

Lib/Con writeup 9/21/10 update

Bill McConochie
Political Psychology Research, Inc.
71 E. 15th Ave.
Eugene, Or. 97401
541-686-9934
Bill@PPRI.com

Politicalpsychologyresearch.com

Acknowledgement: Professor David Leung of Lane Community College kindly provided students for subjects in this study.

Research report: Sixty-four Psychological Facets of
Conservative and Liberal Worldviews.

William A. McConochie, Ph.D

Abstract: Sixty-four psychological traits are measured along ten dimensions of political discourse and are shown to correlate as expected with conservative and liberal political preferences. Five-item scales of primitive tribal views also provide reliable measures that correlate as predicted with hypothesized political orientation, consonant with theory that the conservative worldview evolved in the species to serve an in-group protection function and the liberal worldview evolved to serve an in-group promotion function.

Background. More than five decades of research has documented a wide variety of psychological traits characteristic of conservative and liberal political orientations.

In a series of articles over the past few years John Jost and co-authors have reviewed this body of research, providing comprehensive reference lists. An article on political ideologies was provided in 2003 (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski & Sulloway, 2003). Conservatism has been related to Right Wing Authoritarianism, uncertainty avoidance, religious beliefs, pro-death penalty attitudes, and anti-abortion attitudes. Studies have shown conservative political agendas and related traits such as Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) to correlate with endorsement of social privilege or elitism, a preference for a hierarchical social community, social dominance, endorsement of large financial differences between social classes, desires for certainty, fear of change, fear of radicalism, harsh punishment of deviants, endorsement of aggression, promotion of war, opposition to civil rights, idealization of authority figures, focus on authoritarian religious values, religious orthodoxy, intolerance of ambiguity, rule-following, need for

Acknowledgement: I am very grateful to Professor David Leung, M.S., Lane Community college, who provided student subjects for this study.

Copyright 2010 William A. McConochie

closure and cognitive structure, pro-capitalist attitudes, racial prejudice, homophobia, victim blaming, endorsement of covert government activities, opposition to

environmentalism, opposition to abortion rights and opposition to "diversity on university campuses". RWA is also associated with opposition to civilian gun control laws and desires for reducing freedom of speech and of the press. Other traits associated with conservatism include mental rigidity, dogmatism, close-mindedness and cognitive simplicity versus "cognitive complexity".

These relationships appear on several different continents, suggesting that they are universal human characteristics, not a function of culture.

Theories have been offered to explain the various clusters of conservative traits. Frenkel-Brunsik proposed a theory of ambiguity intolerance. Wilson hypothesized that conservatism is a mechanism for handling environmental uncertainty, "uncertainty avoidance", with activities including militarism. Rokeach focused on closed-mindedness as opposed to open-mindedness to characterize conservative thinking. Tomkins proposed a theory of left-wing versus right-wing polarity, assuming that ideological predilections permeate nearly every domain of a person's life. Webster and Kruglanski have focused on "need for closure". They posit that conservatives tend to engage in stereotyping, resist persuasive influence, and reject opinion deviates.

Higgins has proposed a regulatory focus oriented to two goals. One is termed "promotion" that is focused on individual citizen hopes and aspirations and is associated with the liberal political orientation. The other goal, "prevention", is associated with the conservative orientation and is focused on safety, avoidance of threat and avoidance of change.

Social Dominance theory is grounded in part in biological theory. It reflects beliefs that men should dominate over women, whites over blacks, upper social classes over lower ones, etc. Altemeyer sees the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) as reflecting an "alpha animal" (alpha male) orientation.

System justification theories explain political beliefs as seeking to justify underlying attitudes such as prejudice, superiority and dominance of out-groups. To the extent that such theory includes a belief in defense of the status quo, it may help explain the presence of conservative political attitudes even among lower class members.

Jost and his colleagues posit fear as the central underlying element of

conservatism. They point out that while threat in many instances increases a move of citizen attitudes to the right, this is not universally so, suggesting that factors other than social or cultural influences predispose citizens to their conservative or liberal orientations. If liberals do not move to the right when threatened, their attitudes would appear to be grounded in something more fundamental than current circumstances.

Jost et al more generally postulate that human beliefs, such as political philosophies, are deduced from sets of underlying, more basic beliefs or premises and are related to psychological needs, values and motivations.

More recently Jost discusses specifically the history of the study of political ideology (Jost, 2006). He points out that the left-right, liberal/conservative distinction between political attitudes has been a useful concept for more than 200 years and has been used constructively in many cultural contexts. Liberalism is associated with concerns for social equality, aid to the disadvantaged, promotion of change for improvement in society, and tolerance of dissent. Liberals tend to be higher on Openness (more open-minded), a basic personality trait.

Conservatism is associated with the belief that people are unequal, due unequal rewards, and that order and authority are important to stable society. Conservatives also tend to be more rigid in their thinking and more close-minded. They prefer relatively simple, unambiguous and familiar art, poems and songs. They tend to see the world as a dangerous place and fear crime, terrorism and death. They tend to condemn others, for example persons they consider sexually unconventional. They tend to be more dogmatic than liberals. They are higher on Conscientiousness, another basic personality trait.

Jost posits that a citizen can shift in liberal or conservative attitudes, for example more toward conservative ones under fears of death or threat, a phenomenon that has been empirically demonstrated. On the other hand, he also cites studies that document the considerable stability of conservative and liberal ideologies in citizens and that these ideologies clearly underlie voting for liberal and conservative candidates for national leadership. Differences between liberals and conservatives on the basic personality traits of Openness and Conscientiousness also appear to reflect fundamental, perhaps biological differences.

Conservatives tend to have more organizing supplies, such as laundry baskets, in their bedrooms, while liberals have more maps and travel documents. Even early childhood traits tend to predict later political ideologies. Expressiveness, self-restraint, resiliency and impulsiveness are associated with liberalism in adulthood. Inhibition, indecisiveness, fearfulness and rigidity are associated with adult conservatism. Twin

studies show greater similarity in political attitudes of identical versus fraternal twins, further suggesting biological origins of these political ideologies.

Jost concludes this article by encouraging more studies, based on the assumption that ideological differences do exist between people and can be studied scientifically.

In 2008 Jost with others further review research on political ideologies and offer their theory that the key element of ideological differences is liberals tending to advocate social change toward greater equality among people versus resistance to such change in conservatives (Jost, Nosek & Gosling, 2008).

They point out that there has been resistance to psychological explanations of ideologies, perhaps because of a fear of implicit challenge to the rationality of political beliefs, just as persons of religious faiths might resist psychological explanations or studies of religion. The authors are undeterred and assert that evidence documents good reason to assume that psychological traits of many sorts underlie political ideologies.

Specifically, the evidence by 2008 documented liberal ideologies as associated with preferences for flexibility, rebelliousness, chaos, feminism, welfare, social security, universal health care, remedying social injustices, equal rights, egalitarian attitudes, environmentalism, creativity, novel and different experiences, diversity, poetry, Asian food, jazz music, travel and foreign films.

Conservative ideology is associated with preferences for order, adherence to tradition, conformity, stability, justification of current economic systems, convention, exclusive in-groups such as fraternities and sororities, prayer, religious people, sport utility vehicles, big corporations, rich people, military, and promotion of economic inequality between groups.

Data such as this has been found consistently across many countries and continents, further suggesting that the basic “left” - “right” dichotomy may be a fundamental characteristic of the human species in general.

The authors note that death anxiety and concern for system threat are among the most characteristic psychological traits or issues associated with conservatism.

They cite opinion that the left/right political ideology model exists in all societies.

In 2009 Jost, Federico and Napier again review the field of political ideology,

reviewing data on the traits of liberals and conservatives and reviewing various theoretical efforts to explain facets of political ideology (Jost, Federico & Napier, 2009). They point out that political scientists tend to explain ideologies from a "top down" perspective, while psychologists take a "bottom up" perspective. Political scientists tend to explain ideologies as the products of political elites who supposedly craft ideologies and present them competitively to electorates in the interest of getting votes.

Psychologists, in contrast document through research the many psychological traits that correlate with political ideologies, implying that citizens tend toward one or another political ideology for many psychological trait reasons independent of persuasive messages from elites.

In reviewing the traditional left-right ideological positions they note that the conservative view has been associated by research studies with several broad orientations, including maintaining the status quo, order, capitalism, nationalism and fascism. The liberal view has been associated with progressiveness, system change, equality, protest, socialism and communism.

There is evidence to raise the possibility that these two orientations are not simply opposite ends of a bi-polar dimension but to some extent represent independent factors. "...it is possible for people to be socially liberal and economically conservative." (Pg. 313).

Universality of the conservative/liberal concept is suggested by consistent research findings across as many as 41 of 44 countries in one study (p. 313).

The authors quote Sniderman & Bullock (p. 317), raising the question why some citizens are predisposed to side with left ideologies and some with right

The authors then quote research that suggests biological substrates for some political attitudes in the form of twin studies and traits of children that predict adult political preferences (p. 318). The twin studies yield an estimate that 40 to 50% of attitudes are genetically based.

Research by Skitka and others is cited (p. 319) that leads Skitka to opine that it is easier for liberals to temporarily move to the right than it is for conservatives to move to

the left, suggesting that conservatives tend to hold their political views more rigidly. Specifically, research has shown that reminders of death can induce both liberals and conservatives to move more to the right, characterized by greater stereotyping, hostility, aggression and clinging to religious beliefs.

Conservatives are especially concerned with in-group status, prejudice and discrimination against out-groups, authority, racism and "purity".

Jost et al in conclusion call for psychologists to seek further scientific explanations for political ideology differences, reminding that political behavior has extremely important consequences for nations and the world in general.

Beyond philosophy, sociology, political science and psychology: Biological, evolutionary theory.

The above literature review provides explanations of political behavior via "top down" theory of political scientists and other disciplines and "bottom up" theory of psychologists. Possible biological origins or roots of human political behavior are hinted at by various data: the universality of conservative and liberal orientations, common findings across many cultures on traits associated with these two orientations, differences on psychological traits that are as much as 50% genetically based (Big Five Openness and Conscientiousness, and cognitive complexity/intelligence?), and twin studies and childhood/adulthood trait consistencies.

Psychological theories based on concepts such as that of Jost et al that liberals tend to advocate social change toward greater equality among people versus resistance to such change in conservatives still leave unanswered the question of why some humans advocate social change and some resist such change. Or why some humans have a penchant for militarism as a response to threat while others do not, a la Wilson. Or why, as Higgins proposed, some humans tend to promote hopes and aspirations while others focus on preventing change, threat and danger.

It is reasonable to ask what functions these two basic political orientations serve not just current groups of humans but humans as a species. One answer is provided in

theory by biologist Randy Thornhill and colleagues. Thornhill, at the University of New Mexico, has developed with others a theory based on the frequency of various human behaviors and institutions around the world (Thornhill, Fincher & Aran, 2009). They find that the closer communities are to the equator the higher the frequency of conservative governments, different religions, different languages and war.

In addition, the closer one gets to the equator the more disease pathogens there are. These biologists offer the theory that the conservative political worldview, a cluster of psychological traits, evolved in the human species as a mechanism to promote protection of in-groups. Specifically, it protects an in-group from disease pathogens in neighboring groups against which the in-group does not yet have immunity.

Presumably, groups of humans that had members who were fearful of neighbors and kept them at a distance by united militant activity were less likely to be overwhelmed by their neighbors' diseases. Other human groups or primate, hominid groups that were less fearful were more easily invaded by or otherwise exposed to neighbors and their disease pathogens too quickly to build immunities to their diseases and were killed by illness. Thus, groups did not have to understand disease or disease pathogens per se to benefit from the fearful/militarism/in-group elitism mechanism. They were protected by it indirectly by its tendency to keep them away from foreign diseases.

More specifically, groups that tended to bow to authoritarian leaders of this fearful, bellicose disposition, were better isolationists than groups that did not. So, a cluster of leadership preference, religious and other complementary traits evolved to serve this in-group protection mechanism. These included preserving the in-group's own language and culture as sacred and unique, and their religion as unique and favoring them as their god's chosen people. They crafted their religion to support a bellicose foreign policy, reinforced by blind obedience to authority.

Thus, those groups that had members who were rather quick to fear out-groups and keep them at a distance by war justified by a desire to preserve the status quo (religion, language, etc.) were better protected from neighboring pathogens and thus survived better than human groups that did not have such members.

Thornhill's conservative mechanism of protecting the in-group from disease pathogens is perhaps most dramatically evident in the history of native American

peoples, who were diminished by European diseases more than my European military might per se. They lacked the military technology to adequately defend themselves against the incursion of Europeans and their diseases.

This theory was particularly interesting to the present author because it seemed to dovetail with two human trait factors or clusters revealed in a series of his studies conducted since 2003 (McConochie, 2008a, b). The first factor seems to correspond with the biologists' conservative worldview. This factor is characterized by endorsement of warmongering, violence-proneness, authoritarianism, fundamentalist religious thinking, competition and favoring government that serves one's special interest group.

An authoritarian social structure is required in military activities; citizens must be willing to suspend personal judgment and obey leadership blindly to participate efficiently in war.

An evolutionary protection/promotion theory.

The present author posits that the conservative worldview is a mechanism for protecting in-groups not just from disease pathogens, but also from threats in general from outside groups, such as attempts to overwhelm with war to gain land, females or natural resources.

The biological theory of Thornhill et al had to be broadened to explain the presence of the present author's second cluster of psychological traits. This cluster includes kindly religious beliefs (a factor separate from fundamentalism), and endorsement of a peaceful foreign policy, human rights and sustainable policies and programs. It includes endorsement of government serving not special interest groups but citizens as members of the community overall. This factor represents a type of humans who tend to be cooperative, kind, and comfortable with differences in ideas and traditions, such as those in religious beliefs. This cluster of traits seems to reflect the liberal political worldview.

The present author posits that the liberal worldview also serves the in-group, but by a different mechanism. It serves not by distancing from neighboring groups but by promoting gradual peaceful interaction with neighboring groups to benefit from the opportunities of trade, including trade in goods and services, trade in technologies and

trade in genetic materials that eventually will impart immunities to the in-group against the disease pathogens of neighboring groups.

This broadened theory then sees both the liberal and conservative worldviews as having had complementary survival value for human groups specifically and for the species in general.

More precisely than the present theory holds that there are two psychological trait clusters including, political attitudes, that correspond to two species survival functions, an in-group protection function and an in-group promotion function:

1. Protection from threats function. Protection is provided by defending the status quo in language, religious beliefs and social hierarchy, and by keeping neighboring groups at a distance by military activity. Powerful groups promote this system by establishing a social hierarchy that enables them to dominate less powerful groups. This dominance hierarchy is promoted not only between local and neighboring groups (tribes, nations) but also with one's own local group (family, clan, tribe or nation). Powerful groups demand blind obedience to their authoritarian political and religious leadership, justifying this with various arguments, including a divine right to lead, devotion to the "Motherland", male dominance arguments, etc.

2. Promotion or taking advantage of opportunities function. The in-group's interests are promoted via dialogue, trade, and cooperative interaction with neighboring groups, and discovery of new information and modes for doing things in general, as by promoting and respecting creative innovation by any members of a relatively well-educated, healthy, and politically empowered citizenry.

General hypotheses generated by this theory are:

1. Human groups that had members of both of the two above dispositions were more likely to survive than groups that did not

2. The dozens of psychological traits found by prior researchers to correspond to liberal and conservative political orientations represent several identifiable dimensions of common political discourse (economic policy, preferred government types, foreign policy, attitudes toward disadvantaged citizens, etc.). It is possible to create reliable and valid measures of these psychological traits with a comprehensive range of politically relevant content. These traits will cluster into two factors or groups statistically, one representing the conservative worldview and another representing the liberal worldview.

These clusters will be consonant in content with what have been referred to by observers such as sociologists and psychologists as “political ideologies”.

3. These clusters will relate statistically to preferences for conservative and liberal political orientation specifically in a manner consistent with prior research (as summarized above by Jost, et al).

4. These clusters will be anchored by traits in two clusters found by prior researchers and by the present author such as authoritarianism a la Altemeyer & Hunsberger (1992), religious fundamentalism a la Altemeyer & Hunsberger (1992) and Saucier & Skrzypinska (2006), Saucier (2000), Social Disenfranchisement a la Eidelson (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003), Social Dominance Orientation a la Pratto and Sidanius (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994), and militarism. Specifically, trait measures developed and used by the present author in several prior studies will include measures of violence-proneness, warmongering endorsement, endorsement of religious fundamentalism, authoritarianism and authoritarian governments on the "anti-social" side. On the "pro-social" side, will be measures of human rights endorsement, and endorsement of kindly religious beliefs, public democracy, sustainability and a positive and helpful foreign policy. These two clusters will be found to correspond to the conservative and liberal dimensions of political discourse respectively.

5. Additional "miscellaneous" questionnaire measures will correlate as expected with conservative and liberal political orientation. Those items related to fear of disease pathogens and other elements of the protective/promotional evolutionary theory of political worldviews will correlate with liberal and conservative orientations as predicted, with fearful items correlating with the conservative worldview and travel, trust and interaction items correlating with the liberal worldview.

6. Research data that reflects biological and primitive tribal culture worldviews will correlate in such a manner as to support theory that the conservative/anti-social trait factor evolved in the species to serve an in-group *protection* mechanism and the liberal/pro-social trait factor an in-group *promotion* mechanism. Specifically, the data will support “protection” as protecting against disease pathogens from neighboring human groups and “promotion” as promoting peaceful and cooperative interactions with neighboring groups to benefit from trade of goods, services and genetic material (that will impart immunity to neighboring disease pathogens).

Method.

A matrix of psychological traits was imagined along 10 dimensions of political

discourse within which there are different levels of conservative and liberal attitudes or beliefs.

These dimensions, representing the conservative and liberal worldviews respectively, are:

1. Religious beliefs. Fundamentalism versus kindly religious beliefs.
2. Group belongingness preferences. Social disenfranchisement versus feeling accepted.
3. Gender attitudes. Male superiority versus female egalitarianism.
4. Foreign policy. Militarism/competition/dominance versus peacefulness, cooperation/equality.
5. Government type preferences: In-group services versus all group service.
6. Economics: Self-serving versus sharing.
7. Civilian violence management: Violence, self-protection versus civility promotion.
8. Social group relations: Dominance versus social egalitarianism.
9. Locus of government authority: Authoritarian elite versus citizen authority.
10. Environment policy: Consumption versus conservation.

Within each of these dimensions the author imagined 6 cells of content, three on the hypothesized conservative side and three on the liberal side. Within each cluster of three were imagined three levels. The "a" level is a basic underlying psychological trait, such as religious fundamentalism on the conservative side. The "b" cell is the overt political manifestation of the "a" level trait. This is the overt political attitudes, policies, and preferences of citizens on the content of the dimension, conservative political religious policies, in this first example. These are beliefs that are openly discussed in the media. The "c" cell represents corresponding covert religious attitudes, ones that are extreme enough to be kept private, e.g. to avoid criticism, especially from political opponents, perhaps as "politically incorrect". These covert beliefs might not be respected by voters, either.

The corresponding cells on the liberal side are "d", "e" and "f", Kindly Religious Beliefs, their overt political manifestations, and their covert beliefs.

For the present study 60 primary scales were used, listed in Table 2. The SDO-6 scale based on the work of Sidanius and Pratto is scale 7a. Many scales were ones previously written by the author, or based on them (McConochie, 2008c). These include Religious Fundamentalism (1a), Kindly Religious Beliefs (1d), Social Disenfranchisement (the Eidelson worldviews) (2a), Warmongering Endorsement (4a), Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement (4d), Violence Proneness, (8a), Human Rights Endorsement (8d), Authoritarianism Endorsement (9a), and Sustainability Endorsement

(10d).

The remaining scales were written by the author specifically for this study. An attempt was made to create measures that were independent of each other in content but true to the level of the dimension of which they were a part (basic trait, overt political content, covert underlying content).

With rare exceptions, the scales were created with all pro-trait items. The reasons for this were several. The author has found in a prior study that such scales are not artificially more reliable and valid than their half con-trait counterparts and are viewed by research subjects who take them to be easier to understand and more user-friendly (McConochie, 2007). In very large studies, such as this one with 800 items, maintaining participant motivation and concentration is aided by making the process as user-friendly as possible.

Also, it did not seem to be a concern to have each scale include con-trait (reverse-scored) items because each scale was complemented with a hypothesized counterpart measuring its opposite trait, e.g. Kindly Religious Beliefs (1d) versus Religious Fundamentalism (1a) and Female Respect (3d) versus Male Dominance (3a). In a sense, thus, most trait measures constituted the con-trait items of their mirror counterparts. If persons had a tendency in the study to mark items in a manner significantly indifferent to the content of the items, as from an "acquiescence bias", then the scales would tend to be unreliable. Reliable scales would tend to refute concerns that response biases influenced responses. The author has created dozens of tests that have proven to be reliable and valid for use in clinical, I/O and research use and thus had confidence that the scales in the present study would also be reliable and valid.

Also, if people tended to mark all items in one direction, e.g. all high or all low, then we would expect scales measuring theoretical opposites, e.g. positive foreign policy versus warmongering endorsement, to correlate positively with each other rather than negatively. This was checked when data was obtained for the present study. All pairs of scales measuring theoretically opposite ends of a dimension did indeed correlate negatively with each other.

All con-trait scales have the further advantage of being much easier to score. Ease of scoring reduces the chance of mistakes when processing data.

Also, the author is of the opinion that denying a con-trait item does not necessarily mean that the subject endorses the pro-trait dimension that one hopes to measure. For example, strongly denying that one is a pacifist does not mean that one is a warmonger.

It is better to measure warmongering with all pro-trait items and then separately measure pacifism with all pro-trait measures. There were a few exceptions to this rule when using previously designed scales that include con-trait items, such as the SDO-6 scale. However, even this scale has all its con-trait items in a cluster at the end and was used in this format for the present study.

In general the author was not concerned with fear of response bias distorting responses, e.g. by marking all items high or all low. And, as has been typical in his prior studies, data analysis revealed that only a few (in this instance two) of the research subjects marked their answer sheets mechanically (e.g. all 3's or all 1's). They were discarded.

In addition, in the present study subjects gave responses that often clearly shifted at the last item in a c scale and the first in the corresponding d scale, indicating an appropriate shift in response set to reflect the shift from conservative to liberal worldview predicted by the study design and documented by consistent positive correlations between scales in columns a, b and c as a cluster and scales d, e and f as a cluster, and consistent negative correlations between scales a, b and c on the one hand and scales d, e and f on the other. In short, the subjects kept in the study appeared rather obviously to be responding to the content of the questionnaire items, not in some irrelevant, mechanical, response-set mode.

The items were all presented in 5-option Likert scale format, with options ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The scales were put in four questionnaires for delivery via the Internet at the author's web site, politicalpsychologyresearch.com. They were put in clusters such that each questionnaire had about 200 items, in addition to demographic items and an introductory informed consent page complying with professional ethical concerns. Students in a psychology class at a local community college were invited to participate in the study for extra credit in their class, taught by the secondary author, Professor David Leung. As many as 56 persons completed the first questionnaire; 49 completed all four of them.

Two thirds of the sample was women, one third were men. The mean age was 28, standard deviation 12.3 years. The mean education level was 13.7 years, standard deviation 1.5 years. The mean high school grade was C+.

The best way to appreciate the content of each scale is to read the items in that scale. An introduction to this content is provided in Table 1, which presents a few items

from each scale. When reading these sample items, keep in mind that a and d scales attempt to measure basic human traits, b and e scales attempt to measure overt political attitudes, and c and e scales intend to measure unspoken, perhaps politically “incorrect” beliefs. There are a few exceptions, noticeable in retrospect, e.g. in division 6, which includes government policy at virtually all three levels on both the conservative and liberal sides. These exceptions were perhaps a function of the topic areas, or an oversight by the author. More distinct scales could perhaps be created.

In addition to the ten dimensions presented in Table 1, scales 11a and d represent the miscellaneous items and scale 12 consists of all of the primitive tribal worldview items.

Table 1. Scale names and sample items.

1a. Religious fundamentalism. There is only one true God. There is only one source of absolute truth, the holy religious scriptures or writings of my religion.
1b. Religious conservatism. Our nation cannot be strong unless it is favored and blessed by my God. The truths about my religious faith, e.g. how the earth was created, should be taught in public schools.
1c. Security-oriented religion. My religion is the best way to explain a confusing and frightening world. I find comfort in imagining a perfect place, like heaven.
1d. Kindly religious beliefs. God takes many forms for different peoples around the world. Violence against fellow humans is inappropriate.
1e. Religious liberalism. Our government should not favor any one religion over any other. Whether a woman has an abortion is primarily for her and her doctor to decide and should not be governed by other citizens' religious beliefs.
1f. Spiritual eclecticism. I am comfortable around people who have religious beliefs very different from my own. To keep a separation of church from state we should not print “In God We Trust” or other religious slogans on our money.
2a. Social disenfranchisement/compensatory superiority. I am more special and important than other people are. I prefer to be a member of a group that is entitled to special rights that we will fight for, if necessary.
2b. Cultural conservatism. Our nation is the best and should strive to keep its status. My preferred political group's judgment on important political matters is virtually always correct.
2c. In-group elitism. I prefer to be a member of an elite, special group. Large, powerful corporations are more important to our nation than are individual citizens.

2d. Social enfranchisement/all group respect. I identify with all humanity. I generally trust people and groups that I do not yet know very well.
2e. Cultural Egalitarianism. "All men are created equal" means to me that all humans should have the same basic rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, jobs, educational opportunities and health care. We should support research on stem cells and other technologies that hold promise for improved medical treatments.
2f. Egalitarian Philosophy. I believe that all individual persons have equal value, regardless of nationality, race, color or religious beliefs. Our nation should design effective birth control programs to offer nations that need and want such help.
3a. Male dominance preference. It gives me a sense of security to know that males are strong and powerful. I would rather be a member of a lion pride, where the most important member is the strongest male, than a member of a beehive, where the most important member is the queen bee.
3b. Masculine politics. In general, males make better leaders than do females. With few, if any, exceptions, there should be no birth control measures or abortions for the women of our group.
3c. Alpha male-ism. Male humans are superior to females in almost all ways. Our group should increase in numbers relative to other groups.
3d. Female respect. I think women deserve just as much basic respect as men in all matters. I am comfortable with scientific reports that girls mature more rapidly than boys.
3e. Female politics. Women should have equal say with men on legislation that directly affects women per se, such as abortion laws. Women should have full government support in getting jobs, promotions and pay equal to that of men.
3f. Female dignity. Women should be honored for their exceptional contributions to human culture. For every public statue of a famous man, a community deserves one of an equally famous or honorable woman.
4a. Warmongering endorsement. My national government should do what best serves our nation's interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary. It is more honorable to serve one's nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.
4b. National militarism. Our nation should maintain the strongest possible military strength, even in times of peace. We should have a unilateral military foreign policy, going it alone, if we can find no allies among other nations.
4c. Militaristic Philosophy. I believe in survival of the fittest...that the strongest are destined to survive while weaker individuals don't. I think that civilian vehicles that

look like military ones, like the Jeep or Humvee, are really neat.

4d. Positive foreign policy endorsement. In foreign policy, our nation should...share our natural resources with other nations via trade programs.....and...set limits on our consumption of world resources so resources are available for other nations.

4e. Peace politics. In the U.S., only Congress, not the President, should declare war. We should support United Nations programs to quickly stop civil wars and genocides.

4f. Peace promotion. Citizens via referendum vote should be able to terminate war that their nation is waging. The U.S. National Peace Institute should have free reign to promote research on warmongering and other inappropriate war-related behavior by U.S. leaders.

5a. Special interest group government. Government should serve primarily the most powerful segment of a nation. I can imagine belonging to a special interest group that would feel justified in overthrowing an existing government by military coup.

5b. Power politics government. Government should serve the special interest groups that have the most money. Elected officials should vote on legislation the way their biggest campaign contributors want them to.

5c. Elitist government philosophy. Government should be controlled by the wealthiest citizens. Government should be willing to make its own policies as it sees fit, even imprisoning and eliminating opposition citizens.

5d. Common good democracy endorsement. Elected officials should run government to serve the current and long-term best interests of the community overall...no one special interest group should be favored. Government should have policies that promote a world safe for lower species.

5e. Majority opinion government. Majority opinion of all citizens and their fairly chosen representatives should drive government decisions. Big money should be kept out of campaign contributions, so that elected officials aren't indebted primarily to their biggest contributors.

5f. All citizen government. Government should serve the interests of all citizens. Government should carefully assess and heed public opinion in setting policies and programs.

6a. Profit economics. It is more important that we use natural resources to make money now than to conserve resources for the future. It is more important that big corporations be free to make money than to protect the environment from air pollution and greenhouse gasses.

6b. Conservative economics. Taxes on wealthy people should be kept as low as possible. Military budgets should be increased.

6c. Self-wealth economics. Ideally, no citizen should have to pay any taxes. I do not worry about future generations having to pay for our nation's current borrowing and spending.
6d. Balanced economics. The national budget should be balanced, not spending more than we take in. I prefer a reduction in our government's military spending.
6e. Liberal economics. Progressive income taxes are reasonable, with the wealthy paying more than the less wealthy. Government should promote programs to assure adequate jobs for all able-bodied citizens who can work.
6f. Share economics. Citizens who have above-average income should share it (via taxes) with citizens who make less. Citizens should have a direct vote on how much of the national budget is allocated to each major category: military, foreign aid, health, national parks, etc.
7a. Violence-proneness. I often fall asleep feeling mad or angry. It would be very easy to get my hands on a gun and bullets during the next week without anyone else knowing much about it.
7b. Violence enabling. Citizens should be allowed to own rifles and shotguns. We should put more money into police forces than into school counseling for violence prone-children.
7c. In-group self-defense. I feel safer in my country than I would in any other country. One important reason our citizens must have rights to own handguns is for self-defense in their own homes.
7d. Social agreeableness. I seldom lose sleep over angry feelings. I think cooperation with people from other lands is better than competition against them.
7e. Violence prevention. I think it is shameful that citizens of our country have lynched minority group members in times past. We should do more to prevent child abuse in our families.
7f. Civility promotion. We should encourage the Catholic church to do research to understand and prevent priests from sexually abusing parishioners. We should have an amendment to the Constitution that mandates diplomacy, conflict mediation and other sophisticated, peaceful techniques be used by our national leaders before they resort to war.
8a. Social Dominance Orientation. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
8b. In-group favoritism. The platform of my favored political party should be determined by an elite group of party leaders. It doesn't matter much that some workers lose their jobs in hard times, as long as employers can keep their businesses going.

8c. Power oligarchy. Our party should do whatever is necessary to win elections for party members. Lower class people failing to get to the polls to vote for national leaders is not that bad, because they often vote for the less appropriate candidates.

8d. Human rights endorsement. All people of all nations should have the same basic human rights, such as life and liberty. We should affirm the right of indigenous (native) peoples to their spirituality, knowledge, lands and resources and to their related practices of sustainable livelihoods.

8e. Anti-oligarchy policy. Government should not be controlled or run by families and relatives of leaders just because they are related. We should discourage political power maintained by economic favoritism given to political party loyal supporters.

8f. Social Egalitarianism. All groups of civil citizens should be respected for their unique place in society. A nation should not assign nasty, dangerous jobs, such as foot soldiering in war, primarily to underprivileged minority groups or classes of citizens.

9a. Authoritarianism. Persons should learn to depend on rules given by authorities more than trust their own judgments. We should not question persons in positions of authority but rather take them at their word.

9b. Nationalism. Our nation is entitled to more of the benefits of the world than are other nations. My preferred political party always has the best ideas and policies for our nation.

9c. Leader Devotion. In general, the leaders of a group are more important than are the group members, Without powerful leaders, there would be immediate chaos in society. I would be comfortable with a political leader who was almost Godlike in power and wisdom.

9d. Progressive government. Government should do more to assure affordable housing. Government should do more to improve government itself.

9e. Liberal Political Agenda. Government should provide sufficient regulation of major financial institutions to assure the security of their savers and funding for qualified personal and business borrowers. Government should reduce the “earmarks” system of entitlements based on deal-making among politicians instead of what is fair overall and truly needed by citizens.

9f. Citizen authority. Our government should conduct carefully designed polls to determine how citizens want government to run and incorporate the findings into government policy. Our government should fund research on the development and maintenance of sustainable communities, to include the carrying capacity of each county and state (the number of people that can be supported by the available energy, fresh water, jobs and resources in the area).

10a. Personal resource use. I am not concerned about global warming. I see nothing wrong with burning coal in electrical generating plants.

10b. Government resource use. Our government should support oil drilling even at the risk of harm to the environment. Government should not require that farmers plant crops or plow their fields in ways to reduce topsoil erosion.

10c. Human natural resource use. Humans are destined to dominate all lower forms of life on earth. Maintaining our nation's power with much use of oil is too important to worry about global warming.

10d. Sustainability community endorsement. My national government should support ... international treaties and efforts to reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming. ...and a national health care system that provides basic, affordable care and protects communities from disease epidemics.

10e. Green/clean/safe politics. Our national forests should be protected from excessive cutting so there is an endless crop of harvestable trees. Government should establish and enforce adequate standards to minimize harmful discharge of sewer and industrial waste products into our streams and rivers.

10f. Ideal sustainability. Our government should fund and encourage research on the design of sustainable communities. Our government should support research on how communities can provide adequate jobs for all employable citizens without constant growth of land area covered by houses and commercial buildings.

11a. Miscellaneous hypothetical conservative values. I tend not to worry about poor or unfortunate people unrelated to me. There may be times when we may need to take military action to keep groups of diseased people from invading our country. It is smart for my preferred political leaders to lie and cheat if necessary to win elections and hang onto political power. If scientists come up with facts that are contrary to my religious beliefs, I expect my religious leaders to explain why the claims of the scientists are false.

11d. Miscellaneous hypothetical liberal values. I feel deep concern for the less fortunate citizens of my own nation. I value friendships and experiences more than physical possessions. I like abstract beauty in art and music such as blues, jazz and symphonies. Candidates for political office should not degrade their opponents to make them look bad.

12. Primitive society model.

Imagine there is a primitive human community, perhaps in the Amazon river basin in South America or in the forests of New Guinea. Imagine that in a certain tribe there are a few basic beliefs and attitudes that are held by a few different types of

citizens. Please try to imagine which of these beliefs and attitudes you would agree with if you were one of these citizens:

34. We must be very concerned about keeping diseased people from other nearby tribes from coming into our territory.

35. We should look for ways to trade goods with neighboring tribes.

36. We should protect and preserve our own unique religious beliefs and practices from change.

37. We should consider new religious beliefs and ideas from time to time.

38. I would strongly support efforts to train our young men in use of war weapons.

39. I would strongly support a group that wanted to go exploring into foreign territories to make new friends.

40. We should preserve our own unique language, keeping it pure and special.

41. We should occasionally incorporate new words into our language, adopting words from other neighboring languages.

42. We should fight neighboring tribes to kill their men and take their women captive.

43. We should have occasional friendly meetings with neighboring tribes to dance, sing and arrange marriages between our young people.

Results.

The basic scale statistics are presented in Table 2, which provides for each scale an abbreviated name, the number of scale items, sometimes less the poor items, if any, the identification numbers of the items in the scale, e.g. 23 to 38, the weak items omitted, the range of scores in mean item score units, and the mean, standard deviation and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient.

Only 15 of the 801 items were weak and were dropped because they did not correlate significantly with the total score for their scale. Most of the scales had very good reliability, in the .80's and .90's. None were below .70.

To create questionnaires of approximately equal length (about 200 items) the scales were presented in four clusters as follow:

Questionnaire 1: Rows (divisions) 1, 2 and 5. Questionnaire 2: Rows 3, 4 and 6.

Questionnaire 3: Rows 7, 8 and 9. Questionnaire 4: Rows 10, 11 and 12. Thus, the item numbers in column 3 of Table 1 correspond to those in the respective questionnaire

in which the items appear.

Table 2. Basic scale statistics.

Scale	No. of items	Item nos.	Weak items omitted	Range (of mean item scores)	Mean item score mean	S.D.	Alpha
1a.RFun	22	1 to 22	None.	1 – 3.86	2.11	0.82	.94
1b.CRel	16	23 to 38	None.	1 – 4.50	2.2	0.99	.96
1c.SecurRel	20-1	39 to 58	Item # 57	1 – 4.00	2.36	0.9	.95
1d.Krel	17-1	59 to 75	Item # 66	2.94 – 4.94	4.02	0.49	.81
1e.Relib	9	76 to 84	None.	2.56 – 5.00	3.97	0.75	.86
1f.Eclec Spir	8	85 to 92	None.	2.00 – 5.00	3.54	0.82	.88
2a.SocDis	20	93 to 112	None.	1.00 – 3.35	2.3	0.58	.87
2b.CulCon	22	113 to 134	None.	1.14 – 3.64	2.57	0.54	.88
2c.Igpel	16	135 to 150	None.	1.00 – 3.31	2.19	0.72	.93
2d.SocEnfr	11	151 to 161	None.	2.27 – 4.73	3.5	0.48	.72
2e.Cul Egal	16	162 to 177	None.	2.63 – 5.00	4.04	0.6	.92
2f.EgalPhilo	13	178 to 190	None.	2.38 – 5.00	4.06	0.65	.90
3a.MaleDom	6	1 to 6	None	1.00 – 4.00	2.63	0.76	.85
3b.MascPol	9	7 to 15	None.	1.00 – 3.78	1.83	0.72	.91
3c.AlphaMale	14	16 to 29	None	1.00 – 3.00	1.69	0.58	.90
3d.FemResp	6	30 to 35	None.	3.00 – 5.00	4.18	0.56	.80
3e.FemPol	16	36 to 51	None.	2.88 – 5.00	4.45	0.58	.95
3f.FemHon	11	52 to 62	None.	2.73 – 5.00	3.96	0.69	.89
4a.Warmong	10	63 to 72	None.	1.00 – 3.10	1.84	0.68	.90
4b.WarPol	10	73 to 82	None.	1.00 – 3.60	2.23	0.83	.92
4c.UniMil	20	83 to 102	None.	1.00 – 3.25	2	0.65	.94
4d.PFP	12	103 to 114	None.	1.92 – 5.00	4.15	0.72	.94
4e.PeacePol	19	115 to 133	None.	2.74 – 4.95	3.9	0.64	.92

4f.PeaceProm	14	134 to 147	None.	1.57 – 5.00	3.9	0.8	.95
5a.SIGGov	7	191 to 197	None.	1.00 – 3.86	2.01	0.77	.88
5b.PowPol	10	198 to 207	None.	1.00 – 3.30	1.86	0.72	.93
5c.EliteGov	7	208 to 214	None.	1.00 – 3.14	1.67	0.66	.86
5d.ComGdGv	6	215 to 220	None.	1.67 – 5.00	4.15	0.83	.91
5e.MajOpGv	5	221 to 225	None.	2.80 – 5.00	3.99	0.68	.77
5f.AllCitGov	4	226 to 229	None.	2.00 – 5.00	4.17	0.76	.85
6a.Profit Econ	5	148 to 152	None.	1.00 – 4.20	1.97	0.73	.83
6b.ConEcon	8	153 to 160	None.	1.00 – 4.00	1.85	0.75	.89
6c.WealthEc	12	161 to 172	None.	1.00 – 3.42	2.08	0.64	.85
6d.BalEcon	4	173 to 176	None.	1.00 – 5.00	4.16	0.78	.86
6e.LibEcPol	9 less 1	177 to 185	Item # 178	2.13 – 5.00	3.89	0.64	.84
6f.ShareEco	10	186 to 195	None.	1.90 – 5.00	3.99	0.7	.91
7a.VioProne	10 less 2	1 to 10	#6 & 8	1.00 – 3.50	2.25	0.58	.72
7b.VioEnab	15-1	11 to 25	# 17	1.20 – 3.73	2.61	0.66	.88
7c.InGpDef	18	26 to 43	None.	1.17 – 4.06	2.68	0.69	.91
7d.CivCit	15	44 to 58	None.	2.60 – 5.00	3.75	0.58	.89
7e.VioPref	19	59 to 77	None.	2.53 – 5.00	3.97	0.59	.91
7f.CivProm	12	78 to 89	None.	1.83 – 5.00	4.16	0.73	.96
8a.SDO6	16	90 to 105	None.	1.00 – 3.81	2.05	0.75	.94
8b.InGpFav	11	106 to 116	None.	1.00 – 3.64	2.07	0.73	.92
8c.PowerOlig	10	117 to 126	None.	1.00 – 3.90	1.8	0.78	.96
8d.HumRts	12	127 to 138	None.	3.00 – 5.00	4.36	0.59	.95
8e.AntiOlig	10	139 to 148	None.	1.20 – 5.00	1.8	0.79	.96
8f.Egalitism	7	149 to 155	None.	1.14 – 5.00	4.2	0.77	.91
9a.Authorsm	10 less 4	156 to 165	160,163 to 165	1.00 – 4.50	2.59	0.74	.77
9b.Natlism	8	166 to 173	None.	1.00 – 3.38	2.16	0.68	.84

9c.Ldr Devo	9	174 to 182	None.	1.00 -3.56	2.21	0.71	.88
9d.Pro Gvt	10	183 to 192	None.	2.20 – 5.00	4.14	0.75	.95
9e.ComBGvt	12	193 to 204	None.	2.08 – 5.00	4.04	0.69	.84
9f.CitGov	5	205 to 209	None.	2.40 – 5.00	4.02	0.74	.85
10a.ConsPer	10	1 to 10	None.	1.00 – 3.90	1.94	0.91	.96
10b.ConsGv	10	11 to 20	None.	1.00 – 3.80	2.02	0.84	.94
10c.HumCon	10	21 to 30	None.	1.00 – 4.00	1.94	0.81	.93
10d.Suscom	10	31 to 40	None.	2.10 – 5.00	4.06	0.75	.94
10e.SusNow	9	41 to 49	None.	2.44 – 5.00	4.27	0.7	.95
10f.SusFut	9	50 to 58	None.	2.00 – 5.00	4.16	0.74	.95
11a.MiscCon	57 less 6	59 to 115	117,119, 128,137, 145,163	1.08 – 3.41	2.23	0.61	.96
11d.MiscLib	33	116 to 148	None.	2.97 – 5.00	3.97	0.54	.95
12a.CTribe	5	149, 151, 153, 155, 157	None.	1.00 – 4.20	2.7	0.8	.80
12b.LTribe	5	150, 152, 154, 156, 158	None.	2.80 – 5.00	3.88	0.64	.79
13a. Ctribe18	18	149, 151, 153, 155, 157, 132, 133, 134, 143, 144, 148, 149, 152, 154, 155, 159, 160, 172	None.	1.00 - 3.50	2.28	.66	.92
13b. Ltribe12	12	150, 152, 154, 156, 158, 178, 179, 187, 190, 195,	None.	2.75 - 5.00	4.00	.57	.87

	196, 201				
--	----------	--	--	--	--

The basic hypotheses of the study were tested by computing Pearson Product moment correlations between the scales and between the scales and other variables. The basic correlations are presented in Table 3. Column two has the correlations between the trait and how strongly persons endorse political philosophy preferences, each independently on a five point Likert scale in the demographic section preceding each questionnaire. The philosophies were conservative, liberal, green and independent.

Green philosophy endorsement tended to correlate with other variables in a manner similar to that of liberal endorsement. The independent endorsement tended to not correlate substantially with the other variables.

In the discussion that follows, unless otherwise specified, all correlations are Pearson Product Moment correlations. Almost all of the scales correlate significantly at the .01 level or better and in the direction predicted with conservative and liberal political orientations. Specifically, of the 68 correlations, 64 (94%) are significant at the .05 level or better, most at the .01 level. This is interpreted to mean that the traits as measured represent psychological facets of the conservative and liberal worldviews, as hypothesized.

To assess the collective power of the trait measures in divisions 1 through 10 to predict political orientation, the three traits in each cluster (a-c and d-f) were summed. Then a total score of the six in each division was created by reverse-scoring the three conservative scales and adding this to the three liberal scales. A linear regression between all ten of these dimension scores yielded a multiple correlation of .82 with a measure of the liberalism-conservatism orientation created by summing the liberalism endorsement self-rating and the conservative self-rating, reverse-scored ($F = 7.815$, sig. .000). When just the three strongest predictors were used, dimensions 1 (religion), 3 (government type preference) and 5 (foreign policy), the R value was .79 ($F = 25.222$, sig. .000).

This is considered to be further support for the hypothesis that the traits as measured are meaningful psychological facets of the conservative and liberal political worldviews.

In the third column are the correlations with gender, age, years of general education and high school grades, all as reported by subjects in responding to demographic questions at the beginning of each questionnaire. A negative value means

males tend to be lower.

Males tended to be slightly more likely than females to endorse 1a Religious Fundamentalism, 2a Social Disenfranchisement, 2c In-group Elitism, Male superiority traits (3a, b and c), 4c Militaristic philosophy, 6b Conservative economics, 8a Social Dominance Orientation, 8b In-group favoritism, 8c Power Oligarchy, 9c Leader Devotion, and Resource Consumption (10 a, b and c). They also tend to be higher than women on the cluster of miscellaneous conservative attitudes (11a).

Females tended to be slightly higher than males on 1d Kindly religious beliefs, 3e Female politics, 4e Peace politics, 4f Peace promotion, 5f All citizen government, 6f Share economics, 8f Social egalitarianism, 9d Progressive government, 10e Green/clean/safe politics, and 11d Miscellaneous liberal values.

While the author had made no initial predictions about how the measured traits would correlate with gender, these correlations seem consistent with the content of the traits. They are also consistent with the hypothesis that political worldviews may be shaped by evolution, as males are stronger and more aggressive than women and therefore more likely to serve in war activities and leadership based on physical strength and success in war. War has been necessary to protect groups from invaders, if not to invade.

None of the traits correlate significantly with age, suggesting that these traits as measured may be relatively independent of culture and its influences on citizens over their lifetimes.

Several of the traits on the liberal side of the matrix correlate positively and slightly to moderately with general education, including 7e Violence prevention (.29*), 3f Female Honoring (.29*) and 6e Liberal Economic Politics (.40**), as well as 8e. Anti-oligarchy (.28*), 9d. Progressive government (.29*), 9e. Liberal political agenda (.31*), 9f. Citizen authority government (.41**), 10c Sustainable communities (.33*), 10d Ideal Sustainability (.34*), 11d. Miscellaneous liberal attitudes (.30*), and 12d. Liberal tribal attitudes (.35*). Thus, persons in this sample with more education tended to hold liberal political attitudes as measured by these scales.

In contrast, education consistently correlates negatively with traits in the conservative cluster: 7b Violence enabling (-.35*), 7c In-group self-defense (-.31*), 9a. Authoritarianism (-.29*), 10c Human resource use (-.28*), and 10b Government resource use (-.33*). Persons in this sample with less education tend to hold conservative attitudes as measured by these scales.

Correlation doesn't document causal directions, so we can't conclude from this that education necessarily causes or shapes liberal political attitudes. It is possible that persons who have liberal attitudes are also more curious and open-minded and thus tend to seek educational experiences more than less open-minded persons do. The data cited by Jost, et al above documents that liberals do indeed tend to be higher on Openness than conservatives.

Only a few traits correlated significantly with high school grade point average, with unclear implications, other than suggesting that political attitudes may be unrelated to intelligence.

Table 3. Validity correlations.

1	2	3	4	5
Trait	Correlation with conservative and liberal political preference. Con. Lib.	Correlation with gender*, age, education and high school grades * Neg. value means female higher.	Division correlations a to b, a to c, and b to c. Or d to e, d to f, and e to f.	Mean of 9 correlations between a, b and c with d, e and f. (Or a to d for divisions 11 and 12).
1a.RFun	.69**, -.50**	-.27*, .07, .15, -.29*	.88**, .83**, .85**	-.40**
1b.CRel	.65**, -.47**	-.17, .02, -.05, -.31*		
1c.SecurRel	.56**, -.36**	-.18, .03, -.01, -.21		
1d.Krel	-.51**, .70**	.30*, .00, -.01, .17	.57**, .41**, .76**	
1e.Rellib	-.60**, .70**	.21, -.03, .03, .07		
1f.SpirEcler	-.62**, .57**	.15, .04, .05, .23		
2a.SocDis	.48**, -.48**	-.38**, .00, .07, -.16	.55**, .50**, .55**	-.53**
2b.CulCon	.58**, -.45**	-.12, -.04, .06, -.07		
2c.IgpElite	.54**, -.42**	-.27*, .03, -.04, -		

		.15		
2d.SocEnfr	-.31*, .39**	.07, .18, .13, .07	.42**, .34*, .85**	
2e.Cul Egal	-.54**, .64**	.17, .03, .05, -.08		
2f.EgalPhilo	-.44**, .61**	.22, -.06, -.01, .04		
3a.MaleDom	.49**, -.39**	-.43**, .16, .08, -.23	.67**, .67**, .81**	-.62**
3b.MascPol	.60**, -.56**	-.45**, -.11, -.11, -.21		
3c.Alpha Male	.57**, -.36**	-.39**, .05, -.13, -.21		
3d.FemResp	-.48**, .41**	.24, .02, .09, .06	.72**, .73**, .70**	
3e.FemPol	-.66**, .43**	.29*, -.05, .13, .03		
3f.FemHon	-.57**, .45**	.21, .11, .29*, .13		
4a.Warmong	.69**, -.57**	-.44**, -.03, -.17, -.10	.87**, .79**, .85**	-.73**
4b.NatMil	.68**, -.40**	-.24, -.03, -.14, -.09		
4c.MilPhilo	.62**, -.40**	-.39**, -.04, -.07, -.12		
4d.PFP	-.56**, .47**	.16, -.03, .25, .10	.85**, .84**, .90**	
4e.PeacePol	-.64**, .63**	.31*, .06, .25, .01		
4f.PeaceProm	-.68**, .60**	.27*, -.02, .20, .00		
5a.SIGGov	.36**, -.32*	-.19, -.05, -.06, -.05	.87**, .80**, .87**	-.62**
5b.PowerPol Gov	.32*, -.37**	-.17, -.14, -.09, -.05		
5c.EliteGov	.35**, -.27*	-.02, -.04, -.09, .05		
5d.ComGdGv	-.40**, .36**	.14, .05, .01, .02	.54**, .65**, .58**	

5e.MajOpGv	-.48**, .60**	.23, .21, .04, .06		
5f.AllCitGov	-.47**, .44**	.28*, .20, .06, .00		
6a.ProfEcon	.55**, -.28*	-.19, -.13, -.31*, .05	.72**, .76**, .83**	-.57**
6b.ConEcon	.62**, -.41**	-.32*, -.05, -.12, -.03		
6c.SelfWealthEc	.61**, -.45**	-.25, -.17, -.20, -.02		
6d.BalEcon	-.41**, .47**	.15, .04, .15, .18	.58**, .52**, .56	
6e.LibEc	-.41**, .49**	.05, .14, .40**, -.12		
6f.ShareEco	-.46**, .39**	.29*, .14, .21, .06		
7a.VioProne	.22, -.19	-.25, .18, -.08, -.17	.38**, .44**, .57**	-.45**
7b.VioEnab	.52**, -.44**	-.21, -.06, -.35*, -.20		
7c.InGpDef	.58**, -.40**	-.20, -.07, -.31*, -.25		
7d.SocAgree	-.36**, .48**	.17, .11, .18, .00	.54**, .49**, .86**	
7e.VioPrev	-.51**, .40**	.11, .00, .29*, .08		
7f.CivProm	-.58**, .47**	.18, .03, .20, .12		
8a.SDO16	.56**, -.63**	-.39**, -.09, -.15, -.08	.64**, .62**, .80**	-.62**
8b.InGpFav	.60**, -.50**	-.41**, -.19, -.28*, -.04		
8c.PowerOlig	.53**, -.33*	-.37**, -.05, -.22, -.06		
8d.HumRts	-.64**, .53**	.21, .04, .26, -.02	.60**, .67**, .85**	
8e.AntiOlig	-.33*, .56**	.18, .06, .28*, .29*		
8f.SocEgal	-.34*, .68**	.28*, .03, .18, .30*		
9a.Authorsm	.66**, -.23	-.11, -.15, .29*, -.06	.47**, .56**, .83**	-.46**

		.29*	.77**	
9b.Natlism	.46**, -.27	-.25, -.02, -.18, -.11		
9c.Ldr Devo	.48**, -.36**	-.33*, -.11, -.11, -.19		
9d.Progr Gvt	-.51**, .55**	.28*, -.08, .29*, .09	.80**, .71**, .71**	
9e.LibPolAg	-.55**, .58**	.25, .09, .31*, .02		
9f.CitAuth	-.59**, .56**	.18, .08, .41**, .14		
10a.PRUse	.35*, -.57**	-.30*, .04, -.22, -.11	.84**, .77**, .87**	-.80**
10b.GRUse	.58**, -.58**	-.35*, .01, -.33*, -.14		
10c.HRUse	.61**, -.53**	-.39**, -.03, -.28*, -.15		
10d.Suscom	-.60**, .60**	.21, -.03, .33*, .20	.83**, .90**, .74**	
10e.GCSpol	-.45**, .68**	.35**, -.06, .29*, .18		
10f.IdealSus	-.60**, .47**	.11, -.11, .34*, .12		
11a.MiscCon	.64**, -.58**	-.42**, -.10, -.21, -.11		-.82**
11d.MiscLib	-.52**, .60**	.28*, .16, .30*, .02		
12a.CTribe	.60**, -.39**	-.09, -.24, -.28, -.06		-.35*
12d.LTribe	-.45**, .47**	.20, -.06, .35*, .08		

The relationships between the traits in each of the divisions of political attitudes are presented in columns 4 and 5. The correlations all are significant and in the directions predicted. For each division, 1 through 10, each of the three traits in a conservative cluster correlate positively with each other, as do the traits in the corresponding liberal cluster (column 4). And the conservative traits correlate negatively with the liberal traits, as predicted (column 5).

As stated earlier, an attempt was made for most divisions to create scales that

measure content of basic, political and hypothetical content. However, for some divisions the correlations between traits in a cluster are so high (e.g. in the .80's) that it appears little meaningful differentiation may have been achieved. See for reference the three facets of religious fundamentalism (1a, 1b and 1c), and for violence-proneness and warmongering (4a, 4b and 4c).

Another possible interpretation of these clusters of very high correlations is that for several divisions of human behavior there is indeed a very intimate relationship between basic beliefs or attitudes and corresponding political manifestations of them, and with related semi-conscious or private beliefs.

In any case, the present data seems to document that there are many divisions of politically-relevant human beliefs and that these beliefs consistently fall into two “camps”, liberal and conservative, and that these two camps see the political world from consistently contrary perspectives.

Regarding division 11, many items of rather disparate, miscellaneous content were included in the miscellaneous conservative and liberal clusters respectively. These items were included because they had interesting content, some of which has been suggested by prior research, as had music preferences, summarized above, and some of which didn't seem to fit in any of the prior 10 dimensions. Many had content that the author simply had intuitive hunches about for various conscious and subconscious reasons.

Most of the items correlated strongly and significantly with the total score made up of all the items in its cluster. This suggests that they all share something in common within their cluster (conservative or liberal). And the two cluster total scores correlate very highly and negatively with each other, $-.82^{**}$ (row 11a, column 5). The total scores for these two clusters of miscellaneous traits correlate substantially with conservative and liberal political preference (column b). These data collectively suggest that what the items within each of these two clusters have in common is a political worldview, conservatism and liberalism respectively.

Consider for example the items in the Miscellaneous Conservative scale and their corresponding correlations with conservative and liberal political orientation presented in Table 4. These are the items that most clearly differentiate conservatives from liberals. The content of these items provides an interesting insight into to worldview of conservatives. Note that several items seem to be related to the hypotheses about evolutionary origins of the conservative and liberal worldviews, e.g. on the themes of fear of diseases and interest in visiting foreign lands, which will be discussed in further detail below.

Table 4. Miscellaneous Conservative Endorsed Items and their Pearson Product Moment correlations with political orientation.

Items that conservatives tend to endorse and liberals tend not to endorse:	Conser- vatism	Liberal- ism
4. For me, God is important primarily as a protector.	.58**	-.44**
5. I believe Heaven is somewhere other than on earth.	.49**	-.36*
6. I believe that I will go there (Heaven) and live forever when I die.	.53**	-.33*
11. I tend not to think much about the past or about history.	.36*	-.33*
13. I trust God to take care of those things about which I tend not to worry.	.58**	-.31*
15. Being part of a tightly united group of people of faith is very important to me.	.50**	-.43**
16. I prefer to be part of a group of people who all believe in the same things and worship the same way.	.47**	-.55**
17. What my leaders tell me is the truth <i>is</i> the truth.	.43**	-.41**
18. Spiritual truth is more important than scientific truth.	.57**	-.38**
19. When there's a conflict between scientific facts and my religious beliefs, I prefer to ignore the scientific facts.	.54**	-.41**
20. The more people there are who believe something, the truer that belief is.	.37**	-.39**
24. Getting things for myself now in the present is more important to me than worrying about the future.	.39**	-.41**
25. It makes more sense to me to use natural resources like oil and iron ore to build security and wealth now than to worry about the environment.	.55**	-.47**
26. I worry about terrorist attacks	.39**	-.51**
27. I worry about diseases coming into our area from foreign places.	.42**	-.36**
28. I worry about military attacks against our nation.	.38**	-.44**
31. In international matters, I am motivated more by fear than by hope.	.32*	-.38**

32. People of different language, skin color or nationality are more likely to carry disease than people like me.	.46**	-.54**
33. Such people are more likely to be terrorists than I am.	.47**	-.55**
35. People living in foreign lands are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in our nation.	.42**	-.31*
36. People in other states are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my state.	.56**	-.36*
37. People in other towns or cities are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my town or city.	.49**	-.45**
38. There may be times when we may need to take military action to keep groups of diseased people from invading our country.	.41**	-.43**
40. It is wise strategy for leaders of my preferred political party to keep those citizens away from the polls who might vote against us.	.38**	-.47**
41. It is okay for my political candidates to run down and discredit their opponents during campaigns for office.	.37**	-.35*
42. I see little point in learning new ways of doing things, as long as proven ways work.	.54**	-.58**
43. I see no value in research on how to improve government.	.47**	-.45**
45. There <i>is</i> a place for government run by my preferred politicians to help me get what I want.	.40**	-.30*
51. In business, as in sports, profit and winning is more important than sportsmanship or fairness.	.35**	-.34**
53. In political campaigns, winning justifies lying and conniving.	.37**	-.40**
54. In political campaigns, belittling your opponent, even with lying, is justified if it will help you win.	.33*	-.32*
55. In time of war, it is worthwhile to use propaganda to demonize enemies.	.34*	-.32*
56. Even in times of peace, it is more important to dominate other nations than to make friends with them.	.43**	-.42**
57. If scientists come up with facts that are contrary to my religious beliefs, I expect my religious leaders to explain why the claims of the scientists are false.	.53**	-.36*

The content of several of these items seems to support the theory of disease fear as

a key element of conservatism (e.g. 27 and 32-38). Militarism, fear of foreigners, religious fundamentalism, blind trust of authority and political lying and conniving are additional themes suggested by these items.

Table 5 provides similar data for miscellaneous items that liberals tend to endorse more than conservatives do, providing insight into the liberal worldview.

Table 5. Miscellaneous Liberal Endorsed Items and their Pearson Product Moment correlations with political orientation.

Items that liberals tend to endorse and conservatives tend not to endorse:	Conservatism	Liberalism
2. I feel deep concern for the less fortunate citizens of my own nation.	-.34*	.50**
4. I feel a sense of obligation to help people in foreign lands who are less fortunate than we are.	-.34*	.39**
5. I worry about the welfare of future generations.	-.34*	.51**
6. I feel a sense of obligation to protect the environment for other species and for future generations of humans.	-.41**	.49**
7. I am seldom worried day to day about terrorists, invasions by other warring nations, or disease epidemics from other lands.	-.49**	.43**
8. I value friendships and experiences more than physical possessions.	-.32*	.49**
11. I enjoy traveling, visiting with strangers and learning about people different from myself.	-.45**	.37**
13. I believe scientists have much to teach us about how to improve our nation.	-.41**	.53**
14. I think government should fund research to figure out how to improve our nation and our government.	-.36*	.50**
15. I sometimes think about how our community and government could be much better.	-.45**	.35*
18. I am more inclined to trust rather than fear a stranger from a foreign land.	-.41**	.48**
22. I like stories and movies about overcoming injustice and being compassionate.	-.30*	.30*

23. I like stories and movies about exploring and discovery.	-.30*	.39**
24. In business, it is more important to cooperate, build trusting relationships and be fair rather than to compete, dominate and win however you can.	-.41**	.36*
26. Good sportsmanship is as important or more important than beating your opponent in sports.	-.39**	.32*
27. Candidates for political office should not degrade their opponents to make them look bad.	-.40**	.32*
29. Our nation should strive to help other nations be stronger and more successful.	-.53**	.50**
30. I am more interested in helping other nations fight disease than in avoiding contact with those nations.	-.51**	.39**
31. I like movies about helping unfortunate, helpless people to succeed.	-.40**	.31*
33. I like movies about cooperation, love and kindness.	-.36*	.41**

The content of the items in Table 5 tends to reflect the less fearful, trusting attitudes of liberals toward foreigners and disease and a more compassionate, caring attitude toward others in general.

Finally, the data in rows 12a and 12d of Table 3 reflects the information gained by the last 10 items of the study questionnaires. These items are presented at the end of Table 2. All of the 5 even-numbered items individually and collectively correlate positively with conservative politics endorsement, as indicated in column b. All of the odd items correlate similarly with the liberal orientation. This data is consistent with the theory that these two worldviews evolved to support primitive tribal in-group functions of protection and promotion respectively.

Using the five conservative tribal items to predict conservative political orientation as measured by the demographic item yields an R of .61, significant at the .001 level. Similarly, using the five liberal tribal items to predict liberal political orientation yields an R of .59, significant at the .05 level. Thus just five items of "tribal" attitudes, predict political orientation, conservative and liberal to a significant degree.

As several of the items in the miscellaneous groups appeared similar in content to the two tribal scales, correlations were run between these items and the scales. Thirteen of the 14 miscellaneous conservative items correlated significantly with the conservative

tribal scale. Seven of the eight miscellaneous liberal items correlated significantly with the liberal tribal scale. These items were added to create two expanded scales, the Ctribe18 and Ltribe12 scales. These scales are more reliable than their shorter versions, as indicated in the last rows of Table 1.

The Ctribe18 scale correlates $.67^{**}$ with conservative political orientation and $-.57^{**}$ with liberal orientation. It does not correlate significantly with age, gender, years of education, income or high school grades. The Ltribe12 scale correlates $.59^{**}$ with liberal political orientation and $-.49^{**}$ with conservative orientation. It correlates $.36^*$ with education but insignificantly with the other demographic variables.

Implications regarding all pro-trait item scales.

To explore the possible disadvantage of using scales with all pro-trait items, total scores based on all six-trait scores across each of the ten dimensions was compared with the separate triads of scores of which each was composed. In effect, the total score constitutes a scale made up of half pro-trait items and half con-trait items, as the score consisted of the three liberal traits minus the reverse-scored three conservative traits. The correlations were run with conservatism, liberalism and a total score based on these two, the liberalism score minus the conservatism measure reverse-scored (the "libcon" score).

The results were virtually the same for all ten dimensions, with the six-trait measure slightly outperforming either of the three-trait measures. The all pro-trait measures were for all practical purposes as good as the half con-trait measures. For example, the conservative religion and liberal religion measures of division 1 correlated $.66$ and $-.66$ with conservatism and $-.52$ and $.74$ with liberalism. The corresponding six-trait measure correlated $-.70$ with conservatism (versus $.66$ and $-.66$), and $.65$ with liberalism (versus $-.52$ and $.74$).

Thus, in this study, it appears that trait measures consisting of all pro-trait items are not artificially higher than they would have been had they had half con-trait items. And all pro-trait measures are not seriously lower in validity than they would have been had they had half con-trait items of good quality. The rationale for using scales of all pro-trait items seems justified by this data.

The 6-trait measure of each of the ten primary psychological divisions, and divisions 11 and 12, tended to provide the highest overall correlation with political preference measured as the lib-con score made up of both the liberalism and reverse-

scored conservatism measures. All were significant at the .000 level. These correlations are 1. Religion .73, 2. Group belongingness .65, 3. Government type preference .48, 4. Gender attitudes .68, 5. Foreign policy .73, 6. Economic/money/tax policy .67, 7. Domestic/civilian violence management .64, 8. Group relations .64, 9. Locus of government authority .67, 10. Environment/resource management .64, 11. Miscellaneous items .62, and 12. Tribal worldview .60.

Disease Phobia.

To explore Thornhill's theory specifically about the conservative worldview evolving in the human species to protect in-groups against disease pathogens, a 7-item scale was created from items in the miscellaneous conservative item cluster and one from the tribal scale, as presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Disease Phobia scale items.

1. I worry about diseases coming into our area from foreign places.
2. People of different language, skin color or nationality are more likely to carry disease than people like me.
3. People living in foreign lands are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in our nation.
4. People in other states are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my state.
5. People in other towns or cities are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my town.
6. There may be times when we may need to take military action to keep groups of diseased people from invading our country.
7. (As a hypothetical primitive society resident). We must be very concerned about keeping diseased people from other nearby tribes (communities) from coming into our territory.

This scale had an alpha reliability of .72. This measure correlates with other measures as follow: high school grade point average -.05, age -.18, gender -.24, liberal politics -.45**, conservative politics .58**, Income .35*. In this study 32% of the subjects had high scores on this scale and 36% had high scores on conservatism.

Positive correlations with some of the other scales are: Religious fundamentalism .55**, Social Disenfranchisement .55**, In-group Elitism .54**, Government Serving the Wealthy .47**, Environmental Consumption .40**, Miscellaneous Conservative Beliefs .84**, Hypothetical Conservative Tribal Beliefs .75**.

Negative correlations with some of the other scales are: Kindly Religious Beliefs -.55, Low Social Disenfranchisement -.40**, Egalitarianism -.60**, Government Serving the Common Good -.53**, Sustainable Community Endorsement -.57**, Miscellaneous Liberal Beliefs -.67**, Hypothetical Liberal Tribal Beliefs -.44**

This data is consistent with Thornhill's theory. The disease phobia scale correlates robustly and consistently with traits measured in the study and in the directions expected of the theory, with positive correlations with conservative traits and negative correlations with liberal traits. The scale also correlates directly and substantially with liberal and conservative political orientation in the directions predicted.

Exploring factor structure.

As mentioned in the introduction, there has been discussion of whether liberalism and conservatism are separate factors or different poles of the same factor, with data suggesting the presence of two factors.

To explore this issue with the present data, factor analysis was performed with Varimax rotation. Only two factors emerged with eigen values of 1 or greater, as documented in Table 6.

Table 6. Factor analysis of triad scores (a, b and c, d, e and f) with Varimax rotation.

Triad score	Factor 1 (69.3% of variance)	Factor 2 (6.3% of variance)
Religion, conservative (scales 1a, b and c)	-.33	.77
Religion, liberal (scales 1d, e and f)	.63	-.57
Group belongingness (conservative)	-.48	.76
Group belongingness (liberal)	.75	-.52
Gender attitudes (masc.)	-.45	.63
Gender attitudes (femin.)	.80	-.31
Foreign policy (conserv.)	-.57	.75
Foreign policy (liberal)	.84	-.42
Economic policy (conserv.)	-.63	.65
Econ. Policy (liberal)	.84	-.32

Domestic violence (conser.)	-.41	.70
Domestic violence (liberal)	.86	-.28
Social group relations (con)	-.46	.76
Social group relations (lib)	.83	-.26
Locus of govt control (con)	-.29	.81
Locus of govt control (lib)	.80	-.46
Environment policy (con)	-.74	.52
Environment policy (lib)	.76	-.48
Miscellaneous conserv.	-.45	.82
Miscellaneous liberal	.72	-.48
Tribal worldview (conserv)	-.15	.75
Tribal worldview (liberal)	.67	-.34

The first factor appears to be a liberal worldview factor, as it has substantial positive loadings on all of the liberal traits. The second factor appears to be a conservative worldview factor, with substantial positive loadings on all of the conservative traits. Each of the worldviews tends to have negative loadings on its counterpart scales. This suggests that psychologically there are two separate conservative and liberal worldviews. It also suggests that persons high on one are somewhat likely to be low on the other, but not necessarily, consistent with observations that persons can be conservative on some issues and liberal on other issues.

Indeed, in the present data are individuals who identify primarily with conservatism as measured by the demographic items but endorse some liberal dimensions strongly. For example, one such person who had a lib/con score of 1.5, reflecting conservative leanings, had liberal-leaning scores on dimensions 7. Violence management (4.24), 8. Social group relations (3.86), and 9. Locus of government authority (3.93). Another person high on liberalism, with a lib/con score of 4.5, rather strongly endorsed gender attitudes for males (3.83), dimension 3, Gender attitudes.

Frequency data:

The frequency or prevalence of traits in the present study can be explored in terms of the number of persons with mean item scores of 3.5 or higher on the scales, indicating greater than neutral endorsement of the items that measure the trait. 24 percent of this sample endorsed conservatism. 46% endorsed liberalism. 54% endorsed green politics, while 50% endorsed independent politics. Each of these political orientations is a separate item, so a person can endorse each of them independently of the others.

The percentage of person with mean item scores of 3.5 or higher on sum scores for each of the three facets of each division, conservative and liberal, are presented in Table 7. These percentages are generally similar to data obtained by the principle investigator in prior studies for variables previously used, such as religious beliefs, foreign policy attitudes and environment attitudes. For example, in prior studies 6% typically have endorsed religious fundamentalism and 89% have endorsed kindly religious beliefs. In the present study the figures are 3.6% and 71%

There were some exceptions. For example, in government type preferences, in prior studies as many as 20% have endorsed government serving citizens as members of special interest groups and 90% as members of the community overall. For the present measures and sample of students the corresponding figures are 0% and 79% (division 5).

Table 7. Percentages of persons falling in various political topic categories.

Division or topic.	Traits a + b + c (Conservative). Percent with mean item score of 3.5 or higher	Traits d + e + f (Liberal). Percent with mean item score of 3.5 or higher
1. Religious beliefs.	3.60%	71%
2. Belongingness.	0%	79%
3. Gender attitudes.	0%	86%
4. Foreign policy (militarism/peace).	0%	76%
5. Government type preferences.	0%	79%
6. Economics.	1.7%	79%
7. Civilian violence management.	1.9%	83%
8. Social group relationships.	1.9%	91%
9. Locus of authority.	0%	79%
10. Environment philosophy.	2%	80%
11. Miscellaneous content.	0%	78%
12. Tribal attitudes	12%	71%
Mean	1.925%	79%

The implication of these percentages is not clear to the present investigators. In prior studies by the principle investigator the ratio of similar traits tended to be in the order of 13 to 1 in favor of the "pro-social" traits. In the present data the ratio is 41 to 1.

Larger and more diverse samples may yield different ratios in the future.

Summary and discussion.

The overall implication of the data presented herein is that the conservative and liberal political worldviews are indeed multifaceted to a very rich degree, consistent with the data and theory cited by Jost et al that political attitudes permeate a wide range of human attitudes, from religious beliefs to attitudes about war and peace, and about economics, social group relations, and even music and vehicle type preferences.

To reiterate an earlier point, full appreciation of the richness and scope of this diversity is probably best gained by examining the content of research instruments used to measure it, such as the 800 questionnaire items that make up the scales in the present study.

The present data is compatible with the theory that conservative and liberal worldviews are rooted in evolutionary functions responsible for survival of the species. If they are so-rooted in evolutionary functions, several implications follow. One is that we would expect some persons in any group of humans, even in small tribes or perhaps families to represent the conservative worldview and some to represent the liberal worldview. This would equip each clan or group to meet either threats or opportunities, as current circumstances demand for survival. In informal inquiries to friends, the present author has learned that frequently even within a given family there is significant diversity of liberal and conservative worldviews. A more formal study would be interesting.

Another implication of the evolutionary theory is that we would expect liberals to side with conservatives in time of desperation requiring war, putting all “niceties” aside to maintain the life-and-death philosophy required of victory in war. We might expect conservatives to be slightly paranoid, even in times of peace, like “lookouts”. Hopefully, at least in modern times, conservatives can be persuaded to limit their penchant for militarism enough to minimize unnecessary warmongering and to limit military spending to promote balanced national budgets.

Education correlates positively with many liberal traits but negatively with conservative ones. This may reflect that conservatives are not as open or interested in learning or science. It suggests that conservatives may not be willing to change their worldviews and that liberals are willing to learn more in support of their current worldviews. It does not strongly suggest that conservatives can be “converted” to liberal

views. The challenge may be for society to understand the nature of liberalism and conservatism in detail and use this understanding to manage political groups more adroitly. Certainly adroit management will be required if we are to prevent overpopulation and over use of resources, jeopardizing the survivability of the planet.

How can conservatives be reassured that disease and death can be managed without militarism, prejudice and fearfulness? How can liberals be convinced that providing food, medical aid and disease control to developing nations must be connected to population control programs to prevent overpopulation? How can both groups be convinced of the importance of replacing fossil fuel use with non-polluting fuels, and quickly enough to protect ice caps, glaciers and low-lying nations from destruction? Solutions to these problems will require the utmost cooperation between liberals and conservatives, not competition and obstruction.

It is hoped that the 60 plus scales developed for this study will be useful to other researchers. They will be put in a manual and loaded on the author's web site for this purpose.

It is hoped also that interested parties will want to replicate this study, as by arranging with the author to have groups of students or other adults complete the four questionnaires online. The data files for such studies can then be sent to the interested researchers for their independent analysis.

It is also hoped that a much larger and more diverse and random sample of persons can somehow be acquired, to double-check the present findings. Interested parties are again invited to contact the author to this end.

Study caveats:

The present sample is relatively small and not representative of the national population, so conclusions cannot yet be generalized with confidence to larger populations until larger and more diverse and representative samples are obtained.

The present authors are not aware of biases that might have deliberately influenced their work, but biases may by definition operate subconsciously, and thus be inaccessible to introspective detection. Scales written with other content may yield different frequencies, perhaps. The principal author tried to be true to traits of a full range of political discourse and measure them with enough items to provide reliable measures. Other investigators may develop other traits or measures that will yield different frequencies and perhaps different correlations with liberal and conservative

dispositions.

Conservative readers of the present findings may find them threatening. It is hoped that they will respond by replicating the study rather than simply arguing away its findings. Replication can easily be arranged with the author, to provide access to any group that wants to complete questionnaires conscientiously.

References:

- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113B133.
- Eidelson, R. J., & Eidelson, J. I. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 182–192.
- Jost, J. (2006). The End of the End of Ideology. *American Psychologist*, October, Vol. 61, No. 7, 651-670.
- Jost, J, Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A, & Sulloway, F. (2003), Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition, *Psych. Bulletin*, Vol. 129, No. 3, p 339-75.
- Jost, J, Nosek, B, & Gosling, S. (2008), Ideology: Its Resurgence in Social, Personality, and Political Psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp 126-136.
- McConochie, W. (2007), A Comprehensive Measure of Warmongering as a multifaceted but primarily unitary psychological trait; Response sets as a concern in questionnaire construction, Publication #11, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com.
- McConochie, W., (2008a) Research Report # 5, Sixteen Variable Study: Antisocial Traits, Religious Beliefs and Desired Government Features. Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publications Page.
- McConochie, W. (2008b). Five Horsemen of the Apocalypse: An Evolutionary Species Survival Theory of War and Peace. Politicalpsychologyresearch.com.
- McConochie, W. (2008c). Political Psychology Research Instrument Manual, Publication # 4, Authoritarianism Endorsement Scale, Manual, Publication # 8. Politicalpsychologyresearch.com

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.

Saucier, G. & Skrzypinska, K., Spiritual But Not Religious? (2006), Evidence for Two Independent Dispositions, *Journal of Personality*, 74:5, October.

Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366B385.

Thornhill, R., Fincher, C., Aran, D., (2009). Parasites, democratization and the liberalization of values across contemporary countries. *Biological Reviews*, 84, 113-131.