

Indirect relations

Indirect relations based on all structural equation models we tested (calculated in AMOS 25.0) are reported in the supplementary tables below. We report unstandardized indirect relations with 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals (20000 resamples) and *p*-values. We report total indirect relations (i.e., the sum of all paths that run through a given mediator from predictor to outcome).

Supplementary Table 1. Indirect relations based on the model of ideology as motivated social cognition.

	Unstandardized indirect effect		
	Study 1	Study 2	Study 4
HUM → SJ → PFE	.034[-.014, .130] <i>p</i> = .16	.032[-.006, .088] <i>p</i> = .090	.034[-.040, .176] <i>p</i> = .36
HUM → SJ → RES	-.021[-.120, .009] <i>p</i> = .19	-.022[-.082, .003] <i>p</i> = .093	-.034[-.172, .042] <i>p</i> = .37
HUM → SJ → LR	-.019[-.109, .009] <i>p</i> = .18	-.030[-.100, .006] <i>p</i> = .10	-.084[-.334, .124] <i>p</i> = .45
HUM → PFE → LR	-.128[-.318, -.001] <i>p</i> = .046	-.175[-.397, .028] <i>p</i> = .085	-.534[-1.19, -.218] <i>p</i> = .003
HUM → RES → LR	-.071[-.222, .065] <i>p</i> = .28	-.277[-.487, -.130] <i>p</i> < .001	-.007[-.102, .030] <i>p</i> = .50
NORM → SJ → PFE	-.044[-.159, .003] <i>p</i> = .068	-.161[-.359, -.064] <i>p</i> < .001	-.238[-.530, -.075] <i>p</i> = .002
NORM → SJ → RES	.027[-.008, .135] <i>p</i> = .15	.107[.010, .293] <i>p</i> = .029	.243[.083, .466] <i>p</i> = .008
NORM → SJ → LR	.025[-.007, .136] <i>p</i> = .15	.151[.048, .364] <i>p</i> = .001	.599[.356, .957] <i>p</i> < .001
NORM → PFE → LR	.093[.006, .227] <i>p</i> = .036	.111[-.004, .318] <i>p</i> = .057	.249[.075, .559] <i>p</i> = .003
NORM → RES → LR	.207[.073, .402] <i>p</i> = .001	1.34[.936, 2.06] <i>p</i> < .001	.124[-.126, .397] <i>p</i> = .23

Note. HUM = Humanism; NORM = Normativism; SJ = General system justification; PFE = Preference for equality; RES = Resistance to change; LR = Left-right self-placement.

Supplementary Table 2. Indirect relations based on the dual-process model of ideology.

	Unstandardized indirect effect		
	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
HUM → CWB → SDO	-.269[-.420, -.158] <i>p</i> < .001	-.340[-.565, -.053] <i>p</i> = .026	-.069[-.197, .009] <i>p</i> = .084
HUM → DWB → SDO	-.009[-.024, .000] <i>p</i> = .051	-.008[-.033, .005] <i>p</i> = .24	-.002[-.023, .005] <i>p</i> = .46
HUM → CWB → RWA	-.027[-.055, -.008] <i>p</i> = .006	-.031[-.096, .050] <i>p</i> = .35	-.006[-.032, .002] <i>p</i> = .15
HUM → DWB → RWA	-.101[-.178, -.046] <i>p</i> < .001	-.096[-.222, .000] <i>p</i> = .050	-.028[-.148, .067] <i>p</i> = .57
HUM → SDO → LR	-.449[-.683, -.259] <i>p</i> < .001	-.253[-.445, -.131] <i>p</i> = .001	-.319[-.741, -.050] <i>p</i> = .021
HUM → RWA → LR	-.418[-.681, -.234] <i>p</i> < .001	-.335[-.627, -.134] <i>p</i> < .001	-.073[-.604, .278] <i>p</i> = .65
HUM → CWB → LR	-.182[-.315, -.092] <i>p</i> < .001	.090[-.023, .520] <i>p</i> = .13	-.174[-.499, .019] <i>p</i> = .077
HUM → DWB → LR	-.094[-.174, -.041] <i>p</i> < .001	-.051[-.129, .004] <i>p</i> = .063	.007[-.024, .123] <i>p</i> = .42
NORM → CWB → SDO	.272[.165, .423] <i>p</i> < .001	.325[.080, .571] <i>p</i> = .023	.378[.191, .652] <i>p</i> = .001
NORM → DWB → SDO	.013[-.001, .031] <i>p</i> = .060	.048[-.010, .173] <i>p</i> = .11	.033[-.006, .082] <i>p</i> = .092
NORM → CWB → RWA	.027[.008, .055] <i>p</i> = .005	.030[-.068, .093] <i>p</i> = .34	.035[-.025, .093] <i>p</i> = .22
NORM → DWB → RWA	.142[.083, .223] <i>p</i> < .001	.535[.193, 1.01] <i>p</i> < .001	.394[.283, .567] <i>p</i> < .001
NORM → SDO → LR	.194[.100, .328] <i>p</i> < .001	.216[.098, .499] <i>p</i> = .001	.563[.046, 1.20] <i>p</i> = .033
NORM → RWA → LR	.314[.176, .501] <i>p</i> < .001	1.05[.307, 1.94] <i>p</i> < .001	1.54[.710, 3.04] <i>p</i> = .001
NORM → CWB → LR	.185[.095, .315] <i>p</i> < .001	-.085[-.596, .022] <i>p</i> = .14	.951[.437, 1.69] <i>p</i> = .001
NORM → DWB → LR	.132[.073, .216] <i>p</i> < .001	.286[.127, .619] <i>p</i> < .001	-.101[-.512, .228] <i>p</i> = .56

Note. HUM = Humanism; NORM = Normativism; CWB = Competitive-world beliefs; DWB = Dangerous-world beliefs; SDO = Social dominance orientation; RWA = Right-wing authoritarianism; LR = Left-right self-placement.

Supplementary Table 3. Indirect relations based on the model incorporating HEXACO personality traits.

	Unstandardized Indirect effect Study 4
HUM → O → SJ	.001[-.122, .086] <i>p</i> = .94
HUM → E → SJ	-.147[-.365, -.020] <i>p</i> = .025
HUM → H → SJ	-.088[-.250, -.014] <i>p</i> = .021
HUM → O → PFE	-.001[-.086, .072] <i>p</i> = .93
HUM → E → PFE	.156[.051, .334] <i>p</i> = .006
HUM → H → PFE	.033[-.021, .168] <i>p</i> = .20
HUM → O → RES	.000[-.089, .082] <i>p</i> = .92
HUM → E → RES	.006[-.144, .150] <i>p</i> = .96
HUM → H → RES	-.082[-.258, -.013] <i>p</i> = .012
HUM → O → LR	.003[-.119, .085] <i>p</i> = .90
HUM → E → LR	-.071[-.268, .078] <i>p</i> = .29
HUM → H → LR	-.113[-.302, -.022] <i>p</i> = .016
NORM → O → SJ	.137[.046, .295] <i>p</i> = .005
NORM → E → SJ	-.051[-.222, .007] <i>p</i> = .10
NORM → H → SJ	.098[.026, .247] <i>p</i> = .013
NORM → O → PFE	-.094[-.274, -.010] <i>p</i> = .025
NORM → E → PFE	.054[-.007, .187] <i>p</i> = .084
NORM → H → PFE	-.037[-.162, .024] <i>p</i> = .20
NORM → O → RES	.097[-.005, .253]

Supplement to *Rediscovering Tomkins' Polarity Theory: Humanism, Normativism, and the Bipolar Structure of Left-Right ideology in the U.S. and Sweden*

	$p = .058$
NORM → E → RES	.002[-.052, .066] $p = .79$
NORM → H → RES	.092[.025, .260] $p = .006$
NORM → O → LR	.125[.022, .299] $p = .020$
NORM → E → LR	-.031[-.168, .007] $p = .11$
NORM → H → LR	.123[.040, .290] $p = .010$

Note. HUM = Humanism; NORM = Normativism; SJ = General system justification; PFE = Preference for equality; RES = Resistance to change; O = Openness; E = Emotionality; H = Honesty; LR = Left-right self-placement.