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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table OA1:**  Premise Disputes, Value Conflicts, and Liberalism–Conservatism, with Demographic Covariates | | | | |
| Predictors | | *Ideological ID*  *Odds Ratio* (*p*<) | | *Policy Liberalism*–*Conservatism*  *b* (*p*<) |
| **Premise Disputes** | |  | |  |
| *Human Benevolence–Selfishness* | | 1.31 (.63) | | **.05 (.09)** |
| *Progress Idealism–Skepticism* | | **7.15 (.01**) | | **.24 (.01)** |
| *Social Stability–Fragility* | | **7.62 (.01)** | | **.24 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** | |  | |  |
| *Collectivism–Individualism* | | **2.18 (.08)** | | **.17 (.01)** |
| *Humanism–Theism* | | **7.17 (.01)** | | **.15 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism–Militarism* | | **2.94 (.01)** | | **.16 (.01)** |
| *Nurturance–Punitiveness* | | **1.97 (.13)** | | **.06 (.02)** |
| **Demographic Covariates** |  | |  | |
| *Male* | 1.30 (.28) | | **.03 (.02)** | |
| *White* | .75 (.16) | | **.08 (.01)** | |
| *Age* | .96 (.94) | | .02 (.46) | |
| *Income* | .63 (.29) | | .00 (.98) | |
| *Education* | .96 (.94) | | .01 (.70) | |
| N | | 719 | | 742 |
| Pseudo R2/Adj. R2 | | .25 | | .59 |

NOTE: Coefficients are differences in symbolic liberalism–conservatism and policy liberalism–conservatism (conservatism coded high and converted to 0-1 scales), associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in each independent variable. The p-values correspond to two-tailed tests. Meaningful relationships are in bold.

**I (Continued).**

**Table OA2:**

2014 Linear Regression Analyses of Ideological Sub-Dimensions (Economic, Cultural, Security), with Demographic Covariates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | *Economic Liberalism–Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) | *Cultural Liberalism–Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) | *Security Liberalism–Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) |
| **Premise Disputes** |  |  |  |
| *Human Benevolence-Selfishness* | **.09 (.02)** | .00 (.90) | **.13 (.01)** |
| *Progress Idealism-Skepticism* | **.29 (.01)** | **.25 (.01)** | .03 (.59) |
| *Social Stability-Fragility* | **.20 (.01)** | **.30 (.01)** | **.22 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** |  |  |  |
| *Collectivism-Individualism* | **.20 (.01)** | **.17 (.01)** | .03 (.15) |
| *Humanism-Theism* | **.14 (.01)** | **.20 (.01)** | **.20 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism-Militarism* | **.16 (.01)** | **.13 (.01)** | **.29 (.01)** |
| *Nurturance-Punitiveness* | .04 (.17) | .09 (.01) | **.08 (.01)** |
| **Demographic Covariates** |  |  |  |
| *Male* | .03 (.12) | **.05 (.01)** | **.04 (.01)** |
| *White* | **.06 (.01)** | **.10 (.01)** | **.06 (.01)** |
| *Age* | .01 (.75) | .03 (.40) | **.08 (.06)** |
| *Income* | .04 (.41) | **-.05 (.07)** | .00 (.98) |
| *Education* | .03 (.39) | -.05 (.14) | -.06 (.08) |
| N | 758 | 776 | 765 |
| R2 | .44 | .21 | .25 |

NOTE: The coefficients are differences in economic, cultural, and security liberalism-conservatism (conservatism coded high and converted to 0-1 scales) associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in each independent variable. In parentheses are the probabilities that the null hypothesis in question is true in the population (two-tailed tests).

**I (Continued).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table OA3:**  Premise Disputes, Value Conflicts, and Liberalism-Conservatism, with PID and all Covariates | | | | |
| Predictors | | *Ideological ID*  *Odds Ratio* (*p*<) | | *Policy Liberalism–Conservatism*  *b* (*p*<) |
| **Premise Disputes** | |  | |  |
| *Human Benevolence-Selfishness* | | 1.12 (.76) | | .02 (.58) |
| *Progress Idealism-Skepticism* | | **5.34 (.02**) | | **.21 (.01)** |
| *Social Stability-Fragility* | | **3.92 (.01)** | | **.18 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** | |  | |  |
| *Collectivism-Individualism* | | 1.73 (.27) | | **.14 (.01)** |
| *Humanism-Theism* | | **6.45 (.01)** | | **.12 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism-Militarism* | | **2.42 (.01)** | | **.13 (.01)** |
| *Nurturance-Punitiveness* | | 1.88 (.20) | | **.04 (.04)** |
| **Other Covariates** |  | |  | |
| *Party ID* | **15.06 (.01)** | | **.20 (.01)** | |
| *Male* | 1.17 (.43) | | **.03 (.01)** | |
| *White* | .84 (.51) | | **.04 (.01)** | |
| *Age* | 1.30 (.69) | | .02 (.51) | |
| *Income* | -.52 (.17) | | -.02 (.51) | |
| *Education* | 1.04 (.95) | | .00 (.85) | |
| N | | 716 | | 740 |
| Pseudo R2/Adj. R2 | | .35 | | .65 |

NOTE: Coefficients are differences in symbolic liberalism-conservatism and policy liberalism-conservatism (conservatism coded high and converted to 0-1 scales), associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in each independent variable. The p-values correspond to two-tailed tests. Meaningful relationships are in bold.

**I (Continued).**

**Table OA4:**

2014 Linear Regression Analyses of Ideological Sub-Dimensions (Economic, Cultural, Security), with Party ID and all Covariates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictors | *Econ. Liberalism-Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) | *Cultural Liberalism-Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) | *Security Liberalism-Conservatism*  *b*  (*p*<) |
| **Premise Disputes** |  |  |  |
| *Human Benevolence-Selfishness* | **.06 (.16)** | -.03 (.44) | **.11 (.02)** |
| *Progress Idealism-Skepticism* | **.26 (.01)** | **.21 (.01)** | .04 (.37) |
| *Social Stability-Fragility* | **.14 (.01)** | **.24 (.01)** | **.19 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** |  |  |  |
| *Collectivism-Individualism* | **.16 (.01)** | **.14 (.01)** | .01 (.75) |
| *Humanism-Theism* | **.10 (.01)** | **.17 (.01)** | **.18 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism-Militarism* | **.13 (.01)** | **.10 (.01)** | **.27 (.01)** |
| *Nurturance-Punitiveness* | .02 (.38) | **.07 (.02)** | **.07 (.01)** |
| **Demographic Covariates** |  |  |  |
| *Party ID* | **.20 (.01)** | **.21 (.01)** | **.09 (.01)** |
| *Male* | .03 (.12) | **.05 .(01)** | **.05 (.01)** |
| *White* | **.03 (.01)** | **.06 (.01)** | **-.07 (.01)** |
| *Age* | .03 (.41) | .01 (.78) | **.09** **(.02)** |
| *Income* | .01 (.76) | **-.08 (.01)** | .01 (.87) |
| *Education* | .02 (.47) | **-.06 (.08)** | **-.06 (.10)** |
| N | 755 | 773 | 762 |
| R2 | .49 | .60 | .40 |

NOTE: The coefficients are differences in economic, cultural, and security liberalism-conservatism (conservatism coded high and converted to 0-1 scales) associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in each independent variable. In parentheses are the probabilities that the null hypothesis in question is true in the population (two-tailed tests).

**I (Continued)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table OA5:**  Premise Disputes, Value Conflicts, and Liberalism-Conservatism with Imputed Missing Values in *Policy Liberalism-Conservatism* | |
| **Premise Disputes** | *b* (*p*<) |
| *Human Benevolence-Selfishness* | .**06 (.04)** |
| *Progress Idealism-Skepticism* | **.24 (.01)** |
| *Social Stability-Fragility* | **.23 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** |  |
| *Collectivism-Individualism* | **.17 (.01)** |
| *Humanism-Theism* | **.14 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism-Militarism* | **.16 (.01)** |
| *Nurturance-Punitiveness* | **.06 (.03)** |
| **Demographic Covariates** |  |
| *Male* | **.04 (.02)** |
| *White* | **.09 (.01)** |
| *Age* | .01 (.74) |
| *Income* | .04 (.41) |
| *Education* | .00 (.98) |
| N | 785 |
| Pseudo R2/Adj. R2 | .57 |

NOTE: Coefficients are differences in symbolic liberalism-conservatism and policy liberalism-conservatism (conservatism coded high and converted to 0-1 scales), associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in each independent variable. The p-values correspond to two-tailed tests. Meaningful relationships are in bold.

1. 2014 Structural Equation Model of Premises, Values and Issue-Based Liberalism-Conservatism

To gain a sense of the degree to which premise disputes are also associated with value conflicts, and thus to gain an estimate of the upper bound of possible influence that premise disputes could in theory exert over liberalism-conservatism, we created two recursive structural equations (e.g. Kline 2011)—one for symbolic liberalism-conservatism and one for policy-based liberalism conservatism)—and we estimated them simultaneously, using maximum likelihood estimation; n=691).[[1]](#footnote-1) One of the advantages of using a structural equation modeling approach is the ability to model explicitly the error correlations across each set of endogenous variables in the path (the two liberalism-conservatism variables, and the four value conflict variables). Otherwise, the data, measures, and model specification are the same as those discussed in Table 1. Our path specification produced a *Confirmatory Fit Index* of .94.

Figure 1 highlights the results with respect to policy-based liberalism-conservatism, which we will now discuss (the results for symbolic liberalism-conservatism are quite similar). The first thing to notice is that, as expected, the observed relationships with respect to liberalism-conservatism tell the same general story as the regression models did, which is that premise disputes and value conflicts are comparable in terms of their ability to directly and independently account for both symbolic and policy liberalism-conservatism

Our primary interest, though, is in the degree to which premise disputes are also predictive of value conflicts. As the figure displays, belief in social stability is significantly associated with valuing cooperation/helping others over self-reliance/personal responsibility (p<.001), peace over force (p<.001), and especially knowledge over faith (p<.001) and We also see that belief in the capacity for human progress is substantially associated with valuing cooperation over self-reliance (p<.001), compassion over punitiveness (p<.001), and peace over force (p<.001), but (surprisingly), not scientific knowledge over religious faith in this case. Finally, we see that belief in intrinsic human benevolence is predictive of valuing peace over force (p<.001) and knowledge over faith (p<.02).

**Figure OA1:**

**Path Model: Estimating Upper-Bound of Potential Premise Dispute Influence on Liberalism-Conservatism[[2]](#footnote-2)**
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1. Study II: Replication of Study I Using 2013 CCES Data
2. **Variable Measurement**
3. **Symbolic Liberalism-Conservatism**

“Do you consider yourself very liberal, somewhat liberal, slightly liberal, middle of the road, slightly conservative, somewhat conservative or very conservative?

1. **Policy-based Liberalism-Conservatism**

Factor score index comprised of the following questions:

1. “Is the following statement true or false?” If left unchecked, the growing **national debt** is likely to cripple the US economy and threaten our national security” (0-3; 0=Definitely False; 3=Definitely True)
2. “If you were in Congress, would you vote to repeal the **Affordable Care Act**? (0-1; 1=Yes)
3. “Some people think it is important to protect the **environment** even if it costs some jobs or otherwise reduces our standard of living. Other people think that protecting the environment is not as important as maintaining jobs and our standard of living. Which is closer to the way you feel?” (0=4; 0=Much more important to protect environment; 4=Much more important to protect jobs)
4. “When it comes to reducing **crime**, do you favor stricter punishments for criminals or addressing the social problems that underlie crime? (0-5; 0=Strongly favor addressing social problems; 5=Strongly favor stricter punsishments)
5. On the issue of **gun regulation**, are you for or against banning assault rifles? (0-1; 1=against)
6. “**Affirmative action**programs give preference to racial minorities in employment and college admissions in order to correct for discrimination. Do you support or oppose affirmative action programs?” (0=Strongly Support; 3=Strongly Oppose)
7. Should the federal government grant legal status to all **illegal immigrants** who have held jobs and paid taxes for at least 3 years, ant not been convicted of any felony crimes? (0-1; 1=No). grant legal status to all illegal immigrants who have held jobs and paid taxes for at  least 3 years, and not been convicted of  any felony crimes
8. “Do you favor or oppose allowing **gays and lesbians to marry legally**?” (0-1; 1=Oppose)
9. “There has been some discussion about **abortion** during recent years. Which one of the opinions on this page best agrees with your view on this issue?

0=By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice

1=The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest or danger to the life of the mother, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established

2=The law should permit abortion only in cases of rape, incest or when the life of the mother is in danger

3=By law, abortion ahould never be permitted.

1. “All things considered, do you think it was a mistake to invade Iraq? (0-2; 2=No)
2. “All things considered, do you think it was a mistake to invade Afghanistan? (0-2; 2=No)

**One factor forced; Eigenvalue=3.10**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Factor Loadings | Communalities |
| *National Debt* | .58 | .34 |
| *Affordable Care Act* | .69 | .48 |
| *Protecting the Environment vs. Jobs* | .49 | .24 |
| *Crime* | .57 | .33 |
| *Gun Control* | .48 | .23 |
| *Affirmative Action* | .59 | .34 |
| *Illegal Immigration* | .48 | .22 |
| *Gay Marriage* | .60 | .36 |
| *Abortion* | .47 | .22 |
| *War in Iraq a Mistake* | .51 | .26 |
| *War in Afghanistan a Mistake* | .26 | .07 |

1. **Value Priorities: “What would you say is more important for society . . . ?”**

*Collectivism-Individualism*

Cooperation & helping others or Self-reliance & personal responsibility

0=Cooperation much more important; 3=Self reliance much more important

*Sexual Progressivism-Traditionalism*

Traditional roles for marriage, gender and family or Openness to new social arrangements or choices

0=openness to new social choices much more important; 3=traditional roles much more important

*Militarism-Pacifism*

Protecting our interests with force if necessary or Avoiding military conflict?

0=Avoiding military conflict much more important; 3=Protecting with force much more important

1. **Premises: “Which of the following statements would you say is more true?”**

*Human Benevolence-Selfishness* (Summed index; polychoric correlation=.35 [p<.001]])

* People naturally cooperate rather than compete vs.

People naturally compete rather than cooperate

(0=Definitely cooperate; 3=Definitely compete; factor loading=1.0; communality=1.0)

* People will seek their own interest, rather than what is morally right, vs.

People will do what is morally right, rather than seek their own interest

(0=Definitely do what’s right; 3=Definitely seek own interest; factor loading=.29; communality=.08)

*Progress Idealism-Skepticism* (Eigenvalue=1.04)

* Human society is essentially fixed and cannot be perfected, vs. Society can be perfected

(0=Society definitely perfectible*;* 3=Society definitely fixed; factor loading=.43; communality=.19)

* The world can be made better if we work together, vs. The world is what it is and will remain so

(0=Definitely can be made better; 3=Definitely is what it is; factor loading=.68; communality=.47)

* People in each generation can improve, vs. People in each generation are essentially the same

(0=People can definitely improve; 3=People in each generation definitely are the same; factor loading=.45; communality=.21)

* Efforts to improve society have generally made things better, vs. Efforts to improve society have generally made things worse

(0=Definitely made things better; 3=Definitely made things worse; factor loading=.42; communality=.27)

*Social Fragility-Stability* (Eigenvalue=1.64)

* Our society does not need to worry about declining strength compared to other nations, vs. Our society is vulnerable to losing our place of strength to other nations

(0=Society definitely does not need to worry; 3=Society definitely vulnerable; factor loading=.58; communality=.33)

* The US economy will remain strong in future years, vs. The US economy is likely to weaken in future years

(0=Definitely remain strong; 3=Definitely weaken; factor loading=.60; communality=.36)

* I never worry that our younger generations are coddled and weak, vs. I often worry that our younger generations are coddled and weak

(0=Never worry; 3=Often worry; factor loading=.52; communality=.27)

* The US has few real enemies who can significantly harm us, vs. The US has many dangerous enemies who can significantly harm us

(0=Definitely few real enemies; 3=Definitely many dangerous enemies; factor loading=.44; communality=.20)

* The declining personal character of Americans is weakening us, vs. The personal character of Americans is not declining

(0=Definitely not declining; 3=Definitely declining and weakening; factor loading=.69; communality=.48)

1. **Other Covariates**

*Female: 0=Male;* 1=Female

*Race:* 0=White; 1=Non-White

*Age*: “18-93”; subtracted 18 and divided by 75

*Income*: “What was your family’s total income last year, from all sources, before taxes?” 0=0; <10k=1; 10-19,9k=2; 20-29,9k=3; 30-39,9k=4; 40-49,9k=5; 50-59,9k=6; 60-69,9k=7; 70-79,9k=8; 80-99,9k=9; 100-119,9k=10; 120-149,9k=11; 150-199,9k=12; 200-249,9k=13; 250k+=14. Divided by 14.

*Education*: “What is the highest level of schooling you have completed?” 0=<HS; 1=HS only; 2=Some College; 3=2-year college degree; 4=4-year college degree; 5=Post-graduate. Divided by 5.

**Table OA7:**

Study Two: 2013 CCES Data Replication Predicting Symbolic Liberalism–Conservatism with Value Conflicts, Premise Disputes, and Demographic Covariates

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictors** | *Ideological*  *Identification* | *Issue-based*  *Liberalism–Conservatism* |
|  | *Odds Ratio* (*p*<) | *b* (*p*<) |
| **Premise Disputes** |  |  |
| *Human Benevolence–Selfishness* | **1.75 (.12)** | -.04 (.06) |
| *Progress Idealism–Skepticism* | **2.14 (.08)** | **.18 (.01)** |
| *Social Stability–Fragility* | **2.80 (.01)** | **.18 (.01)** |
| **Value Conflicts** |  |  |
| *Collectivism–Individualism* | **3.05 (.01)** | **.12 (.01)** |
| *Sexual Progressivism–Traditionalism* | **9.77 (.01)** | **.26 (.01)** |
| *Pacifism–Militarism* | **2.95 (.01)** | **.10 (.01)** |
| **Demographic Controls** |  |  |
| *Female* | .99 (.96) | **-.03 (.01)** |
| *White* | 1.54 (.04) | **.03 (.07)** |
| *Age* | .67 (.30) | **.07 (.01)** |
| *Income* | .52 (.16) | -.04 (.23) |
| *Education* | .81 (.39) | **-.03 (.05)** |
| N | 830 | 800 |
| Pseudo R2/Adj. R2 | .23 | .65 |

NOTE: Coefficients represent differences in ideological identification (conservatism high) associated with minimum-to-maximum differences in the independent variables. The left-side results column presents changes in the odds of identifying as a “conservative,” rather than a “liberal,” from a generalized ordered logistic regression equation. The right-side column presents linear regression estimates. In parentheses are the probabilities that the null hypothesis in question is true in the population (two-tailed tests).

1. **Study III Robustness Checks and Alternative Model Specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table OA8:**  Regressing Sanguinity-Cynicism regarding Human Nature and Society on the Experimental Treatments and Ideology, without Covariates | |
| **Predictors** | *b* (s.e.) |
| *Ideological Conservatism* (among control group) | . 04 (.04) |
| *Humanity Good Treatment* (among liberals) | **-.15 (.03)** |
| *Humanity Good Treatment \* Ideological Conservatism* | .09 (.05) |
| *Humanity Bad Treatment* (among liberals) | .03 (.03) |
| *Humanity Bad Treatment \* Ideological Conservatism* | **.14 (.05)** |
|  |  |
| Constant | .61 |
| N | 1560 |
| Adjusted R2 | .07 |

NOTE: Coefficients are percentage-point differences on the *human nature sanguinity-cynicism* index (cynicism coded high), with standard errors in parentheses. Statistically significant coefficients (p<.05) are in bold.

**IV (Continued).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table OA9:**  Regressing Sanguinity-Cynicism regarding Human Nature and Society on Ideology | |
| **Predictors** | *b* (s.e.) |
| *Ideological Conservatism* (among control group) | **.12 (.02)** |
|  |  |
| *Female* | -.03 (.02) |
| *White* | **.02 (.02)** |
| *Age* | **-.19 (.05)** |
| *Household Income* | -.02 (.03) |
| *Education* | **-.08 (.04)** |
|  |  |
| Constant | .55 |
| N | 1558 |
| Adjusted R2 | .03 |

**NOTE:** Coefficients are percentage-point differences on the *Human Nature Sanguinity–Cynicism* index (cynicism coded high), with standard errors in parentheses. Statistically significant coefficients (p<.05) are in bold.

**IV (Continued).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table OA10:**  Binary Probit Models: Experimental Treatments, Ideological Identification, and Individual Premises about Human Nature as the Outcome Variable in place of the Sanguinity-Cynicism Index | | | | |
|  | Human Nature Selfish | Human Nature Devious | Human Nature Undisciplined | Human Efforts Fail |
| Predictors | *dy/dx* (s.e.) | *dy/dx* (s.e.) | *dy/dx* (s.e.) | *dy/dx* (s.e.) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Ideological Conservatism* | -.01 (.05) | .01 (.05) | .07 (.05) | **.21 (.05)** |
| *Humanity Good Treatment* | **-.23 (.04)** | **-.16 (.04)** | **-.14 (.04)** | -.01 (.04) |
| *Humanity Good Treatment \* Ideological Conservatism* | **.15 (.07)** | .**16 (.07)** | .10 (.07) | .09 (.07) |
| *Humanity Bad Treatment* | .01 (.04) | .03 (.04) | .10 (.04) | .02 (.04) |
| *Humanity Bad**Treatment \* Ideological Conservatism* | **.21 (.07)** | **.21 (.07)** | .01 (.07) | .05 (.07) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Female* | -.01 (.03) | -.07 (.03) | .01 (.03) | -02 (.02) |
| *White* | -.01 (.03) | .01 (.03) | **.08 (.03)** | .01 (.03) |
| *Age* | **.18 (.07)** | **.32 (.07)** | **.28 (.07)** | .01 (.06) |
| *Household Income* | -.03 (.05) | .01 (.05) | -.09 (.05) | -.01 (.04) |
| *Education* | -.06 (.05) | **-.12 (.05)** | .02 (.05) | **-.15 (.05)** |
| N | 1558 | 1558 | 1558 | 1558 |
| Pseudo R2 | .05 | .05 | .03 | .04 |

**NOTE:** Coefficients are differences in the predicted probability of holding a cynical view of human nature that are associated with minimum-to-maximum increases in each explanatory variable, with standard errors in parentheses. Statistically significant relationships (p<.05) are in **bold**.

1. We are *not* arguing that premise disputes are exogenous. We suspect that there is considerable endogeneity between premise disputes and value conflicts. Given that endogeneity, we think that the effects we observe when modeled simultaneously with value conflicts probably understate their magnitude. By estimating a structural equation path model in this sway, we are attempting to estimate the range of possible premise dispute effect sizes, with the single equation regression results representing the minimal effect sizes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. N=685. Recursive Structural Equation Model. Statistically significant relationships (p<.05) noted with an \*. Party ID and demographic paths not displayed due to space constraints. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)