ONLINE SUPPORTING MATERIALS

SUPPORTING MATERIAL S1. EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENTS

Full experimental materials are available from the author.

SUPPORTING MATERIAL S2. PRETEST FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENTS

The priming manipulations were pretested for their effect on various associations and discrete emotions. Participants included 52 undergraduates who answered a computerized questionnaire for course credit and reported on their thoughts and feelings following the exposure to each of the four primes (order of primes was randomized).[1] Table 1 presents the means from this task.

The pretest results confirmed that the manipulations are effective. Thus, t-tests indicate that the harm prime generated significantly more injury and harm associations compared to the other primes, that the damage prime generated associations with convenience, and the disgust and sadness primes each generated the relevant emotion significantly more than the other three primes.[2]

---

[1] Note that prior to the pretest reported above, another pretest (N=21) took place leading to slight alteration of the harm and sadness primes.

[2] The harm manipulation and the disgust prime were compared using three items: associations about "injuries," associations about "harm to a person," and feelings of "disgust." While responses on two of the items, injuries and disgust, yielded the expected and statistically significant differences, responses on "harm to a person" yielded higher scores for the harm prime compared to all other three primes- but its difference from the disgust prime was too small to reach an accepted significance level. A possible reason for that may be phrasing the harm item as "harm to a person" while the pictures of the essay depict only dummies. While the harm prime originally depicted pictures of real injured people, they were replaced by pictures of dummies following an initial pretest (see footnote iv) showing that participants report high levels of disgust in response to real injuries in people. However, the item testing the new prime still referred to "harm to a person," which perhaps confused some of the participants given that the images do not show any real persons. To test this option, an additional pretest was executed on

TABLE S1. REPORTED THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS UPON ENCOUNTERING EACH PRIME (PRETEST)

	Harm	Disgust	Damage	Sadness
This essay made me think about…				
Injuries	5.78[a]	2.98[b]	3.10[b]	2.27[b]
Harm to a person	4.12[a]	3.55[ab]	3.09[b]	2.45[b]
Convenience	2.64[ab]	2.35[a]	3.22[b]	1.96[a]
Cultural differences	2.10[a]	6.39[b]	1.61[a]	2.33[a]
Art	1.45[a]	1.71[a]	1.37[a]	4.75[b]
Justice	1.94[a]	1.59[a]	2.04[a]	1.88[a]
Fairness	2.04[a]	1.61[a]	2.39[a]	1.90[a]
This essay made me feel…				
Sad	3.45[a]	2.39[b]	2.60[ab]	4.18[c]
Disgusted	1.96[a]	5.88[b]	1.56[a]	1.43[a]
Anxious	2.49[a]	2.35[a]	2.20[a]	2.80[a]
Angry	1.78[a]	2.25[a]	2.21[a]	1.98[a]
Ashamed	1.62[a]	1.78[a]	1.60[a]	1.47[a]
In general…				
How negative?	3.60[ab]	4.16[a]	3.01[b]	3.37[ab]

Table entries are means on scales varying from 1-7; t tests compared the 4 primes for each question; any two primes that do not share a superscript are significantly different in the two-tail 95% confidence level (i.e., entries with an "ab" superscript are not significantly different from entries with either an "a" or a "b").

As expected, the four primes did not significantly differ in reported associations of fairness and justice or in the reported emotions of anxiety, anger, and shame. Still, there were some idiosyncratic effects emerging due to the specific stimuli employed. Thus, the disgusting delicacies essay raised significantly more cultural difference associations as it presented foods from around

the world, and the sadness prime generated art associations as it cited sad autumn poems.

In addition, to get at the extremity of the manipulations, participants were asked how negative they found the essay to be in general. The only two essays that significantly differed on a t test were disgust and damage. All other pairs of primes were comparable in level of negativity, ranking slightly above the middle point of the 7-points scale.

TABLE S2. MEASURES FOR CONTROL VARIABLES, EXPERIMENT 2

Item#	Question Wording
Ideology	"In general, when it comes to politics, do you consider yourself…? From extremely liberal to extremely conservative", 7-point scale, $\bar{x}$ =.41.
Religiosity	"Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, how often do you attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, funerals, and other important ceremonies", 6-point scale, from never to more than once a week, $\bar{x}$ =.38.
Income	"Can you give us an estimate of your total family income last fiscal year before taxes? This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest and all other income for every member of your family living in your house in the last fiscal year", 5-point scale, $\bar{x}$ =.57.
Age	In years, $\bar{x}$ =30.4.
Gender	Male=1, 194 males, 202 females.
Authoritarianism	Four Item F scale (Lane, 1955): "What young people need most of all is strict discipline by their parents"; "Most people who don't get ahead must don't have enough will power"; "A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk"; "People sometimes say that an insult to your honor should not be forgotten. Do you agree or disagree with that?", agree/disagree, $\bar{x}$ =.57, α=.53.
Political knowledge	Six multiple choice items scale: "which party controls a majority of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives"; "What job or political office does Harry Reid now hold"; "Is the current Federal Minimum Wage in the US larger or smaller than it was 5 years ago"; "What job or political office does John Roberts now hold "; "How much of a majority is required for the US Senate and House to override a presidential veto—a bare majority (50% plus one), a two thirds majority, or a three-fourth majority"; "Who is the president of Russia", $\bar{x}$ =.69, α=.57.
Openness to Experience	Four items adopted from Buchanan et al. (2005): "I enjoy hearing new ideas"; "I have a vivid imagination"; "I do not like art"; "I tend to avoid philosophical discussions", 6-point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.71, α=.61.
Empathy	Four items adopted from Caruso and Mayer (1998): "too much is made of the suffering of pets or animals"; "I feel other people's pain"; "I don't give others' feelings much thought"; "Seeing other people smile makes me smile", 6-point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.69, α=.59.
Social Conservatism	Five items adopted from Kerlinger's (1984) SA-II scale and Eysenck's Public Opinion Inventory scale: "Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and to adopt new thinking and customs"; "If civilization is to survive, there must be a turning back to religion"; "All individuals who are intellectually capable of benefiting from it should get a college education, at public expense if necessary"; "There are too many professors in our colleges and universities who are radical in their social and political beliefs"; "Patriotism in the modern world is a force which works against peace", 6-

	point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.44, α=.48.
Fiscal Conservatism	2 items adopted from Kerlinger's (1984) SA-II scale: "Government laws and regulations should be such as first to ensure the prosperity of business since the prosperity of all depends on the prosperity of business"; "a first consideration in any society is the protection of property rights", 6-point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.54, α=.47.
Militarianism	"Do you think it will be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?", 1=Active participation, 0=Stay out, $\bar{x}$ =.68.
Libertarianism	Two items from Mehrabian (1996): "my ideal government would be very small and would only perform a very few essential functions"; "In my kind of ideal society, all basic needs (food, housing, healthcare, education) will be guaranteed by the government for everyone ", 6-point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.43, α=.28.
Disgust Sensitivity	Six items adopted from the Revised Disgust Scale (see Haidt, McCauley, and Rozin, 1994; Olatunji et al., 2007): "How disgusting would you find each of the following experiences…? You see maggots on a piece of meat in an outdoor garbage pail; While you are walking through a tunnel under a railroad track, you smell urine; Your friend's cat dies, and you have to pick up the dead body with your bare hands; You discover that a friend of yours changes underwear only once a week; A friend offers you a piece of chocolate shaped like dog-doo; You are walking barefoot on concrete, and you step on an earthworm", 5-point scale, from not disgusting at all to extremely disgusting, $\bar{x}$ =.53, α=.82.
Feminism	Three items adopted from Morgan (1996): "men have too much influence in American politics compared to women"; "Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders"; "Women need to unite and work together to achieve equal political and social rights in this country", 6-point agreement scale, $\bar{x}$ =.64, α=.61.

All measures were coded to vary 0-1, except for age (in years).

TABLE S3. THE INTERACTIVE EFFECT OF PRIMING, FOR THE ISSUES OF DARFUR AND PORN REGULATION IN EXPERIMENT 2, INCLUDING COEFFICIENTS FOR CONTROL VARIABLES

	Intervention in Darfur			Internet porn regulation		
	Hot MC	**Cold MC**	**MJ**	**Hot MC**	**Cold MC**	**MJ**
Harm	.007 (.043)	.065 (.048)	.047 (.047)	.055 (.058)	-.020 (.061)	-.005 (.064)
Disgust	.071 (.042)*	.094 (.050)*	.064 (.046)	.084 (.057)	-.054 (.059)	.091 (.062)
Damage	-.001 (.049)	.058 (.051)	.046 (.049)	-.013 (.057)	-.061 (.063)	-.050 (.070)
Sadness	.049 (.043)	.067 (.054)	-.002 (.049)	-.046 (.061)	-.085 (.069)	-.021 (.071)
Supports refraining D/P	-.001 (.072)	-.131 (.070)*	.526 (.082)**	.045 (.064)	-.345 (.068)**	.417 (.081)**
Harm*Support	.032 (.113)	-.176 (.104)*	-.193 (.114)*	-.085 (.089)	.028 (.092)	-.068 (.108)
Disgust*Support	-.188 (.089)**	-.172 (.103)*	-.250 (.104)**	-.151 (.086)*	.141 (.087)	-.231 (.107)**
Damage*Support	-.030 (.101)	-.090 (.105)	-.142 (.109)	-.043 (.087)	.144 (.098)	.039 (.130)
Sadness*Support	-.126 (.090)	-.169 (.111)	.055 (.113)	.140 (.093)	.163 (.112)	-.025 (.120)
Ideology (conservatism)	-.056 (.057)	-.035 (.054)	-.074 (.043)*	.072 (.058)	-.018 (.057)	.034 (.060)
Religiosity	.054 (.033)	.066 (.031)**	-.020 (.025)	.034 (.038)	.104 (.032)**	-.022 (.035)
Income	.005 (.032)	-.023 (.030)	-.029 (.024)	.017 (.036)	.005 (.031)	.046 (.035)
Age	-.002 (.001)**	.001 (.001)	.000 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.002 (.001)*
Male	-.066 (.021)**	-.006 (.022)	-.017 (.018)	-.026 (.026)	-.032 (.025)	-.037 (.027)
Authoritarianism	.026 (.033)	.021 (.034)	-.031 (.027)	.047 (.042)	-.010 (.036)	.023 (.038)
Political knowledge	-.111 (.049)**	-.055 (.045)	.023 (.037)	-.125 (.053)**	-.076 (.047)	.023 (.052)
Openness to experience	.044 (.078)	-.076 (.077)	-.001 (.061)	.178 (.087)**	.014 (.079)	.051 (.084)
Empathy	.069 (.080)	.102 (.079)	-.091 (.063)	.114 (.085)	.156 (.080)*	-.056 (.088)
Social conservatism	-.018 (.105)	-.136 (.098)	.100 (.078)	.015 (.103)	.133 (.099)	.003 (.107)
Fiscal conservatism	-.120 (.065)*	-.064 (.062)	.137 (.050)**	-.138 (.065)**	-.067 (.064)	.037 (.069)
Militarianism	-.019 (.025)	.071 (.023)**	-.038 (.019)**	-.024 (.027)	.036 (.023)	-.032 (.025)

Libertarianism	.012 (.063)	.063 (.062)	.004 (.050)	-.008 (.062)	-.004 (.066)	-.017 (.072)
Disgust sensitivity	.053 (.051)	.003 (.046)	-.010 (.037)	.096 (.055)*	-.024 (.048)	-.113 (.053)**
Feminism	.092 (.055)*	.014 (.067)	-.102 (.054)*	-.163 (.065)**	-.056 (.071)	-.002 (.077)
Constant	.296 (.110)**	.533 (.098)**	.438 (.086)**	.146 (.112)	.535 (.108)**	.425 (.117)**
R^2	.269	.307	.549	.255	.496	.417

Table entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses.
* = one-tail 95% confidence level, ******=two-tail 95% confidence level.