

## DATA PAPER

# Data from "Demographic Influences on Disgust: Evidence from A Heterogeneous Sample."

Uri Berger<sup>1</sup> and David Anaki<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology and Gonda interdisciplinary center for brain research, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

The dataset contains the data of a large heterogeneous sample of participants who completed the Hebrew version of the Disgust Scale Revised (DS\_R), and provided various demographic variables. Participants were chosen from the general population, using a convenience sampling method. They were approached at various locations (e.g., shopping centres, transport hubs, and government buildings) during the period of 2011- 2012. The raw data is stored in a table form, in both SPSS and tab-delimited formats. The dataset may aid in understanding disgust in different cultural settings and the relationship between disgust sensitivity and demographic variables.

**Keywords:** disgust sensitivity; demographics; Israel**Funding Statement:** This work was supported by an ISF grant 841/10 to D. Anaki.

## (1) Overview

### Context

#### Collection dates

10/2011-06/2012

### Background

Disgust is a basic emotion that is pivotal in many psychopathologies [10], as well as in intergroup prejudice and discrimination [3, 4, 8]. Due to its importance and significant implications several measures have been developed to assess disgust in a valid and reliable fashion. The Disgust Scale (DS) [2], and its later modification, the Disgust Scale – Revised (DS\_R) [11], are one of the most prominent assessment tools of disgust sensitivity (also known as "disgust propensity"). The DS\_R questionnaire is comprised of 25 items divided into three domains of disgust. The first domain is Core-Disgust, a mechanism that elevates awareness about disease and oral incorporations of dangerous materials. The second domain is Animal-Reminder, a mechanism that elevates awareness to human animalistic nature. The third domain is Contamination-Based Disgust, which contains items related to dangers of contamination.

The goals of our original study [1] were to examine the construct and external validity of the DS\_R, using a heterogeneous sample from a population that is culturally different from the one where the DS\_R was originally developed. In addition, since disgust has been shown to be related to several demographic variables [2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13] we wanted to explore the influence of demographics on the DS\_R in our sample. Thus, participants in the current study were asked to report their gender, age,

education (years of schooling), political orientation (ranging from left-wing [liberal] through center to right-wing [conservative]), and religiosity (ranging from very religious [orthodox] through religious [observant], to non-religious [secular]).

The study [1] revealed that the DS\_R's validity is high and adheres to the three-factor structure (i.e., Core disgust, Animal-reminder Disgust, and Contamination-Based Disgust). Moreover, gender was found to be strongly associated with DS\_R score, while DS\_R scores' relations with the other demographic variables were exceptionally modest. We concluded that demographic variables, excluding gender, do not directly influence disgust's sensitivity. Rather, these variables determine the context in which disgust is elicited. For example, the dietary differences in Hindi and Jewish religions define which food is forbidden and consequently will be perceived as disgusting. Thus, Hindus will be repelled from beef consumption while pork will arouse disgust in Jews. However, the level of religiosity in each religion may modulate only slightly the intensity of this subjective disgust emotion.

## (2) Methods

### Sample

All participants (N=1414; 762 women) were Israeli Jewish citizens with a mean age of 33.18 years (SD = 12.64). They were mostly educated (14.36 years of education, SD=2.32), their average religiosity level was between secular to observant (M=1.44, SD=0.7), and their political views were between political center to right wing (m=1.9, SD=0.79). All were approached at places of mass

gatherings to ensure a wide coverage of the Israeli population. Race, as defined in some countries, (e.g., Caucasian, Asian, African-American etc.) was not monitored, because it is rarely acknowledged in Israeli culture, which is predominantly Caucasian.

### Materials

DS\_R Hebrew version: The DS\_R consists of 25 items, rated on a 5-point scale (0-4). In addition, it contains two “catch” items to eliminate respondents who are not paying attention or following instructions (items 12 and 16, e.g., “would you rather eat a piece of fruit or a piece of paper”). Three items (1, 6, 10) are reverse-coded and their reversal command can be found in the syntax file on the server. The questionnaire was translated to Hebrew by a bilingual native speaker and then translated back to English by a second bilingual native speaker in order to compare the two forms. This process was repeated until the two forms matched. The Hebrew version is available for download on the server. Other versions of the DS and DS\_R, in English and other languages, are available at: <http://people.stern.nyu.edu/jhaidt/disgustscale.html>.

### Procedures

The first author (B.U) approached participants at various locations (shopping centres, train stations, government offices, airports, etc.), and requested them to participate in the study. The data was gathered at Israel’s major cities (Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, Be’er-Sheba), thus ensuring an adequate socio-economical coverage. Sampling times varied throughout the day, ranging from early morning (06:00) to late nights (23:00). The text used to recruit respondents was as follows: “Hello Sir/Madam, I am conducting a research as part of my PhD thesis on disgust-sensitivity. If you are willing to participate I ask you to dedicate 5 minutes of your time to fill out this questionnaire”. No compensation was offered for participation, yet consent rate approximated 75%.

### Quality control

Subjects who have given improbable responses on the “catch” items were excluded (N=97; excluded participants are marked as “0” in the variable “Catch\_response” in the dataset while included participants are marked as “1”). We also removed pregnant women (N=2; pregnant women are marked as “0” in the variable “pregnant”, the non-pregnant women [and men] are marked as “1”). Finally, participants who had unanswered missing items (N=128) were not included in the study. These latter participants can be eliminated from the dataset with a removal script given in the syntax file. All excluded participants are marked as “0” in the filter variable (“FILTER”) in the dataset, whereas all included participants are marked as “1”.

### Ethical issues

The study followed the ethical standards by the American Psychological Association. The study was approved by the IRB at Bar-Ilan University. In addition, the questionnaire form did not include any personal information slots, and was entirely anonymous.

## (3) Dataset description

### Object Name

Berger and Anaki disgust scale 2014

### Data type

Raw data file

### Format names and versions

The files are in a SPSS .sav file and a tab-delimited .txt file.

### Dataset creators

No additional collectors.

### Language

English

### License

CC0

### Repository location

10.7910/DVN/27285 (v1)

### Publication date

05/09/2014

## (4) Reuse potential

The data may be reused by other researchers who wish to examine how, and to what extent, demographic variables are related to disgust sensitivity. Furthermore, since this study was conducted in a specific culture the data may be compared to data from other cultures. Finally, the data may be of use to researchers who wish to use the DS\_R distribution norms as inclusion and exclusion criteria for other research purposes.

### Author contributions

Uri Berger: Data collection, data analysis, manuscript writing.

David Anaki: Manuscript writing.

### References

1. **Berger, U** and **Anaki, D** 2014 Demographic influences on disgust: Evidence from a heterogeneous sample. *Personality and Individual Differences* 64: 67–71, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.016>
2. **Haidt, J, McCauley, C** and **Rozin, P** 1994 Individual differences in sensitivity to disgust: A scale sampling seven domains of disgust elicitors. *Personality and Individual Differences* 16: 701–713, DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90212-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90212-7)
3. **Haslam, N** 2006 Dehumanization: An Integrative Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10: 252–264, DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4)
4. **Hodson, G** and **Costello, K** 2007 Interpersonal disgust, ideological orientations, and dehumanization as predictors of intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science* 18: 691–698, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01962.x>

5. **Hunsberger, B** and **Jackson, L M** 2005 Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues* 61(807): 826. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00433.x>
6. **Inbar, Y, Pizarro, D A, Knobe, J** and **Bloom, P** 2009 Disgust sensitivity predicts intuitive disapproval of gays. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)* 9: 435–439, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015960>
7. **Inbar, Y, Pizarro, D** and **Bloom, P** 2009 Conservatives are more easily disgusted than liberals. *Cognition and Emotion* 23: 714–725, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930802110007>
8. **Inbar, Y, Pizarro, D, Iyer, R** and **Haidt, J** 2007 Disgust sensitivity, political conservatism, and voting. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 3: 537–544, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1948550611429024>
9. **Kim, E H, Ebesutani, C, Young, J** and **Olatunji, B O** 2013 Factor structure of the Disgust Scale–Revised in an Adolescent Sample. *Assessment* 20: 620–631, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191111434200>
10. **Olatunji, B O** and **McKay, D** 2009 Disgust and Its Disorders: Theory, Assessment, and Treatment Implications. *American Psychological Association*, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11856-000>
11. **Olatunji, B O, Tolin, D F, Huppert, J D** and **Lohr, J M** 2005 The relation between fearfulness, disgust sensitivity and religious obsessions in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences* 38: 891–902, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.06.012>
12. **Olatunji, B O, Williams, N L, Tolin, D F, Abramowitz, J S, Sawchuk, C N, Lohr, J M** and **Elwood, L S** 2007 The Disgust Scale: Item analysis, factor structure, and suggestions for refinement. *American Psychologist* 19: 281–297, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.19.3.281>
13. **Quigley, J F, Sherman, M F** and **Sherman, N C** 1997 Personality disorder symptoms, gender, and age as predictors of adolescent disgust sensitivity In: Fischer, A H ed. 1997 *Personality and Individual Differences* 22: 661–667, DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(96\)00255-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(96)00255-3)

**Peer review comments:** <http://openpsychologydata.metajnl.com/downloads/peerreview/jopd-ag.pdf>

**How to cite this article:** Berger, U and Anaki, D 2015 Data from “Demographic Influences on Disgust: Evidence from A Heterogeneous Sample.”. *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, 3: e1, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jopd.ag>

**Published:** 19 January 2015

**Copyright:** © 2015 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License (CC-BY 3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.