

From: **Colin DeYoung** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 27, 2012 at 8:50 AM
Subject: RE: personality and politics
To: Pete Hatemi <[REDACTED]>

Thanks Pete. Didn't mean to bug you on your vacation. Maybe we can talk about this further when you're back at work. We'd love to take a look at your data to see if we can understand why your results are opposite to ours.

Regarding P associations, see attached for the first two google scholar hits on "Psychoticism authoritarian" – note that both report negative correlations between P and conservatism and/or explicit authoritarian attitudes (F scale). This is consistent with the repeated demonstration that conservatives score higher in C, and it's also consistent with our finding that conservatives score higher in the Politeness aspect of A (see Hirsh et al., attached). Conservatives may tend to be rule-bound and respect authority (low P), but in the general population, at least, it doesn't seem that they are aggressive (high P).

In your 2010 paper, by far the highest loading on P is .79 for the item "Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects?" – precisely the type of P content that you acknowledge should be associated with liberalism.

I'd say Eysenck's theory ran ahead of the data where P is concerned (in several different ways actually, since it's not a measure of psychoticism at all, in the standard sense of the word, but rather impulsivity, nonconformity, and antisociality).

Colin

From: Pete Hatemi [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, July 27, 2012 8:20 AM
To: Colin DeYoung
Subject: Re: personality and politics

nope, I'm not looking at the paper, so whatever direction you see in the paper I can't comment on. just running scripts on the data. dont have the paper handy, working remote, using ipad to laptop so a bit cumbersome as I'm on holiday. Theremight be in error in how factor scores are displayed in the paper (maybe a flipped sign in the table/graph script- i dont remember what the figures or tables look like), I'll have to look at that, but I can comment on what's more important- the direction of the relationships, which looking at the raw data are right.

Pete Hatemi

On Fri, Jul 27, 2012 at 3:10 PM, Colin DeYoung <[REDACTED]> wrote:

So just to be clear, if you use the factor scores from the analysis presented in appendix 2 (in which conservative is positive), you get correlations in the reverse direction from those in table 1?

From: Pete Hatemi [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: Friday, July 27, 2012 8:04 AM

To: Colin DeYoung

Subject: Re: personality and politics

I dont think I was clear, the relationship between personality and attitudes whether we use the factor or raw scores, I took a look at the raw correlations, in both US and OZ, they follow the outcomes we have in the papers. So I dont think it is miscode. for our samples, the more liberal, less P. Part of P I can see being liberal-drugs, creativity, etc, but mostly not. It is possible that the two samples we have are just odd balls, but they follow the general direction with Eysenck's earlier work and they are pretty large and totally independent of one another (30K in the US in 1988, 22K in OZ in 1990).

Pete Hatemi

On Fri, Jul 27, 2012 at 2:49 PM, Colin DeYoung <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Pete,

The raw scores track the same way as the factor scores? But in your appendix 2, the factor scores appear to be oriented so that conservative is the positive pole – opposite to what is stated in text and Table 1. If you used the factor scores from that analysis, then I suspect we're right.

As for the content of the P scale, note that the items in the short form you used describe being unconventional, impulsive, and anti-rule. That's why liberals tend to score high (and also why P is a combination of low A and C in Big Five).

Colin

From: Pete Hatemi [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: Friday, July 27, 2012 12:56 AM

To: Colin DeYoung

Subject: Re: personality and politics

Hi Colin, same here. My first thoughts are that it does not seem likely we interpreted the results wrong, though it is possible we didn't make the coding clear. The raw attitudes individual scores track the same way as our factor scores did in both data sets. But you have a set where P tracks with being more liberal? Weird. The scale is pro authoritarian and militarism - that doesn't make a lot of sense to me. But if you have it, that is kinda of cool and would be a great sample to look at they are so different. I think Tom is wrong on this one, as Eysenck found the same as we did. But I'll look again to be sure

Pete Hatemi

On Fri, Jul 27, 2012 at 12:25 AM, Colin DeYoung <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Pete,

It was good to get to know you in Trieste. Coincidentally, your name just came up in my lab because one of my grad students is working on political attitudes and ideology. He has some questions about a couple of your papers, and I told him I'd pass them on. They concern the 2010 PAID article with Velhurst and Martin, and the 2012 article with Velhurst and Eaves. It looks to us likethere may be a mistake in your interpretation of your results, based on the coding direction of the attitude scales. Your note for Table 1 in the 2010 article states that "Higher scores on the attitude factors denote more liberal responses." However, this is not what is indicated by the factor loadings in Appendix 2, nor is it consistent with the direction of the personality correlations. I'm familiar with the literature on personality and politics, and it suggests the opposite direction for all of your correlations (our own datasets bear this out too). Liberalism is typically positively related to Psychoticism and negatively related to the Lie scale, and sexual liberalism is positively related to Extraversion. We are wondering if it's possible that your attitude scales are coded backward in both articles. Tom Bouchard agrees with our interpretation here.

The 2012 article has a link to the data, but it seems to be broken.

Best,
Colin

p.s. I'll paste in a blurb my student wrote, making similar points: "The results from the Table 1 of the 2010 PAID paper are the most interesting to me, because in our samples I find the exact same pattern as they did, except precisely reversed on each count. The most important is the psychoticism-conservatism result: I read their results as finding the people who would say "I believe in biblical truth and I oppose abortion" (i.e. conservatives) as also saying "I prefer to go my own way and do not care about cleanliness or manners" (i.e. Eysenck's psychotics). I also have conservatives scoring high on social desirability scales comparable to Eysenck's, as well as sexual conservatives as particularly low in extraversion, and economic conservatives scoring high on aspects of neuroticism, where the 2010 PAID paper reports precisely the opposite on each count. The 2012 AJPS paper replicates parts of their 2010 PAID paper, and has a link for the data in that paper, but it seems to be broken. It would be great to have a chance to see either data set to see what might explain the divergence here."