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Abstract

Effects and interaction of personal values and locus of control on evaluation of political choices were examined. Seventy-one participants filled a questionnaire that measured personal values, locus of control, trust with two fictitious political candidates, intention to vote, and how much participants thought their vote mattered. Results indicated that personal values do not influence evaluation of political choices in isolation, whereas locus of control influenced strength of intention to vote for a center-left candidate, who participants trusted most with national security, and how much participants thought their vote mattered. Finally, personal values and locus of control interacted to influence which candidate participants trusted most with the economy, and how much participants thought their vote mattered overall and with the economy.
Effects of Personal Values and Locus of Control on the Evaluation of Political Choices

Americans indicate a preference for one set of beliefs, values, and courses of action over another when they elect a President. When public officials are elected into office, they are expected to execute an agenda that reflects what voters want. Thus, in societies with representative government, citizens’ voting decisions can have profound consequences. These consequences are even more profound when it comes to the choices Americans make when they vote for a new President every four years; the American President holds the most powerful political office in the world and has the authority to make decisions that affect the lives of millions, if not billions of people. It is not surprising then that Presidential candidates and their political parties exert tremendous effort in trying to influence the decision making process of American voters. For example, in the general election of 2008 more than one billion dollars were raised by both Presidential candidates (Cooper & Meckler, 2008). With these funds, candidates can take various steps (e.g., buy advertising) to influence how people evaluate them in comparison with their rivals. It would be beneficial to understand better how people evaluate political candidates before casting their votes. Political campaigns could improve the way they deliver their message to voters, and voters would be in a position to make smarter choices by understanding how political campaigns might try to influence their decisions.

Decision Making

There are multiple cognitive processes involved in decision making. One process is attention, which provides an individual the ability to selectively focus on one aspect of the environment or memory while ignoring other irrelevant information. For example, selective attention can result in goal activation when individuals perceive a situation as relevant for completing a particular goal (Krantz & Kunreuther 2007; Weber & Johnson, 2009; Weber et al.,
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2005). A second process is memory retrieval. This process allows people to activate goal-relevant information from the past. For example, the presentation of a stimulus can increase the retrieval of associations related to that stimulus (also known as priming), and that in turn has been shown to influence the choices people make (Weber & Johnson). For example, selectively priming an attribute of one product might make that product more desirable to purchase in comparison with other products (Verplanken & Holland, 2002). Evaluation of goal-relevant information is a third process and will be the focus of this study. This process allows individuals to compare the relative worth of individual options found among a set of alternatives (Stewart et al. 2003; Weber & Kirsner, 1997).

One model that attempts to describe evaluation of choices is the elimination-by-aspects model (Tversky, 1972). In this model, the most important attribute is considered first, and any one alternative in set of alternatives that does not include the relevant attribute is eliminated. This process continues with the next most important feature until only one course of action remains. This implies that people are not necessarily motivated to make the best possible choice by using all information that is available to them; instead, people use minimal cognitive effort to make choices that are just good enough. In terms of politics, this means that voters do not seek to understand all the information that is relevant for their voting decision. Instead, they use schemas of political parties and leaders as a way to simplify the overwhelming amount of information that is available (Jones & Hudson, 1996). Furthermore, political parties and leaders provide such schemas to voters when they use labels to describe themselves and their opponents.

Personal values. Personal values are desirable goals that people use to guide their behavior. In addition, values vary in importance and they can influence behavior across situations (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Personal values can be divided along two dimensions, and
one of those dimensions is self-enhancement versus self-transcendence. Self-enhancement values include power and achievement because they emphasize the pursuit of self-interest. Specifically, the end goals of power include social status and prestige as well as control and dominance over resources and people. Pursuing power might involve taking advantage of or mistreating others, but more positively, it involves fulfillment of personal desires (Schwartz & Bardi). On the other hand, the end goal of achievement is personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. Basically, pursuing achievement is about self-enhancement that also benefits the welfare of others (Schwartz & Bardi). Self-transcendence values include benevolence and universalism because these values emphasize concern for the welfare and interest of others. An individual with benevolence values (honesty, loyalty, helpfulness, forgiveness, responsibility) will generally enhance the welfare of someone they know and have a relationship with. On the other hand, individuals with universalism values (social justice, wisdom, broadminded, equality, a world at peace, protecting the environment) will focus and enhance the welfare of all others and nature, most significantly on those outside the person’s own in-group (Schwartz & Bardi).

People who deem self-enhancement values as important evaluate political choices in a way that leads to decisions that enhance personal welfare. Similarly, people who deem self-transcendence values as more important will evaluate political choices in a way that leads to decisions which enhance the welfare of others. For example, voters who valued power and achievement were much more likely to vote for the center-right party in the Italian national election of 2001, whereas voters who deemed universalism and benevolence as more important voted for the as opposed to the center-left party (Caprara et al., 2006). This makes sense, as the center-right party promoted the merits of individual enterprise, personal wealth, and a free
market economy and thus attracted those with self-enhancement values; the center-left party attracted those with self-transcendence values by emphasizing social welfare, equality, concerns for social justice, and pluralism (Caprara et al.).

In addition to influencing which parties people vote for, values can also affect the attractiveness of climate change strategies. For example, in Sweden, workers in the private sector rated self-enhancement values as higher than those who worked in the public sector, and thus were more hesitant to accept policies designed to address climate change in comparison with public sector participants, who rated self-transcendence values are more important (Nilsson, von Borgstede, & Biel, 2004).

Furthermore, values can influence judgments of justice. For instance, when asked to describe their evaluation of a dispute involving a company and a union representing that company’s employees, those people that held the self-enhancement value of power as important were more likely to favor the company, whereas those that favored the union held the self-transcendent of universalism as more important (Feather, 2002). This makes sense because the primary goal of a company is to make a profit for its shareholders (i.e., dominance over resources), which is compatible with one of the end goals of power, whereas the primary goal of a union is to ensure a fair stake for the employees of an organization (i.e., protection of the welfare of all people), which is compatible with one of the end goals of universalism (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).

Values also influence the groups that people decide to seek membership in. Students who deem self-enhancement values as important are more likely to join a hypothetical organization that promotes national and individual achievement of wealth. In contrast, students who deem
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self-transcendence values are more important are more likely to join an organization which aimed to promote the protection of the environment (Feather, 1995).

*Locus of control*. Locus of control refers to a person’s belief in what causes the successes and failures in their life. When someone believes that they are solely responsible for what happens to them in life, they are said to have an internal locus of control. On the other hand, if a person believes that luck or other people determine their fate, then that person is said to have an external locus of control (Twenge, Zhang, & Im, 2004).

Given that locus of control influences how people think the world works, it makes sense that people with an internal locus of control will evaluate political choices differently from those with an external locus of control. For example, in the 1972 US Presidential election, those who had an internal locus of control were significantly more likely to register as a Republican, whereas those with an external locus of control were significantly more likely to register as a Democrat (Gootnick, 1974). Furthermore, those with an internal locus were more likely to vote in the 1972 election in comparison with those who had an external locus (Blanchard & Scarboro, 1973). In fact, students with an internal locus of control are more likely to vote in general in comparison with those with an external locus of control (Deutchman, 1985).

Moreover, citizens with a high socio-economic status (SES) are more likely to have an internal locus of control, and as a result, more likely to actively participate (e.g., vote, gain membership, or donate to a political party) and be psychologically involved with (e.g., watch the news to gain knowledge of issues) politics than those with an external locus of control (Cohen, Vigoda, & Samorly, 2001; Krampen, 2000). In addition to people who are generally more active in politics, environmental activists are more likely to have an internal locus of control (Huebner, Lipsey, 1981).
Finally, those with an external locus of control are also more persuadable. For example, they are more likely to accept reasons put forth by government officials to explain an economic crisis, as long as they perceive the government officials to be credible (Chebat, Filiatrault, & Perrien, 1990).

*Interaction of personal values and locus of control.* It is reasonable to expect that personal values and locus of control interact in ways that produce individual differences in the evaluation of political choices. For example, liberals increase their political participation when they perceive an increase in control exerted by powerful others, whereas conservatives decrease their political participation (Levenson & Miller, 1976).

In terms of evaluation of political candidates, perhaps those people who (a) deem self-enhancement values as important and (b) have an internal locus of control are more likely to vote for a Republican political candidate. That would make sense, given that right-wing parties are associated with the self-enhancement values of power and achievement (Caprara et al., 2006) and those with an internal locus of control are more likely to register as a Republican (Gootnick, 1974). On the other hand, someone who (a) deems self-transcendent values as important and (b) has an external locus of control might be expected to vote for a Democratic political candidate given that left-wing parties are associated with the self-transcendent values of universalism and benevolence (Caprara et al.) and those with an external locus of control are more likely to register as a Democrat (Gootnick).

It is clear that personal values and locus of control influence the evaluation of choices due to considerable research that has looked at these two factors in isolation. Unfortunately, there has been little research looking at how two factors interact to affect the process of evaluation. As a result, not much is known about exactly how personal values and locus of control interact to
influence the evaluation of choices. The previous paragraph contained some inferences about how these two factors might interact for example, to influence the evaluation of political choices. Nonetheless, inferences are not the same as empirical evidence. This study will look at how type of personal values (self-enhancement versus self-transcendent) and locus of control (internal versus external) influence the evaluation of two political candidates. Results from the study may lead to additional knowledge about how people with different values and loci of control make political choices.

Method

Participants

Seventy-nine undergraduate students (69% female, 31% male; $M$ age = 21.4 years) from San José State University participated by filling out a questionnaire. Although participants were from a variety of majors, almost half of them said they were either in Psychology (35.4%) or Pre-Nursing (13.9%). Participants were ethnically diverse and identified themselves most commonly as White, Vietnamese, Asian, African American, and Mexican. Eight participants failed to respond properly to all items so their data was not included in the analyses.

Measures

Personal values. Personal values were assessed through the 57-item Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992; see Appendix A). The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) has shown good reliability and validity when used by college students in 54 nations (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Each value is presented with a short descriptive phrase and participants were asked to use a 9-point rating scale numbered from -1 to 7 to rate how important each value was as “a guiding principle in your life.” Each item on the survey represented the motivational goal of one value. For example, “BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)” was for measuring
universalism, whereas “WEALTH (material possessions, money)” was for measuring power. The rating scaled was labeled as follows: -1 (opposed to my values), 0 (not important), 3 (important), 6 (very important), and 7 (of supreme importance). As suggested in the SVS Manual (Schwartz, 2007), participants who left 15 or more items blank or used a particular scale anchor 35 times or more were dropped from the analysis.

*Locus of control.* Locus of control was measured using a shortened and validated eleven-item version of Rotter’s (1966) internal–external locus of control scale (Valecha, 1972; see Appendix B). Participants were asked to circle one of two sentences that best described their explanation of life events. For example, one item asked participants to choose between: “Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it OR Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.”

*Background questionnaire.* Relevant participant traits such as gender, age, ethnicity, academic major and voting history were obtained using a background questionnaire (see Appendix C) used to check participant representativity and for potential follow-up analyses. In addition, political locus of control, and political knowledge of various issues were obtained by asking participants to respond to a series of Likert-type questions. For example, one item asked participants to indicate “How much do you think your vote matters overall?” along a Likert scale that went from “Not important” to “Extremely Important”. The scales on the Likert-type questions were reversed on every other question to check for response reliability.

*Evaluation of political candidates.* Evaluation of political candidates was measured using a 6-item scale developed for this experiment (see Appendix D). Participants read a description of two fictitious political candidates. The description for Candidate A was designed to appeal to participants who (a) ranked self-enhancement values as more important and (b) had an internal
locus of control. The description for Candidate B was designed to appeal to those who (a) ranked self-transcendence values as more important and (b) had an external locus of control. Because data was collected a couple weeks before the American general election of 2008, color images of two White, senior aged men wearing identical clothes were used to prevent response bias from participants who might have linked Candidate A and Candidate B with Sen. Barack Obama and Sen. John McCain.

Participants indicated their evaluation of the political candidates by responding to 6 Likert-type questions. For example, one item asked participants to indicate “Which candidate would you trust the most with national security issues?” along a Likert scale that went from “Definitely Candidate A” to “Not Sure” to “Definitely Candidate B”. The scales on the Likert-type questions were reversed on every other question to check for response reliability.

Procedure

Most participants (64 out of 79) took part in their usual, reasonably distraction-free classroom. Classroom participants completed a consent form and were reminded that they were under no obligation to participate and that they could stop participating at any point. After collecting consent forms, participants received verbal and oral instructions to complete the questionnaires.

The rest of the participants (15 out of 79) were colleagues of the researchers who filled out the questionnaire in a setting and time of their choice. Again, these participants were given a consent form and were reminded that they were under no obligation to participate and they could stop participating at any point.

All participants had the opportunity to ask any questions about the experiment after completing the questionnaires.
Design and Analysis. The data were collected in six experimental conditions for a 2 x 3 ANOVA. Both personal values (self-enhancement values, self-transcendent values) and locus of control (internal, external, mixed) were between-subjects factors. The rejection level for all analyses was set at $p = .05$.

To obtain scores for self-enhancement values of each participant, item scores for the values of power and achievement were averaged. Likewise, scores for self-transcendence values of each participant were obtained by averaging item scores for the values of universalism and benevolence. The higher average indicated the type of values (self-enhancement or self-transcendent) that was more important for each participant.

Locus of control had three levels: internal locus of control, external locus of control, and mixed locus of control. A point was given to participants for every sentence they circled that was indicative of an external locus of control. Participants were labeled as having an external locus of control if they scored 7 or higher, an internal locus of control if they scored 3 or lower, or a mixed locus of control if they scored between 6 and 4.

For all Likert-type questions in the background questionnaire, the researchers measured the distance in centimeters from the left edge of the scale to the point where the participants indicated their response with a slash mark. This distance was a dependent variable and represented either how important participants thought their vote was or how knowledgeable participants felt about politics. For all reversed scales, the researchers measured the distance in centimeters from the right edge of the scale to the point where the participants indicated their response with a slash mark.

For all Likert-type questions in the Evaluation of Political Candidates Scale, the researchers measured the distance in centimeters from the center of the scale toward the point
where participants indicated their response with a slash mark. This distance was a dependent variable and represented which political candidate participants felt they could trust the most, or which candidate they would vote for. If participants made slash marks toward Candidate B, the distance in centimeters was recorded as a positive value (e.g., +3.5 cm). If participants made slash marks toward Candidate A, the distance in centimeters was recorded as a negative value (e.g., –3.5 cm).

Results

This study examined the effects of personal values and locus of control on the evaluation of political choices.

Effects of Personal Values

Personal values had no effect on which political candidate participants thought they could trust the most with national security issues, $F(2, 64) < 1$. This result was not expected.

Personal values had no significant effect on which political candidate participants thought they could trust the most with economic issues, $F(2, 64) = 1.808, p > .10$. This result was not expected.

Personal values had no effect on which political candidate participants thought they could trust the most with environmental issues, $F(2, 64) < 1$. This result was not expected.

Personal values had no effect on which political candidate participants thought they could trust the most with human rights issues, $F(2, 64) = <1$. This result was not expected.

Finally, personal values also had no significant effects on which candidate voters felt they were most like $F(2, 64) = <1$, or which candidate participants would vote for $F(2, 64) = <1$. These results were not expected.
Effects of Locus of Control

When asked which political candidate they would vote for, participants indicated they would vote for Candidate B, regardless of their type of locus of control. However, locus of control did seem to affect how strongly they indicated an intention to vote for Candidate B. Participants with an external locus of control indicated the strongest intention to vote for Candidate B (M = 3.79, SD = 3.3), whereas those with an internal locus of control were a bit more moderate (M = 2.48, SD = 4.7), and those with a mixed locus of control indicated even lower intentions (M = 1.14, SD = 4.5). This effect came close to statistical significance, \( F(2, 64) = 2.249, p < .068 \).

With national security issues, those who had an internal locus of control were more likely to trust Candidate A (M = -1.58, SD = 3.9), just like participants who had a mixed locus of control (M = -.906, SD = 5.1). Participants with an external locus of control were more likely to trust Candidate B (M = .977, SD = 4.8). This effect was not statistically significant, \( F(2, 64) = 2.249, p < .114 \).

Those with an internal locus of control thought their vote mattered the most (M = 9.40, SD = 3.6), whereas those with a mixed locus of control through their vote mattered less (M = 8.60, SD = 3.2), and those with an external locus of control through their vote mattered the least (M = 6.93, SD = 5.4). This effect was statistically significant, \( F(2, 64) = 3.261, p < .045 \).

Participants who had an internal locus of control thought their vote mattered the most (M = 8.24, SD = 2.6), whereas those with a mixed locus of control through their vote mattered slightly less (M = 8.14, SD = 3.8), and those with an external locus of control though their vote mattered the least (M = 6.05, SD = 3.9). This effect was statistically significant, \( F(2, 64) = 3.529, p < .035 \).
Finally, participants who had an internal locus of control thought their vote mattered the most for human rights issues (M = 9.77, SD = 2.3), whereas those with a mixed locus of control thought their vote mattered slightly less (M = 9.75, SD = 3.3), and those with an external locus of control thought their vote mattered the least (M = 5.80, SD = 3.9). This effect was very statistically significant, $F(2, 64) = 8.156, p < .001$.

**Interactions of Personal Values and Locus of Control**

A nearly significant interaction effect, $F(2, 64) = 2.749, p < .072$, was found when participants were asked which political candidate they would trust the most when it came to economic issues (see Figure 1). Participants said they would trust Candidate B the most if they held self-enhancement values as more important and had an internal locus of control (M = 1.95, SD = 3.8), or if they held self-transcendence values as more important and had a mixed locus of control (M = 2.92, SD = 4.0). Participants said they would trust Candidate A the most if they held self-transcendence values as more important, regardless of whether they had an internal (M = –1.02, SD = 3.8) or external (M = –0.40, SD = 4.4) locus of control, or if they had held self-enhancement values as more important, regardless of whether they had a mixed (M = –2.07, SD = 3.4) or external (M = –1.74, SD = 5.2) locus of control.

Furthermore, in terms of how much participants thought their vote mattered overall, a nearly significant interaction effect was found, $F(2, 64) = 2.632, p < .080$. In general, participants who held self-transcendence values as more important did not seem to vary a great deal in the level of importance they placed upon their vote overall (see Figure 2). However, participants who deemed self-enhancement values as more important placed only placed a high (M = 11.58, SD = 2.7), medium (M = 8.6, SD = 4.0) or low (M = 4.36, SD = 5.4) level of importance upon their vote as their locus of control was internal, mixed, or external, respectively.
It is also notable that all participants, regardless of personal values or locus of control, felt that their vote was “moderately” to “greatly” important.

Finally, in terms of how much participants thought their vote mattered when it came to economic issues, another nearly significant interaction effect was found, $F(2, 64) = 3.038, p < .055$. In general, participants who deemed self-transcendence values as more important did not seem to fluctuate a great deal in the level of importance they placed upon their vote, whereas participants who deemed self-enhancement values as more important seemed to vary more (see Figure 3). Specifically, participants who deemed self-enhancement values as more important and had an external locus of control placed the lowest level of importance ($M = 3.48, SD = 3.9$), whereas those with who deemed self-enhancement values as more important and had a mixed locus of control placed the highest level of importance ($M = 9.65, SD = 2.9$).

**Discussion**

This study examined the effects of personal values and locus of control on the evaluation of political choices. The effects of personal values (Caprara et al., 2006; Nilsson, von Borgstede, & Biel, 2004; Feather, 2002; Feather, 1995) and locus of control (Gootnick, 1974; Blanchard & Scarboro, 1973; Deutchman, 1985; Cohen, Vigoda, & Samorly, 2001; Krampen, 2000; Huebner, Lipsey, 1981; Chebat, Filiatrault, & Perrien, 1990) on the evaluation of political choices have been extensively studied. The present study built on this previous research by examining how personal values and locus of control interact to influence the evaluation of political choices. Specifically, this study looked at the effects of personal values and locus of control on how much participants trusted two hypothetical political candidates, the intention to vote for either of the candidates, and how much participants thought their vote mattered.
Effects of Personal Values

Unexpectedly, this study failed to find evidence that personal values influence the evaluation of political choices. Specifically, personal values were found to have no significant or nearly significant effects on which political candidate participants thought they could trust the most with national security, economic, environmental, or human rights issues. Personal values also had no significant or nearly significant effects on which candidate voters felt they were most like, or which candidate participants would vote for.

These results seem to go against previous lines of research (Caprara et al., 2006; Nilsson, von Borgstede, & Biel, 2004; Feather, 2002; Feather, 1995). Thus, it seems likely that the results from the present study came about because of methodological issues and not because personal values actually do not influence the evaluation of political choice. One methodological problem might have been this study’s use of hypothetical political candidates. Caprara et al. for example, directly asked participants which political party they had voted for in the Italian Presidential election of 2001. It may be that the use of fictitious political candidates in the current study failed to activate participants’ personal values.

Effects of Locus of Control

This study added to previous evidence that suggested locus of control influences the evaluation of political choices. One finding was that participants who had an external locus of control indicated the strongest intention to vote for Candidate B, followed by those with an internal locus of control, and mixed locus of control, respectively. This makes sense, given that Candidate B’s policies of social equality, a welfare state, and international cooperation should appeal the most to participants who believe that powerful others are in control of life events.
But it is surprising that those with an internal locus of control also indicated an intention to vote for Candidate B. Instead, it was expected that Candidate A’s emphasis on individual freedom would appeal to the sense of control that participants with an internal locus of control have. This surprising finding might partly be explained by the political environment from when data was collected (two weeks before the American general election of 2008), as the election of 2008 was characterized by a surge in voting by center-left voters and apathy amongst center-right voters (Lynch, 2008). It may be that all participants, regardless of locus of control, intended to vote for any candidate as long as that candidate was not a center-right candidate, like Candidate B.

In addition, those who had an internal locus of control were more likely to trust Candidate A, just like participants who had a mixed locus of control, whereas those with an external locus of control were more likely to trust Candidate B. This makes sense, given that the “go it alone” approach to national security advocated by Candidate A appealed to the sense of control over events that participants with an internal locus of control believe they have. On the other hand, the recognition from Candidate B that national security requires cooperation and diplomacy with other powerful countries probably appealed to the belief of those with an external locus of control that powerful others are in control of their destiny.

Furthermore, those with an internal locus of control thought their that vote mattered the most both overall, followed by those with a mixed locus of control and those with an external locus of control, respectively. Similar results were found with specific issues, such as the economy and human rights. These results follow previous evidence that general locus of control is related to locus of control in specific domains in life, such as perceived control over social and political events and institutions (Paulhus, 1983). That participants with an internal locus of
control believed their vote mattered more in general and in terms of specific issues is not surprising, given that they believe in the ability of individuals to influence life events, whereas those with an external locus of control believe that societal factors play a more important role.

*Interactions of Personal Values and Locus of Control*

The current study is apparently the first to look at how personal values and locus of control interact to influence the evaluation of political choices. A particularly interesting finding, as shown in Figure 1, was that participants with a mixed locus of control said that they would trust Candidate A more with economic issues if they had self-enhancement values or Candidate B more if they had self-transcendence values. It maybe that unlike those participants who have a strongly internal or external locus of control, participants with a mixed locus of control use personal values as the more important attribute in determining which candidate they trust the most with the economy. However, it is puzzling to see that participants with an internal or external locus of control (regardless of personal values) did not follow any expected pattern in terms of which candidate they would trust the most with the economy. It maybe that these participants failed to link their locus of control and personal values with their level of trust due to the use of fictitious political candidates by the present study.

Furthermore, as shown in Figure 2, participants who ranked self-transcendence values as more important generally did not seem to vary a great deal in the level of importance they placed
upon their vote overall. The belief that all people are equal may have moderated the general level of importance these participants placed upon their vote, as they did not place a very high or very low level of importance upon their vote overall in comparison with those who had self-enhancement values.

In addition, as Figure 2 illustrates, participants who ranked self-enhancement values higher placed a high, medium, or low level of importance upon their vote as their locus of control was internal, mixed, or external, respectively. That participants with an internal locus and self-enhancement values placed the greatest importance upon their vote overall is not surprising, given that those participants believe they are in control of their destiny and want to increase their personal welfare. More interesting was the finding that participants with an external locus of control and self-enhancement values placed a markedly low level of importance upon their vote in comparison with all other types of participants. For participants with a combination of external locus of control and self-enhancement values, it maybe difficult to believe in the importance of their vote since they want to enhance their own power and at the same time believe that others are in control of their destiny.

Finally, as Figure 3 illustrates, results almost identical to the ones in the previous two paragraphs were found when it came to the level of importance participants placed upon their vote when it came to economic issues. As mentioned before, there is previous evidence that general locus of control is related to locus of control in specific domains in life, such as perceived control over social and political events and institutions (Paulhus, 1983). However, the
present study has built upon this knowledge by providing evidence that the interaction between general locus of control and personal values also follows to specific issues.

Personal values and locus of control do have an interaction effect on the evaluation of political choices. In isolation, only locus of control was found to have an effect, whereas personal values were not. However, given that previous research provided evidence that personal values influence the evaluation of political choices, it seems that improved measures and methods would allow a more thorough and refined examination of personal values' influence. For example, future research could ask participants how they have voted in the past in order to activate their personal values in a political context before asking them how they would vote in the future. That would build upon the expansion in knowledge of how personal values and locus of control interact to influence the evaluation of political choices generated by this study.
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