



Actively Open-Minded Thinking: Development of a Shortened Scale and Disentangling Attitudes Towards Knowledge and People

Journal:	<i>Thinking & Reasoning</i>
Manuscript ID	TAR-EP 60.17.R2
Manuscript Type:	Empirical Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Sep-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Svedholm-Häkkinen, Annika; Helsingin Yliopisto Laaketieteellinen tiedekunta, Department of Psychology and Logopedics Lindeman, Marjaana; Helsingin Yliopisto Laaketieteellinen tiedekunta, Department of Psychology and Logopedics
Keywords:	actively open-minded thinking, thinking disposition, reflective thinking, Type 2 processing, scale development

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Actively Open-Minded Thinking: Development of a Shortened Scale and Disentangling Attitudes**Towards Knowledge and People**

Svedholm-Häkkinen, Annika M.¹, Lindeman, Marjaana¹

¹ *Department of Psychology and Logopedics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland*

*Corresponding author: Annika M. Svedholm-Häkkinen, Department of Psychology and

Logopedics, P. O. Box 21, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail:

annika.svedholm@helsinki.fi, phone +358 504484154, ORCID: 0000-0002-6462-6630.

Marjaana Lindeman, Department of Psychology and Logopedics, P. O. Box 21, 00014 University of

Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: marjaana.lindeman@helsinki.fi, phone +358 29 4129402, ORCID: 0000-

0003-4176-3736.

RUNNING HEAD: Factors in the Actively Open-Minded Thinking Scale

Funding: This work was supported by the Academy of Finland [grant number 265518].

Word count: 9047

Abstract

Actively Open-Minded Thinking (AOT) is often used as a proxy for reflective thinking in research on reasoning and related fields. It is associated with less biased reasoning in many types of tasks. However, few studies have examined its psychometric properties and criterion validity. We developed a shortened, 17-item version of the AOT for quicker administration. AOT17 is highly correlated with the original 41-item scale and has highly similar relationships to other thinking dispositions, social competence, and supernatural beliefs. Our analyses revealed that the AOT is not a unitary construct, but comprises four distinct dimensions, some of which concern attitudes towards knowledge, and others concern attitudes towards people. This factor structure was replicated in another dataset, and correlations with other measures in four datasets (total $N = 3345$) support the criterion validity of these dimensions. Different dimensions were responsible for the AOT's relationships with other thinking dispositions.

Keywords: actively open-minded thinking; thinking disposition; reflective thinking; Type 2 processing; scale development;

Introduction

Actively open-minded thinking is one of several thinking styles, or thinking dispositions, suggested to play an important role for how humans reason. According to Stanovich and West (2000), the long debate on whether humans are rational can be solved by responding that some people behave and think more rationally than others. Partly this is due to individual differences in cognitive ability, but Stanovich and colleagues have shown that independently of cognitive ability, thinking dispositions also play an important part in explaining the degree to which individuals tend to reason rationally (e.g., Stanovich, 2009). That is, those with a strong disposition to think reflectively, to use all their cognitive skills to think things through, tend to display good reasoning, while those with a lower striving for good thinking tend to put less effort into their thinking, and therefore, to display poorer and less rational reasoning.

Among the thinking dispositions discussed in the reasoning literature, actively open-minded thinking describes a highly intellectual type of thinking. The concept is originally from Baron (1993), who wanted to define principles of good thinking that apply in any field. According to Baron, one central principle is avoiding myside bias (also known as confirmation bias), that is, looking at issues from a multitude of perspectives instead of only generating arguments in favour of one's own opinion, as people so often tend to do (Mercier & Sperber, 2011). To operationalise this tendency, Stanovich and colleagues have put together a scale that has come to be used in much research on reasoning. In Stanovich's refinement, the AOT (Sá, West, & Stanovich, 1999; Stanovich & West, 1997) intends to assess high-level epistemic goals, decontextualized reasoning, and the tendency to reflect on the rules of inference. As such, the AOT has been used to illustrate humans' ability for the highest level of reflective thinking, which is decoupled from immediate experience (Stanovich, 2009).

1
2
3 Empirical studies have confirmed that the AOT succeeds in measuring the absence of myside
4 bias. For example, AOT predicts the ability to evaluate argument quality objectively (Stanovich &
5 West, 1997) and it is negatively related to the tendency to rate arguments that are in favour of
6 one's own viewpoint as being better than counterarguments (Stanovich & West, 2008). AOT has
7 also been found related to less use of heuristics and to being less influenced by prior beliefs (i.e.,
8 having less belief bias) on several types of reasoning tasks (Campitelli & Gerrans, 2014; Heijltjes,
9 van Gog, Leppink, & Paas, 2015; Macpherson & Stanovich, 2007; West, Toplak, & Stanovich, 2008).
10 Higher AOT has also been linked with providing more evidence for one's views (Sá, Kelley, Ho, &
11 Stanovich, 2005). Furthermore, people high in AOT are better than those with low AOT at
12 assessing their own level of knowledge and at assessing how many people agree with them, that
13 is, at avoiding the curse of knowledge bias and the false consensus bias (Sá & Stanovich, 2001).
14 Moreover, the AOT has been found to predict higher acceptance of counterintuitive ideas such as
15 evolution (Sinatra, Southerland, McConaughy, & Demastes, 2003).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Despite its merits, the AOT measure in its current form could be improved in several ways.
35
36 First of all, the measure is long – 41 items. For easier administration, a shorter measure is called
37 for. Secondly, and more importantly, the dimensionality and other psychometric properties of the
38 AOT have never been thoroughly reported. The items in the scale were originally drawn from a
39 multitude of sources. Stanovich and West (1997) report that when choosing the items, "Within the
40 larger domain of thinking dispositions, we examined those that we viewed as most relevant to
41 rational thought" (p. 345), and "with potential epistemic significance" (p. 345). Items were drawn
42 from existing scales (and some newly devised scales) on flexible thinking, openness-ideas,
43 openness-values, absolutism, dogmatism, categorical thinking, belief identification, and
44 counterfactual thinking. Summing these measures into one composite score was justified by a
45 principal components analysis, which showed that one component accounted for most measures,
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 while a second one captured the measure of counterfactual thinking. The resulting composite
4
5 score is described as assessing cognitive flexibility, willingness to perspective-switch, willingness to
6
7 decontextualize, the opposite of cognitive rigidity, epistemological absolutism, and resistance to
8
9 belief change.

10
11
12 Recently, Haran, Ritov and Mellers (2013) presented a welcome, much shortened version of
13
14 the AOT consisting of 7 items that the authors deemed most closely corresponded to Baron's
15
16 description of actively open-minded thinking and most relevant for a general population.
17
18 Preliminary findings indicate that this short scale is related to unbiased reasoning on syllogistic
19
20 reasoning tasks and has correlations with other thinking dispositions and abilities comparable to
21
22 those that are typically found for the 41-item version of the AOT (Szaszi, Szollosi, Palfi, & Aczel,
23
24 2017). However, no studies to date have reported empirical evidence of how this short scale
25
26 relates to the original, and thus, more research is needed to establish what aspects of the AOT
27
28 construct it measures.
29
30
31
32

33
34 The original, 41-item AOT scale tends to have an internal reliability coefficient of .70–.88
35
36 (e.g., Deniz, Donnelly, & Yilmaz, 2008; Heijltjes et al., 2015; Newstead, Handley, Harley, Wright, &
37
38 Farrelly, 2004), indicating that the various items share a moderate amount of variance. Because all
39
40 the original scales correlate with each other, most researchers no longer calculate subscales but
41
42 treat the AOT as a single scale. However, it is currently not known whether actively open-minded
43
44 thinking is a unitary phenomenon or whether it is multidimensional, an option that is certainly
45
46 feasible given the various origins of the items. As Stanovich and West's (1997) principal
47
48 components analysis was run on sum variables of the included scales, any possible dimensionality
49
50 within the original scales was not examined. For example, the scale on flexible thinking included
51
52 items on both reflexivity, willingness to consider alternative opinions, and a willingness to
53
54 postpone closure. In the few studies that report the internal consistencies of these original
55
56
57
58
59
60

subcales, the consistencies tend to be low, with Cronbach's α s in the range of .44–.78 (Newstead et al., 2004; Stanovich & West, 1997). This leaves open the possibility that the different aspects of the subscales are differently related to each other.

Possible dimensions in the AOT might also help clarify its relationship to other thinking dispositions. In research on both reasoning and in applied fields, many different measures of reflective, Type 2, or analytical thinking are in use, often without explanation of why a certain measure was chosen for a particular study. The most often used reflective thinking disposition measure is the Need for Cognition scale (NFC; Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984). In addition, many studies include the Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT; Frederick, 2005), which partly measures numerical and reflective reasoning skill and partly disposition (for discussion of the CRT, see e.g., Campitelli & Gerrans, 2014; Toplak, West, & Stanovich, 2011; Szaszi et al., 2017). Even though the AOT typically correlates with both of these measures only around $r = .20$ (Campitelli & Gerrans, 2014; Kokis, Macpherson, Toplak, West, & Stanovich, 2002; Toplak, West, & Stanovich, 2014; Toplak et al., 2011), items from these different instruments are sometimes even mixed together. For example, to operationalise reflective processing, Klaczynski (2014) summed items from NFC, AOT, and other scales into one composite variable. This type of praxis makes it difficult to know what proportions of variance the different scales accounted for.

To gain more insight into the similarities and differences between these different types of analytical or reflective thinking dispositions and skills, we will examine the relationships between NFC, CRT, and the possible dimensions found in the AOT. For comparison, we will also look at how the AOT relates to the counterpart of reflective thinking, namely the disposition for intuitive thinking. Further, as AOT has been found related to the propensity to rate arguments without being biased by one's own opinions (Stanovich & West, 1997), we are also going to look at which of its subdimensions are responsible for this relationship.

1
2
3 Moreover, as some of the items on the AOT particularly concern how one relates to other
4
5 people, it seems likely that these items might be related to measures of social competence. For
6
7 example, the AOT items “I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people’s lifestyles”
8
9 and “There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for”
10
11 explicitly concern attitudes towards others and they sound quite different from more impersonal
12
13 items such as “Beliefs should always be revised in response to new information or evidence”,
14
15 which are more straightforwardly concerned with one’s general epistemological stance. Thus, we
16
17 can expect the former type of items to be related to interpersonal variables while the latter are
18
19 probably not related to them.
20
21
22

23
24 Lastly, one type of measure that is likely to bring out differences between the potential
25
26 dimensions within the AOT are supernatural beliefs. Studies have found people with higher AOT to
27
28 hold weaker supernatural beliefs (Pennycook, Cheyne, Barr, Koehler, & Fugelsang, 2013). As these
29
30 beliefs are independent of empathic ability (Lindeman, Svedholm-Häkkinen, & Lipsanen, 2015),
31
32 they seem unlikely to be related to the interpersonal aspects of the AOT and their relationship to
33
34 the AOT is more likely driven by its more epistemological aspects.
35
36
37

38 In sum, to find out whether a smaller number of items may be enough to assess the AOT
39
40 concept and to get to the bottom of its possible dimensions, we will run factor analysis on the
41
42 individual items in the AOT. In Study 1, we will first use exploratory analysis to preliminarily
43
44 identify the main dimensions in the AOT and to identify the items that most clearly tap into one of
45
46 these main dimensions. Then, for a more rigorous test of the factor structure, we will use
47
48 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The aim is to shorten the AOT scale and to form meaningful
49
50 subfactors. By correlating these subfactors with external variables of other thinking dispositions,
51
52 social competence, and various forms of supernatural beliefs, we will explore their construct
53
54 validity. Study 2 aims to replicate the factor structure using CFA on a different data set, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Studies 2–4 will further explore the correlations of the subfactors with outside criterion variables.
4
5 In addition, we will analyse the 7-item version of the AOT (Haran et al., 2013) to test what its
6
7 relationship to the original scale is, how well it fits the data and what aspects of the AOT it
8
9 measures.
10

11 Study 1

12 Method

13
14
15 **Participants and procedure.** The participants were 2735 Finnish volunteers (65% females).
16
17 The mean age was 28 years ($SD = 8.87$, range 15–69). Of the participants, 27% were working, 64%
18
19 were students, and 9% were otherwise occupied. Of the students, most were university students
20
21 (85%). Originally, 3086 people took part in the study, but 2 were excluded because their
22
23 comments about the study revealed that they had not completed the questionnaire seriously.
24
25 Because the questionnaire was long, many participants skipped one or more measures. Full data
26
27 on the AOT was available for 2735 people. The participants were recruited to the online study via
28
29 several open internet discussion forums, several student mailing lists, and from a participant pool
30
31 comprising individuals who had expressed an interest to participate in our studies. No exclusion
32
33 criteria for participation were applied. The participants were told that the study concerned
34
35 thinking and personality, and confidentiality and voluntary participation were emphasised. The
36
37 respondents were given 3 weeks to participate in the study. As compensation, all participants
38
39 received a thinking style profile based on the AOT.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Measures.** We administered the 41-item Actively Open-Minded Thinking scale ($\alpha = .83$) (Sá
49
50 et al., 1999; Stanovich & West, 1997). Other thinking dispositions were assessed with the 10-item
51
52 Intuition subscale ($\alpha = .79$) and the 12-item Rational subscale ($\alpha = .86$; corresponding to the Need
53
54 for Cognition subscale of the REI) of the Rational/Experiential Multimodal Inventory (REIm;
55
56 Epstein, 2010). The Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT; Frederick, 2005), which consists of three items,
57
58
59
60

was used to assess the disposition and skills necessary to inhibit heuristically compelling but incorrect responses and to calculate the correct response. To assess social competence, we included the Empathy Quotient (EQ-short, 15 items, $\alpha = .81$; Muncer & Ling, 2006), the Pictorial Empathy Test (PET, 7 items; $\alpha = .90$; Lindeman, Koirikivi, & Lipsanen, 2016), the Tromsø Social Intelligence scale (21 items, $\alpha = .90$, Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001), and the Friendship Scale (6 items, $\alpha = .82$, Hawthorne, 2006). Lastly, to assess supernatural beliefs we used 15 items ($\alpha = .94$) on paranormal beliefs from the Revised Paranormal Beliefs Scale (RPBS; Tobacyk, 2004) and 8 items ($\alpha = .94$) on religious beliefs (Jong, Bluemke, & Halberstadt, 2013).

Results and Discussion

In order to shorten the AOT, we first ran an exploratory factor analysis on the entire scale. Extraction was done using the maximum likelihood method and direct oblimin rotation. Inspection of the scree plot indicated that the scale contained five factors. Four-factor and six-factor solutions were also tested but setting the number of factors at five resulted in a solution with the clearest factor structure. There were 19 items with loadings $>.40$ on one of the five factors, and no crossloadings $>.30$.

Insert Table 1

Next, these 19 items were used in confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Preliminary analyses indicated that a factor consisting of the two items on counterfactual thinking (items 25 and 28) had only weak correlations with the other items, and thus, we left them outside further analyses. We tested four different models, summarised in Table 1. Model 1 tested whether AOT can be modelled as a unitary phenomenon, Model 2 tested the assumption that the AOT contains four distinct dimensions that are part of a larger underlying AOT factor, and Model 3 tested four

1
2
3 independent but intercorrelated factors. By adding crossloadings suggested by modification
4
5 indices to Model 3, we arrived at Model 4 which showed good fit to the data. Table 2 shows the
6
7 factor loadings in this model and Table 3 shows the correlations between its latent factors. The
8
9 maximal weighted reliabilities (Raykov's ρ) of the four latent factors (crossloadings not included)
10
11 were as follows: .73, .68, .45, and .63. In subsequent analyses, we used this 17-item version,
12
13 which was highly correlated with the 41-item original ($r = .91$). Tested using Feldt's (1980) method,
14
15 the internal consistency of the shortened scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$) was lower than of the 41-item
16
17 original, $t(2733) = 24.47, p < .001$, but still acceptable.

18
19
20
21
22 Next, we compared the AOT17 to the 7-item version of AOT (AOT7). In the 7-item version
23
24 used by Haran et al. (2013), 3 items were slightly reworded but in the present analyses, we used
25
26 the original wordings of the items as they were included in our dataset. Inspecting the AOT7
27
28 shows that 4 of its items overlapped with the newly found Fact Resistance subscale of the AOT17,
29
30 while the remaining 3 items on the AOT7 did not make their way into the AOT17. To test the fit of
31
32 AOT7 to the data, we tested a model in which its 7 items loaded onto one latent factor. As Table 1
33
34 shows, the AOT7 fit the data less well than the final version of AOT17 (Model 4), although the
35
36 maximum weighted reliability of the latent AOT7 factor ($\rho = .68$) was comparable to the
37
38 reliabilities of the latent subfactors in Model 4. However, the alpha reliability of these 7 items ($\alpha =$
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
.61) was significantly lower than of AOT17, $t(2731) = 14.94, p < .001$. Likewise, the correlation of
AOT7 with AOT41 ($r = .60$) was lower than of AOT17, $z = 27.03, p < .001$, two-tailed. The
significance of the difference of the correlations was tested using the COCOR calculator
(Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015), available at <http://comparingcorrelations.org>. These results
indicate that as a shortened measure of the overall AOT construct, AOT7 was less reliable and less
valid than AOT17.

1
2
3 Based on the results of the CFA, we then calculated simple sum variables representing the
4
5 four factors of the AOT17. For clarity, we excluded items that loaded equally strongly on more
6
7 than one factor. Items marked in boldface in Table 2 were included in the sum variables. Thus,
8
9 subscale 1 (Dogmatism) contained 5 items ($\alpha = .67$) expressing dogmatic thinking, subscale 2 (Fact
10
11 Resistance) contained 3 items ($\alpha = .67$) expressing a resistance to change one's mind in the face of
12
13 facts, subscale 3 (Liberalism) contained 3 items ($\alpha = .43$) expressing liberal and tolerant attitudes
14
15 towards people, and subscale 4 (Belief Personification) contained 3 items ($\alpha = .56$) expressing the
16
17 personification of opinions. Note that all subscales are coded in the direction that higher scores
18
19 indicate greater open-mindedness. Table 2 also shows the source of the items, that is, the
20
21 instruments from which Stanovich and West (1997) and Sá et al. (1999) originally drew the items.
22
23 As the table shows, items from the original sources were distributed across the new factors /
24
25 subscales.
26
27
28
29

30
31 To investigate the criterion validity of this four-dimensional structure, we turned to
32
33 correlations with external variables, presented in Table 4. For comparison, Table 4 also presents
34
35 correlations with AOT7. As EQ, PET, Social Intelligence and the Friendship Scale showed highly
36
37 similar patterns of correlations with the new AOT subscales, we combined their standardised
38
39 scores into a Social Competence composite variable to ease interpretation of the results. Likewise,
40
41 the items on paranormal beliefs and religious beliefs (which were highly correlated with each
42
43 other, $r = .68$) were combined into a Supernatural Beliefs composite variable.
44
45
46
47

48 -----

49
50 Insert Tables 2, 3, 4
51

52 -----
53
54

55 As Table 4 shows, AOT17 showed highly similar correlations to all the studied variables as
56
57 the original AOT41. Inspection of the correlations between AOT subscales and other variables
58
59
60

1
2
3 reveals a pattern in which the Fact Resistance subscale dominated the associations between AOT
4
5 and the criterion variables. The associations with other thinking dispositions as well as with
6
7 Supernatural Beliefs were largely driven by this subscale. However, the association between AOT
8
9 and Social Competence, in turn, was driven by all other subscales but not the Fact Resistance
10
11 subscale. These results indicate a dissociation between elements of the AOT that concern
12
13 attitudes towards knowledge, and other elements that concern attitudes towards people. Besides
14
15 this pattern of associations, slightly stronger correlations were also found between NFC and
16
17 Liberalism, and between Supernatural Beliefs and Dogmatism. The AOT7, in turn, showed a similar
18
19 pattern of correlations with the criterion variables as the Fact Resistance subscale, which was not
20
21 surprising given its overlap with this subscale.
22
23
24
25

26
27 In sum, the present results indicate that it was possible to shorten the AOT to a 17-item
28
29 version without compromising criterion validity, although reliability did suffer somewhat. The 17-
30
31 item version showed better fit to the data than the 7-item version. Further, the results suggest
32
33 that the AOT consists of four distinct dimensions with different patterns of association with
34
35 external measures of other thinking dispositions, social competence, and supernatural beliefs.
36
37 Next, we conducted Study 2 to examine whether this same factor structure could be replicated in
38
39 another dataset, and whether correlations with further criterion variables support the conclusions
40
41 drawn from Study 1.
42
43
44

45 Study 2

46 Method

47
48
49 **Participants and procedure.** We reanalysed the data used in Svedholm & Lindeman (2013b,
50
51 Study 2). The participants were 458 Finnish volunteers (77% females; mean age 27, $SD = 7.9$ years,
52
53 range 18–65) who were recruited through student mailing lists and several online discussion fora.
54
55 Of the sample, 76.6% were students, and 17.2% were working.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Measures.** AOT was assessed as in Study 1. The reliability of the 41-item scale was $\alpha = .83$.

4
5 Faith in Intuition and Need for Cognition were assessed using the 20-item versions of the scales
6
7 developed by Pacini and Epstein (1999). Supernatural Beliefs were assessed using 23 items ($\alpha =$
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 .94) from the Revised Paranormal Beliefs Scale (RPBS; Tobacyk, 2004), with modifications
15
16 described in Svedholm and Lindeman (2013b).

17 **Results and Discussion**

18 As in Study 1, we tested models expressing AOT17 as a unitary phenomenon, as four distinct
19
20 dimensions that are part of a larger underlying AOT factor, and as four independent but
21
22 intercorrelated factors. These models (6–8) were equivalent to Models 1–3 from Study 1. By
23
24 adding crossloadings to Model 8, we arrived at Model 9, which was equivalent to Model 4 of Study
25
26 1 and which fit the data excellently. In addition, we tested AOT7, which again fit the data less well.
27
28 The maximum weighted reliabilities (Raykov's ρ) for the four latent factors of AOT17 were .76, .73,
29
30 .48, and .56, and the ρ for the latent AOT7 factor was .72. Table 5 shows the factor loadings in the
31
32 AOT17 and Table 6 shows their intercorrelations.

33
34
35 As in Study 1, we calculated sum variables for the four AOT subscales using the items that
36
37 had strong loadings (the same items had strong loadings in both studies). We calculated the new
38
39 subscales of Dogmatism ($\alpha = .70$), Fact Resistance ($\alpha = .65$), Liberalism ($\alpha = .46$), and Belief
40
41 Personification ($\alpha = .52$). Table 7 shows their correlations with external criterion variables. As the
42
43 table shows, AOT17 ($\alpha = .76$) was again highly correlated with the original 41-item scale and it had
44
45 highly similar correlations with all studied variables. However, its reliability was again lower than
46
47 that of the original scale, $t(456) = 8.49, p < .001$, although still on an acceptable level. Breaking
48
49 down the correlations between AOT subscales and other variables reveals that as in Study 1, the
50
51 Fact Resistance subscale had the strongest correlations with Faith in Intuition and with
52
53 Supernatural Beliefs. However, Need for Cognition was almost equally related to all AOT subscales.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As in Study 1, AOT7 had significantly weaker reliability ($\alpha = .66$) than AOT17, $t(456) = 4.92, p < .001$. Moreover, AOT7 was less strongly related to AOT41 than was AOT17, $z = 10.15, p < .001$. Its pattern of correlations with the criterion variables was again similar to that of the Fact Resistance subscale of AOT17.

Insert Tables 5, 6, 7

In sum, the results of Study 2 supported the validity of the shortened, 17-item version of AOT. The results also showed that the factor structure with four distinct factors on Dogmatism, Fact Resistance, Liberalism, and Belief Personification could be replicated in another dataset. Further, these results replicated the finding that many of the associations between AOT and knowledge-related variables were strongest for the AOT Fact Resistance subscale.

Study 3

Method

Participants and procedure. For this study we reanalysed the data gathered for Svedholm and Lindeman (2013a). The participants were 102 Finnish upper secondary school (grade 10–12) students (47% females, mean age 16 years, age range 15–18). The participants were recruited with the help of teachers from the schools and the study was conducted in classrooms during school hours.

Measures. AOT was assessed as before. The reliability of the 41-item scale was $\alpha = .83$. Faith in Intuition and Need for Cognition were assessed using the 5-item versions (FI: $\alpha = .60$; NFC: $\alpha = .75$) of Epstein, Pacini, Denes-Raj, and Heier (1996). Because trust in complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) is positively related to supernatural beliefs, intuitive thinking, openness, and magical thinking (Honda & Jacobson, 2005; Saher & Lindeman, 2005), we included

1
2
3 it in the present analyses. Trust in CAM was assessed using a list of 13 commercially available
4
5 treatments such as homeopathy and oriental medicine ($\alpha = .92$); for details, see Svedholm and
6
7 Lindeman (2013a).
8

9 10 **Results and discussion**

11
12 Table 8 shows the correlations between the studied variables. Because this dataset was
13
14 smaller, we did not run CFA. Instead, we calculated the new subscales of Dogmatism ($\alpha = .58$), Fact
15
16 Resistance ($\alpha = .60$), Liberalism ($\alpha = .58$), and Belief Personification ($\alpha = .48$) using the same items
17
18 as before, as well as the AOT7. As the table shows, AOT17 ($\alpha = .71$) was again highly correlated
19
20 with AOT41, and had similar correlations to the other studied variables, although its reliability was
21
22 lower than that of the original scale, $t(100) = 5.93, p < .001$. In line with the findings from Studies 1
23
24 and 2 on a negative association between Fact Resistance and supernatural beliefs, Fact Resistance
25
26 was the subscale with the strongest relationship to trust in alternative medicine. Differing slightly
27
28 from the results in Studies 1 and 2, the intuitive disposition was nearly as strongly associated with
29
30 Dogmatism and Belief Personification as it was with Fact Resistance. On Need for Cognition, the
31
32 only subscale with a significant association was Belief Personification. These different emphases in
33
34 the results may be due to the younger age of the participants: adolescents may not have fully
35
36 established their thinking dispositions yet because of their limited life experience, which gives
37
38 them little grounds to trust their intuition (Fletcher, Marks, & Hine, 2012). The AOT7 ($\alpha = .47$)
39
40 showed the strongest correlation to the Fact Resistance subscale and its only significant
41
42 correlation with the criterion variables was a fairly strong negative association with the intuitive
43
44 disposition. Again, AOT7 had significantly lower reliability, $t(100) = 3.76, p < .001$, and a lower
45
46 correlation with AOT41, $z = 4.65, p < .001$, than AOT17 did.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Table 8

Study 4

Method

Participants and procedure. For this study we reanalysed the data gathered for Svedholm & Lindeman (2013b, Study 1). The participants were 50 Finnish volunteers (74 % females, mean age 34 years, age range 19–62) recruited from student mailing lists, by snowball sampling and by inviting people who had expressed an interest in further studies. Of the sample, 38% were university students, 42% were working full time, and 10% were otherwise occupied. The majority (62%) had completed a university degree.

Measures. AOT was assessed as before. The reliability of the 41-item scale was $\alpha = .84$. We calculated the new subscales of Dogmatism ($\alpha = .49$), Fact Resistance ($\alpha = .64$), Liberalism ($\alpha = .58$), and Belief Personification ($\alpha = .48$). Faith in Intuition was assessed using 19 items ($\alpha = .88$) from Pacini and Epstein (1999), and Need for Cognition using the 18-item ($\alpha = .81$) version of Cacioppo et al. (1984). The ability to rate argument quality independently of one's own opinion was assessed using the Argument Evaluation Test developed by Stanovich and West (1997; Finnish adaptation by Svedholm & Lindeman, 2013b). Supernatural Beliefs were assessed with 23 items ($\alpha = .95$) from the Revised Paranormal Beliefs Scale (Tobacyk, 2004).

Results and discussion

Table 9 shows the associations between all the studied variables. AOT17 ($\alpha = .68$) was again highly correlated with AOT41, and had very similar correlations to the other studied variables, but lower reliability than the AOT41, $t(48) = 5.37, p < .001$. Due to the small sample size, few correlations reached significance. However, notable findings are that the AET, which can be

1
2
3 thought of as a direct assessment of the absence of myside bias, was fairly strongly positively
4
5 correlated with AOT's Dogmatism and Fact Resistance subscales, but not with Liberalism or Belief
6
7 Personification. Need for Cognition had a positive association with Liberalism but with none of the
8
9 other subscales. In this dataset, the AOT7 ($\alpha = .59$) had stronger relationships to the other thinking
10
11 dispositions than the Fact Resistance subscale did, but its correlations with AET and Supernatural
12
13 Beliefs were of a similar magnitude as those of Fact Resistance. Even in this small dataset, the
14
15 correlation with AOT41 was higher for AOT17 than for AOT7, $z = 3.17, p = .002$. However, the
16
17 difference in reliability coefficients did not reach statistical significance, $t(48) = 1.19, p = .24$.
18
19
20
21

22 -----
23
24 Insert Table 9
25
26 -----
27

28 29 30 **General Discussion**

31
32 The aims of the present study were twofold: firstly, to develop a shorter version of the AOT
33
34 assessment instrument and secondly, to explore its possible dimensions. Through exploratory and
35
36 confirmatory analyses of four separate samples, including students as well as the general
37
38 population and adolescents, we found that it was possible to shorten the AOT to less than half its
39
40 original items without compromising criterion validity. In all samples, the 17-item version of the
41
42 AOT had a high correlation with the original 41-item version, and highly similar correlations with
43
44 external criterion variables assessing other thinking dispositions, social competence, and
45
46 supernatural beliefs. Moreover, even though the internal consistency of the AOT17 was lower
47
48 than that of the AOT41, it was acceptable and on par with that typically reported for the AOT41
49
50 (Heijltjes et al., 2015; Newstead et al., 2004; West et al., 2008). The advantages of a shorter scale
51
52 are multiple: since they require less time than longer scales, they are particularly suitable for use
53
54 in longitudinal studies and large-scale studies, and they also lessen participant boredom and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fatigue (for discussion, see Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006; Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann
4
5 Jr., 2003). However, shortening the scale as drastically as to 7 items, like Haran et al. (2013) did,
6
7 resulted in a larger loss of reliability and to an instrument that less strongly reflects the same
8
9 construct as the original. Based on the present results, then, the 17-item version is preferable to
10
11 the 7-item version if the aim is to assess overall AOT.
12
13

14
15 Regarding the dimensionality of the AOT, we found that AOT is unquestionably not a unitary
16
17 phenomenon, as models testing this assumption showed very poor fit to the data. Nor could AOT
18
19 be modelled as separate dimensions subsumed under one higher-order factor. Rather, the data
20
21 pointed us to search for distinct but intercorrelated factors within the AOT. The model that fit the
22
23 data the best, and which was replicated in another sample, revealed four AOT subfactors:
24
25 Dogmatism (a lack of dogmatic thinking), Fact Resistance (an openness to change one's mind in
26
27 the face of facts), Liberalism (liberal and tolerant attitudes towards other people), and Belief
28
29 Personification (a refusal to judge people for their opinions).
30
31
32

33
34 That AOT is not unitary is not a new idea and not surprising, given that the original scale is a
35
36 composite of diverse measures. Rather, this result confirms what was already known in principle.
37
38 However, the dimensions that we identified on statistical grounds turned out to be somewhat
39
40 different from the factors that were originally included. For example, our analyses formed the
41
42 Dogmatism subscale from items that were originally from the Openness-Values, Dogmatism, and
43
44 Categorical Thinking scales used by Stanovich and colleagues. Our Fact Resistance subscale mostly
45
46 consists of items that were originally included in the Belief Identification scale, but our analyses
47
48 show that one item on Flexible Thinking also loads strongly on this same factor. Moreover, we
49
50 found that the subdimensions do not reflect a common higher-order factor, which indicates more
51
52 conceptual independence of the different dimensions than has perhaps been previously thought.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The correlations of these subscales with outside variables are indicative of the different
4
5 elements making up the AOT. Most strikingly, the present studies revealed that many of the
6
7 relationships between AOT and other thinking dispositions and supernatural beliefs were mainly
8
9 driven by one AOT subfactor, namely Fact Resistance. That is, the more open one was to change
10
11 one's mind in light of new facts, the less one tended to trust one's intuition, the less one believed
12
13 in phenomena such as clairvoyance, ghosts, and alternative medicine, and the better one did on
14
15 the trick questions in the Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT). Further, Dogmatism and Fact Resistance
16
17 were responsible for the AOT's association with the Argument Evaluation Test, while the other
18
19 subfactors bore no relation to it. Taken together, these findings indicate that Fact Resistance and
20
21 Dogmatism measure the propensity to avoid myside bias and to evaluate information objectively,
22
23 which is the hard core of what researchers have wanted to capture with the AOT (Stanovich &
24
25 West, 1997). Based on item overlap with Fact Resistance as well as correlations with criterion
26
27 variables, AOT7 (Haran et al., 2013) also seems to mostly focus on this aspect of AOT.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 However, the findings indicate that the longer versions of AOT also involve elements of a
35
36 softer nature, which concern how one relates to other people. Our analyses showed that the AOT
37
38 items concerned with interpersonal attitudes formed two distinct factors, Liberalism and Belief
39
40 Personification, which were separate from the factors concerned with knowledge. These two
41
42 people-focused subscales (together with Dogmatism) drove the association between AOT and our
43
44 measures of Social Competence, which was comprised of measures of empathy, social
45
46 intelligence, and friendship quality. These results are understandable – it is not difficult to see why
47
48 people who have an open and allowing attitude towards others, and who refrain from ad
49
50 hominem-type thinking, are more likely to fare well in social situations.
51
52
53

54
55 Another consequence of knowing what dimensions the AOT contains is that it helps us clarify
56
57 the relationships of the AOT with other thinking dispositions and abilities, particularly NFC and
58
59
60

1
2
3 CRT. Across our four samples, NFC had variable associations with the different subscales of the
4
5 AOT. These results may be explained in terms of the more general scope of need for cognition
6
7 compared to actively open-minded thinking. That is, the need for cognition is a more general
8
9 interest in understanding the surrounding world (a review: Petty, Briñol, Loersch, & McCaslin,
10
11 2009), explaining why it mostly tended to only be related to overall AOT. In von Stumm and
12
13 Ackerman's (2013) terms, both of these thinking styles can be thought of as "investment traits"
14
15 that determine how much effort the person invests in thinking. However, while the need for
16
17 cognition is seen as a higher order factor, intellectual curiosity such as that assessed by AOT is a
18
19 more specific concept as it focuses on avoiding bias. In contrast, the CRT was mainly related to the
20
21 Fact Resistance subscale of the AOT, indicating that the CRT captures a more focused open-
22
23 minded stance towards knowledge.
24
25
26
27

28 **Limitations and Future Directions**

29
30
31 When assessing the findings of the present study, a few limitations should be taken into
32
33 account. Firstly, as the newly formed AOT subscales had low reliabilities (no better than the
34
35 internal consistencies of the original subscales), the correlations between these subscales and
36
37 other variables were likely deflated and any findings obtained using these subscales should be
38
39 taken as preliminary. If in future studies one wishes to measure the different dimensions of AOT, it
40
41 may be best to start by developing more statistically robust assessment instruments with more
42
43 items per subscale.
44
45
46

47
48 Secondly, the findings of the present studies are necessarily limited by the choice of external
49
50 variables that we used. To establish whether the dissociation between knowledge-related and
51
52 people-related elements in the AOT can be replicated, future studies should test for associations
53
54 between AOT and more diverse measures of, on the one hand, social skills, and on the other hand,
55
56 good reasoning. A particular variable related to good reasoning that deserves attention in this
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context is epistemic sophistication. In their description of how the AOT was developed, Stanovich
4
5 and West (1997) noted that “Perhaps the strongest similarities are with the two dispositional
6
7 factors that Schommer (1990, 1993) called ‘belief in simple knowledge’ and ‘belief in certain
8
9 knowledge.’” However, we know of no research directly testing whether the AOT measure
10
11 covaries with the epistemic factors of Schommer or with any other assessments of epistemological
12
13 beliefs.
14
15

16
17 Thirdly, the variable relationships of the NCF with different AOT subfactors need to be
18
19 interpreted with caution. Partly these variable results may stem from subtle differences between
20
21 the different versions of the NFC that were in use in the different studies. In particular, the finding
22
23 that NFC was only related to Belief Personification in Study 3 was obtained using a 5-item scale,
24
25 which has not been validated for adolescents, who made up the sample for that study. Likewise,
26
27 that NFC was only related to Liberalism in the small sample in Study 4 is a deviating result that
28
29 needs to be replicated before any conclusions can be drawn from it.
30
31
32

33 **Conclusions**

34
35
36 The present studies confirmed that in line with its background as a collection of items from
37
38 multiple sources, actively-open minded thinking is a multidimensional rather than a unitary
39
40 thinking disposition. We developed a shortened, 17-item version, which was highly correlated with
41
42 the original and showed comparable reliability and criterion validity. In studies in which the
43
44 purpose is to assess overall AOT, we recommend using this AOT17 for quicker administration.
45
46 Within the AOT, we found four distinct dimensions. Two of them concerned knowledge (a lack of
47
48 dogmatism and an openness to facts even if they contradict one’s previous views) and two
49
50 concerned people (a liberal attitude towards people and a refusal to judge others for their
51
52 opinions). The knowledge-related and the interpersonal dimensions showed different
53
54 relationships to other thinking dispositions, to social competence, and to supernatural beliefs.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These results indicate a dissociation between elements of the AOT that concern attitudes towards
4
5 knowledge, and other elements that concern attitudes towards people, and call for more research
6
7 to develop statistically robust instruments to more reliably assess these different aspects of the
8
9 actively open-minded disposition.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgments

Thanks for statistics advice to Jari Lipsanen.

Declaration of Interest statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

For Peer Review Only

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Baron, J. (1993). Why teach thinking?--An essay. *Applied Psychology, 42*, 191-237.
- 6
7 Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of*
8
9
10 *Personality Assessment, 48*, 306-307.
- 11
12 Campitelli, G., & Gerrans, P. (2014). Does the cognitive reflection test measure cognitive reflection? A
13
14 mathematical modeling approach. *Memory & Cognition, 42*, 434-447. doi: 10.3758/s13421-013-
15
16 0367-9
- 17
18 Deniz, H., Donnelly, L. A., & Yilmaz, I. (2008). Exploring the factors related to acceptance of evolutionary
19
20 theory among Turkish preservice biology teachers: Toward a more informative conceptual ecology
21
22 for biological evolution. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45*, 420-443.
- 23
24
25 Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective
26
27 measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 192-203. doi:
28
29 10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192
- 30
31 Epstein, S. (2010). Demystifying intuition: What it is, what it does, and how it does it. *Psychological Inquiry,*
32
33 *21*, 295-312.
- 34
35 Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V., & Heier, H. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and
36
37 analytical-rational thinking styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 390-405.
- 38
39
40 Feldt, L. S. (1980). A test of the hypothesis that Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is the same for two
41
42 tests administered to the same sample. *Psychometrika, 45*, 99-105.
- 43
44
45 Fletcher, J. M., Marks, A. D. G., & Hine, D. W. (2012). Latent profile analysis of working memory capacity
46
47 and thinking styles in adults and adolescents. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*, 40-48. doi:
48
49 10.1016/j.jrp.2011.11.003
- 50
51 Frederick, S. (2005). Cognitive reflection and decision making. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 19*, 25-42.
- 52
53
54 Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann Jr., W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality
55
56 domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 504-528. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Haran, U., Ritov, I., & Mellers, B. A. (2013). The role of actively open-minded thinking in information
4 acquisition, accuracy, and calibration. *Judgment and Decision Making, 8*, 188-201.
5
6
7 Hawthorne, G. (2006). Measuring social isolation in older adults: Development and initial validation of the
8 Friendship Scale. *Social Indicators Research, 77*, 521-548. doi: 10.1007/s11205-005-7746-y
9
10
11 Heijltjes, A., van Gog, T., Leppink, J., & Paas, F. (2015). Unraveling the effects of critical thinking instructions,
12 practice, and self-explanation on students' reasoning performance. *Instructional Science. An*
13 *International Journal of the Learning Sciences*. doi: 10.1007/s11251-015-9347-8
14
15
16 Honda, K., & Jacobson, J. S. (2005). Use of complementary and alternative medicine among United States
17 adults: the influences of personality, coping strategies, and social support. *Preventive Medicine, 40*,
18 46-53. doi: 10.1016/j.yjmed.2004.05.001
19
20
21
22
23
24 Jong, J., Bluemke, M., & Halberstadt, J. (2013). Fear of death and supernatural beliefs: developing a new
25 supernatural belief scale to test the relationship. *European Journal of Personality, 27*, 495-506. doi:
26 10.1002/per.1898
27
28
29
30
31 Klaczynski, P. A. (2014). Heuristics and biases: interactions among numeracy, ability, and reflectiveness
32 predict normative responding *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 1-13. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00665
33
34
35 Kokis, J. V., Macpherson, R., Toplak, M. E., West, R. F., & Stanovich, K. E. (2002). Heuristic and analytic
36 processing: Age trends and associations with cognitive ability and cognitive styles. *Journal of*
37 *Experimental Child Psychology, 83*, 26-52.
38
39
40
41
42 Lindeman, M., Koirikivi, I., & Lipsanen, J. (2016). Pictorial Empathy Test (PET). An easy-to-use method for
43 assessing affective empathic reactions. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. doi:
44 10.1027/1015-5759/a000353
45
46
47
48 Lindeman, M., Svedholm-Häkkinen, A. M., & Lipsanen, J. (2015). Ontological confusions but not mentalizing
49 abilities predict religious belief, paranormal belief, and belief in supernatural purpose. *Cognition*,
50 134, 63-76. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2014.09.008
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Macpherson, R., & Stanovich, K. E. (2007). Cognitive ability, thinking dispositions, and instructional set as
4
5 predictors of critical thinking. *Learning and Individual Differences, 17*, 115-127. doi:
6
7 10.1016/j.lindif.2007.05.003
8
9
10 Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory.
11
12 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 34*, 57-74. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X10000968
13
14 Muncer, S. J., & Ling, J. (2006). Psychometric analysis of the empathy quotient (EQ) scale. *Personality and*
15
16 *Individual differences, 40*, 1111-1119. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.09.020
17
18 Newstead, S. E., Handley, S. J., Harley, C., Wright, H., & Farrelly, D. (2004). Individual differences in
19
20 deductive reasoning. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 57A*, 33-60. doi:
21
22 10.1080/02724980343000116
23
24 Pacini, R., & Epstein, S. (1999). The relation of rational and experiential information processing styles to
25
26 personality, basic beliefs, and the ratio-bias phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social*
27
28 *Psychology, 76*, 972-987.
29
30
31 Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Barr, N., Koehler, D. J., & Fugelsang, J. A. (2013). Cognitive style and religiosity:
32
33 the role of conflict detection. *Memory & Cognition*. doi: 10.3758/s13421-013-0340-7
34
35
36 Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., Loersch, C., & McCaslin, M. J. (2009). The Need for Cognition. In M. R. Leary & R. H.
37
38 Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 318-329). NY & London:
39
40 Guilford Press.
41
42 Sá, W. C., Kelley, C. N., Ho, C., & Stanovich, K. E. (2005). Thinking about personal theories: individual
43
44 differences in the coordination of theory and evidence. *Personality and Individual Differences 38*,
45
46 1149-1161. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.07.012
47
48
49 Sá, W. C., & Stanovich, K. E. (2001). The domain specificity and generality of mental contamination:
50
51 Accuracy and projection in judgments of mental content. *British Journal of Psychology, 92*, 281-302.
52
53 Sá, W. C., West, R. F., & Stanovich, K. E. (1999). The domain specificity and generality of belief bias:
54
55 Searching for a generalizable critical thinking skill. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 497-510.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Saher, M., & Lindeman, M. (2005). Alternative medicine: A psychological perspective. *Personality and*
4
5 *Individual Differences, 39*, 1169-1178.
6
7 Schommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. *Journal of*
8
9 *Educational Psychology, 82*(3), 498-504. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.82.3.498
10
11 Schommer, M. (1993). Epistemological development and academic performance among secondary
12
13 students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*, 406-411. doi: /10.1037/0022-0663.85.3.406
14
15 Silvera, D., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure
16
17 of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42*, 313-319. doi: 10.1111/1467-
18
19 9450.00242
20
21
22 Sinatra, G. M., Southerland, S. A., McConaughy, F., & Demastes, J. W. (2003). Intentions and beliefs in
23
24 students' understanding and acceptance of biological evolution. *Journal of Research in Science*
25
26 *Teaching, 40*, 510-528.
27
28 Stanovich, K. E. (2009). *What intelligence tests miss. The psychology of rational thought*. New Haven &
29
30 London: Yale University press.
31
32 Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (1997). Reasoning independently of prior belief and individual differences in
33
34 actively open-minded thinking. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 342-357. doi: 10.1037/0022-
35
36 0663.89.2.342
37
38 Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2000). Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality
39
40 debate? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23*, 645-665.
41
42 Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2008). On the failure of cognitive ability to predict myside and one-sided
43
44 thinking biases. *Thinking & Reasoning, 14*(2), 129-167. doi: 10.1080/13546780701679764
45
46
47 Svedholm, A. M., & Lindeman, M. (2013a). Healing, mental energy in the physics classroom: Energy
48
49 conceptions and trust in complementary and alternative medicine in grade 10-12 students. *Science*
50
51 *& Education, 22*, 677-694.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Svedholm, A. M., & Lindeman, M. (2013b). The separate roles of the reflective mind and involuntary
4
5 inhibitory control in gatekeeping paranormal beliefs and the underlying intuitive confusions. *British*
6
7 *Journal of Psychology*, 104, 303-319. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.2012.02118.x
8
- 9 Szaszi, B., Szollosi, A., Palfi, B., & Aczel, B. (2017). The cognitive reflection test revisited: exploring the ways
10
11 individuals solve the test. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 23, 207-234. doi:
12
13 10.1080/13546783.2017.1292954
14
- 15 Tobacyk, J. J. (2004). A revised paranormal belief scale. *The International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*,
16
17 23, 94-98.
18
- 19 Toplak, M., West, R., & Stanovich, K. E. (2014). Assessing miserly information processing: An expansion of
20
21 the Cognitive Reflection Test. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 20, 147-168. doi:
22
23 10.1080/13546783.2013.844729
24
- 25 Toplak, M., West, R. F., & Stanovich, K. E. (2011). The Cognitive Reflection Test as a predictor of
26
27 performance on heuristics-and-biases tasks. *Memory & Cognition*, 39, 1275-1289. doi:
28
29 10.3758/s13421-011-0104-1
30
- 31 West, R. F., Toplak, M. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (2008). Heuristics and biases as measures of critical thinking:
32
33 associations with cognitive ability and thinking dispositions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100,
34
35 930-941. doi: 10.1037/a0012842
36
37
- 38 von Stumm, S., & Ackerman, P. L. (2013). Investment and intellect: A review and meta-analysis.
39
40 *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(4), 841-869. doi: 10.1037/a0030746
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Running head: FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE 1

Table 1

Summary of tested models with fit indices in Studies 1 and 2

Model nr	Model description	X2	df	NFI	CFI	RMSEA, 90 % CI

Study 1						
1	1 latent factor	2812.987	119	.644	.654	.091 [.088, .094]
2	4 latent factors + 1 higher-order factor	1588.191	115	.799	.811	.068 [.065, .071]
3	4 latent factors, no crossloadings	1439.919	113	.818	.829	.066 [.063, .069]
4	4 latent factors, with crossloadings	795.531	106	.899	.911	.049 [.046, .052]
5	AOT7: 1 latent factor	383.020	14	.811	.816	.098 [.090, .197]
Study 2						
6	1 latent factor	613.011	119	.612	.658	.098 [.090, .105]
7	4 latent factors + 1 higher-order factor	613.011	119	.612	.658	.098 [.090, .105]

(Table 1 continued)

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

30

8	4 latent factors, no crossloadings	362.223	113	.771	.827	.071 [.063, .079]
9	4 latent factors, with crossloadings	212.677	103	.865	.924	.050 [.040, .059]
10	AOT7: 1 latent factor	62.305	14	.855	.881	.088 [.066, .110]

Note. All χ^2 s significant at $p < .00001$.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE 31

Table 2

Factor loadings in CFA Model 4 Study 1

Item	Latent factor				Source
	F1	F2	F3	F4	
Factor 1: Dogmatism					
23. I believe that loyalty to one's ideals and principles is more important than "open-mindedness." (R)	.64				o-v
32. I believe that the "new morality" of permissiveness is no morality at all. (R)	.59				o-v
24. Of all the different philosophies which exist in the world there is probably only one which is correct. (R)	.52				dogm
8. I think there are many wrong ways, but only one right way, to almost anything. (R)	.89	-.49			cat
39. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. (R)	.45				o-v
7. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. (R)	.20	.29			o-v
Factor 2: Fact Resistance					
33. One should disregard evidence that conflicts with your established beliefs. (R)		.64			bel

(Table 2 continued)

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

32

15. It is important to persevere in your beliefs even when evidence is brought to bear against them. (R)	.61		bel
19. Certain beliefs are just too important to abandon no matter how good a case can be made against them. (R)	.68	-.22	bel
37. Beliefs should always be revised in response to new information or evidence.	-.68	.90	bel
41. People should always take into consideration evidence that goes against their beliefs.	-1.14	1.28	.48 flex

Factor 3: Liberalism

18. I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people's lifestyles.	.58		o-v
4. A person should always consider new possibilities.	.40		flex
27. I believe that the different ideas of right and wrong that people in other societies have may be valid for them.	.42		o-v

Factor 4: Belief Personification

11. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for. (R)			.73 dogm
3. I tend to classify people as either for me or against me. (R)	.27		.40 cat
31. My blood boils over whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong. (R)			.44 dogm

Note. Loadings in boldface are included in the sum variables used in subsequent analyses. R = reflected item. O-v = openness-values, dogm =

dogmatism, cat = categorical thinking, bel = belief identification, flex = flexible thinking.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

Table 3

Correlations between the latent factors in CFA Model 4, Study 1

	F1	F2	F3
F2	.85		
F3	.60	.39	
F4	.32	.08	.41

For Peer Review Only

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

34

Table 4

Correlations between the new AOT17 subscales, AOT7, and criterion variables, Study 1

	AOT41	AOT17	AOT7	Dogma	Facts	Liberal	Person
AOT41	--	--	--	.76**	.63**	.49**	.53**
AOT17	.91**	--	--	.80**	.70**	.54**	.55**
AOT7	.60**	.62**	--	.33**	.70**	.19**	.04*
FI	-.15**	-.12**	-.38**	.04	-.26**	.12**	-.02
NFC	.23**	.24**	.33**	.06**	.24**	.18**	.09**
CRT	.13**	.12**	.22**	<.01	.15**	.06**	.05*
Social competence	.21**	.19**	-.10**	.22**	-.04*	.29**	.26**
Supernatural beliefs	-.31**	-.32**	-.43**	-.18**	-.44**	.04	-.02

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Dogma = Dogmatism, Facts = Fact Resistance, Liberal = Liberalism, Person = Belief Personification.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

35

Table 5

Factor loadings in CFA Model 9 Study 2

Item	Latent factor			
	F1	F2	F3	F4
Factor 1: Dogmatism				
23. I believe that loyalty to one's ideals and principles is more important than "open-mindedness." (R)	.67			
32. I believe that the "new morality" of permissiveness is no morality at all. (R)	.63			
24. Of all the different philosophies which exist in the world there is probably only one which is correct. (R)	1.13	-.69		-.24
8. I think there are many wrong ways, but only one right way, to almost anything. (R)	1.03	-.59		
39. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. (R)	.57			
7. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. (R)	.35	.28		
Factor 2: Fact Resistance				

(Table 5 continued)

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

36

33. One should disregard evidence that conflicts with your established beliefs. (R) .65 .23

15. It is important to persevere in your beliefs even when evidence is brought to bear against them. (R) .66

19. Certain beliefs are just too important to abandon no matter how good a case can be made against them. (R) .58

37. Beliefs should always be revised in response to new information or evidence. -1.46 1.47 .79

41. People should always take into consideration evidence that goes against their beliefs. -1.54 1.53 .92

Factor 3: Liberalism

18. I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people's lifestyles. .55

4. A person should always consider new possibilities. .43

27. I believe that the different ideas of right and wrong that people in other societies have may be valid for them. .49

Factor 4: Belief Personification

11. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for. (R) .73

3. I tend to classify people as either for me or against me. (R) .250 .45

31. My blood boils over whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong. (R) .32

Note. R = reflected item.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

Table 6

Correlations between the latent factors in CFA Model 9, Study 2

	F1	F2	F3
F2	.82		
F3	.65	.21	
F4	.09	-.12	.35

For Peer Review Only

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

38

Table 7

Correlations between the new AOT17 subscales, AOT7, and criterion variables in Study 2

	AOT41	AOT17	AOT7	Dogma	Facts	Liberal	Person
AOT41	--	--	--	.71**	.67**	.50**	.45**
AOT17	.90**	--	--	.78**	.73**	.55**	.46**
AOT7	.64**	.65**	--	.33**	.74**	.16**	.04
FI	-.18**	-.12 *	-.44**	.01	-.31**	.20**	.02
NFC	.40**	.41**	.35**	.20**	.29**	.32**	.25**
Supernatural Beliefs	-.41**	-.40**	-.49**	-.26**	-.48**	-.04	<-.01

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Dogma = Dogmatism, Facts = Fact Resistance, Liberal = Liberalism, Person = Belief Personification.

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

Table 8

Correlations between the new AOT17 subscales, AOT7, and criterion variables in Study 3

	AOT41	AOT17	AOT7	Dogma	Facts	Liberal	Person
AOT41	--	--	--	.80**	.62**	.53**	.42**
AOT17	.89**	--	--	.76**	.69**	.57**	.55**
AOT7	.62**	.58**	--	.36**	.64**	.23*	<-.01
FI	-.39**	-.38**	-.29**	-.27**	-.38**	-.02	-.27**
NFC	.15	.25	.08	.10	.08	.13	.35**
Trust in CAM	-.19	-.18	-.20	-.14	-.25*	.22*	-.08

Note. ** p < .01, * p < .05. Dogma = Dogmatism, Facts = Fact Resistance, Liberal = Liberalism, Person = Belief Personification.

FACTORS IN THE ACTIVELY OPEN-MINDED THINKING SCALE

40

Table 9

Correlations between the new AOT17 subscales, AOT7, and criterion variables, Study 4

	AOT41	AOT17	AOT7	Dogma	Facts	Liberal	Person
AOT41	--	--	--	.67**	.61**	.44**	.59**
AOT17	.89**	--	--	.76**	.68**	.50**	.58**
AOT7	.66**	.69**	--	.30*	.74**	.13	.16
FI	-.19	-.21	-.36**	-.13	-.13	.08	-.03
NFC	.21	.18	.23	.06	.03	.29*	.03
AET	.34*	.36**	.31*	.37**	.41**	.08	.05
Supernatural Beliefs	-.48**	-.43*	-.40**	-.25	-.43*	-.03	-.09

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Dogma = Dogmatism, Facts = Fact Resistance, Liberal = Liberalism, Person = Belief Personification.