeoJournal **47**: 463-475.
- Grendstad, G. and P. Selle (1997). Cultural theory, postmaterialism, and environmental attitudes. Culture matters: essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky. R. J. Ellis and M. Thompson. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.
- Hindess, B. (1991). "Review of *Cultural Theory*." Australian Journal of Political Science **26**(2): 390-391.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, voice, and loyalty: responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Hood, C. (1998). The art of the state: culture rhetoric and public management. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1971). "The silent revolution in Europe: intergenerational change in post-industrial societies." American Political Science Review **65**(4): 991-1017.
- Kitschelt, H. (1994). The transformation of European social democracy. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Linton, R. (1936). The study of man: an introduction. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Lipset, S. M. (1963). The first new nation: the United States in historical and comparative perspective. New York, Basic Books.
- Little, G. (1985). Political ensembles: a psychosocial approach to politics and leadership. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.
- Macfarlane, A. (1991). The legacy of Sir Henry Maine. The Victorian achievement of Sir Henry Maine: a centennial reappraisal. A. Diamond. Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Macridis, R. C. (1982). Contemporary political ideologies. Boston, Little, Brown and Company.
- Markus, H. R. and S. Kitayama (2003). "Culture, self, and the reality of the social." Psychological Enquiry **14**(3/4): 277-283.
- Marriott, M. (1976). Hindu transactions: diversity without dualism. Transaction and meaning. B. Kapferer. Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Maruyama, M. (1974). "Hierarchists, individualists and mutualists: three paradigms among planners " Futures **6**(2): 103-113.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). "Social structure and anomie." American Sociological Review **3**(5): 672-682.
- Miller, D. (1976). Social justice. Oxford, Clarendon.

- Miller, D. Y., D. C. Barker, et al. (2006). "Mapping the genome of American political subcultures: a proposed methodology and pilot study." Publius: The Journal of Federalism **36**(2): 303-315.
- Mills, C. W. (1972 [1960]). The new left. Power, politics and people: the collected essays of C. Wright Mills. I. L. Horowitz. New York, Oxford University Press.
- New School (2008). "Vilfredo Pareto, 1848-1923."
<<http://cepa.newschool.edu/het/profiles/pareto.htm>> accessed April 2008.
- Ostrander, D. (1982). One- and two-dimensional models of the distribution of beliefs. Essays in the sociology of perception. M. Douglas. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1980). "Markets, bureaucracies and clans." Administrative Science Quarterly **25**(1): 129-141.
- Pepperday, M. (2009). Way of life theory: the underlying structure of worldviews, social relations and lifestyle. <https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/49334/4/02whole.pdf>
- Polanyi, K. (1944). The great transformation. New York, Farrar & Rinehart.
- Presthus, R. (1978). The organizational society, revised edition. New York, St Martin's Press.
- Presthus, R. V. (1958). "Toward a theory of organizational behavior." Administrative Science Quarterly **3**(1): 48-72.
- Rasinski, K. A. (1987). "What's fair is fair - or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **53**(1): 201-211.
- Redfield, R. (1947). "The folk society." The American Journal of Sociology **52**(4): 293-308.
- Rigby, T. H. (1964). "Traditional, market, and organizational societies and the USSR." World Politics **16**(4): 539-557.
- Shweder, R. A., N. C. Much, et al. (1997). The "Big Three" of morality (autonomy, community, divinity) and the "Big Three" explanations of suffering. Morality and culture or Morality and health. A. Brandt and P. Rozin. New York, Routledge.
- Streeck, W. and P. C. Smitter (1985). Community, market, state - and associations? The prospective contribution of interest governance to social order. Private interest government: beyond market and state. W. Streeck and P. C. Smitter. London, Sage.
- Swanson, G. E. (1969). Rules of descent: studies in the sociology of parentage. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan.
- Thompson, M., R. Ellis, et al. (1990). Cultural theory. Boulder, Westview Press.
- Thornton, J. (1997). "Vilfredo Pareto: a concise overview of his life, works, and philosophy."
<http://jkalb.freeshell.org/misc/pareto.html>.
- Tönnies, F. (1974 [1887]). Community and association (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft). London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder Co, Westview.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). "Individualism-collectivism and personality." Journal of Personality **69**(6): 907-924.
- Triandis, H. C. and M. Gelfand (1998). "Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **74**(1): 118-128.
- Wicks, R. (2008). The three spheres of society – markets, governments, and communities – related to Fiske's four relational modes: modeled in dynamic balance explaining why social goods are more important than social capital.
<<http://gupea.ub.gu.se/dspace/bitstream/2077/9680/1/gunwpe0292.pdf>> University of Gothenburg. School of Business, Economics and Law, Department of Economics.