

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000348>

Electronic Supplementary Material 1 for *Associations of Multiple Measures of Openness to Experience with a Brief Questionnaire of Positive, Negative, and Disorganized Schizotypy*

Table E1. Factor Loadings for the Principal Components Analysis of 15 Facet Scores from the NEO-PI-3, HEXACO, IPC, and EPI

	<u>Fantasy/ Feelings</u>	<u>Eccentricity</u>	<u>Non- Traditionalism</u>	<u>Ideas</u>
HEXACO aesthetic appreciation	.613	-.102	-.107	.402
HEXACO inquisitiveness	-.158	-.075	-.008	.933
HEXACO creativity	.748	.033	-.076	.103
HEXACO unconventionality	.099	.250	.313	.444
NEO-O fantasy	.595	.261	.101	-.124
NEO-O aesthetics	.781	.023	-.093	.178
NEO-O feelings	.918	-.247	.168	-.386
NEO-O actions	.045	-.069	.426	.376
NEO-O ideas	.217	-.008	.271	.547
NEO-O values	.129	-.110	.839	.015
IPC traditionalism	-.132	.064	.806	.071
IPC imagination	.549	.332	-.020	.031
IPC odd	-.146	.864	.000	.074
EPS odd eccentric	.216	.736	-.332	-.004
EPS unrestricted self	-.039	.705	.358	-.280
Total Variance	36.8%	10.9	8.5%	7.8%

Principal components analysis with Promax rotation. Four factors were retained based upon parallel analysis and Kaiser's Stopping Rule.

Table E2. Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale-Brief Subscale by Sample Interaction Analyses for Openness Measures

	Step 1			Step 2	Step 3		
	Positive Schizotypy	Negative Schizotypy	Disorganized Schizotypy	Sample	Positive x Sample	Negative x Sample	Disorganized x Sample
<u>Criteria:</u>	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
NEO Openness Total	.197*	-.189*	.045	-.035	.146	.088	.019
NEO Openness to Fantasy	.223*	-.095*	.127	-.009	.093	.113	-.029
NEO Openness to Aesthetics	.241*	-.151*	.057	-.048*	.011	.053	-.027
NEO Openness to Feelings	.151*	-.400*	.046	-.028	.182	.010	-.009
NEO Openness to Actions	.042	-.129*	-.032	-.029	-.017	.059	.030
NEO Openness to Ideas	.129*	-.013	-.056	-.028	.039	.053	.073
NEO Openness to Values	-.029	-.006	.027	.005	.300*	.071	.047
HEXACO-PI Openness Total	.157*	-.041	-.016	-.083*	.039	.073	.000
HEXACO-PI Aesthetic Appreciation	.147*	-.044	.025	-.059	.037	.083	-.007
HEXACO-PI Inquisitiveness	.000	.096*	-.082	-.121*	-.035	.078	.019
HEXACO-PI Creativity	.179*	-.154*	.004	-.034	.102	.029	-.041
HEXACO-PI Unconventionality	.147*	-.015	.013	-.020	.007	.015	.039
IPC Unconventionality Total	.140*	.044	.170*	-.038	.079	.067	.014
IPC (Un)Traditionalism	-.074	.016	.125*	-.007	.225	.065	-.006
IPC Imagination	.264*	-.130*	.006	-.029	.048	-.007	.058
IPC Odd	.203*	.091*	.201*	-.033	-.090	.050	-.014
EPI Odd and Eccentric	.544*	.024	.112*	-.023	-.118	.026	-.033
EPI Unrestricted Self	.258*	.040	.078	.019	-.007	-.037	.039

* $p < .001$

Table E3. Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale-Brief Subscale by Sample Interaction Analyses for Openness Factors

	Step 1			Step 2	Step 3		
	Positive Schizotypy	Negative Schizotypy	Disorganized Schizotypy	Sample	Positive x Sample	Negative x Sample	Disorganized x Sample
<u>Criteria:</u>	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Fantasy/Feelings	.282*	-.250*	.046	-.040	.116	.056	-.011
Eccentricity	.409*	.087*	.160*	-.015	-.097	.022	.004
Nontraditionalism	-.057	-.053	.059	.011	.257*	.053	.049
Ideas	.080	.084*	-.067	-.093*	-.069	.082	.031

* $p < .001$

Tables E2 and E3 present the linear regressions predicting each of the openness domain and facet scores, as well as the openness factors from the PCA. Each line represents a separate analysis in which the three MSS-B schizotypy subscales were entered at step 1, a dummy code indicating the sample was entered at step 2, and the three sample x MSS-B subscale interaction terms were entered at step 3. A sample code of 1 indicated the sample from CITATION BLINDED, which had the MSS-B scores derived from the full-length MSS, and a code of 2 indicated the new sample that completed the MSS-B. Note that only 2 of the 96 interaction terms were statistically significant, indicating that the associations of the MSS-B with the openness measures were consistent across the two samples and the two methods of deriving MSS-B scores. The positive schizotypy x sample interaction term was significant in the prediction of the NEO openness to values facet. Simple slopes analysis indicated that positive schizotypy was inversely associated with the NEO openness to values in sample 1, $B = -.223$ ($SE = .055$), $t = -4.09$, $p < .001$, but unassociated in sample 2, $B = .173$, ($SE = .062$), $t = 2.81$, $p = .005$. The positive schizotypy x sample interaction term was significant in the prediction of the Nontraditionalism factor. Simple slopes analysis indicated that positive schizotypy was inversely associated with the Nontraditionalism factor in sample 1, $B = -.054$ ($SE = .012$), $t = -4.58$, $p < .001$, but unassociated in sample 2, $B = .020$, ($SE = .013$), $t = 1.50$, $p = .134$.

As a secondary set of analyses, we examined whether the negative slopes of positive schizotypy with NEO openness to values and the Nontraditionalism factor revealed in sample 1 by the sample x positive schizotypy interactions were driven by the inclusion of MTurk participants in sample 1. Therefore, we repeated the regression analyses in sample 1 using MTurk vs university participants as the moderator variable. In both analyses, the interaction

was significant. Simple slopes analyses revealed in both cases that positive schizotypy was inversely associated with NEO openness to values and the Nontraditionalism factor in the MTurk participants, but not in the university students. In the simple slopes analysis of NEO openness to values, positive schizotypy was inversely associated with openness to values in the MTurk participants, $B = -.741$ ($SE = .114$), $t = -6.52$, $p < .001$, but unassociated in the university participants, $B = -.064$, ($SE = .062$), $t = -0.84$, $p = .404$. Positive schizotypy was inversely associated with the Nontraditionalism factor in the MTurk participants, $B = -.183$ ($SE = .024$), $t = -7.61$, $p < .001$, but unassociated in the university participants, $B = -.039$, ($SE = .013$), $t = -2.93$, $p = .003$.