**Appendix 1**

**Similarities and differences between our studies and Press, Sagan, and Valentino (2013; Study 2) and Sagan and Valentino (2017; Study 1)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Study 1** | **PSV2013 Study 2** |
| sample | Amazon Mechanical Turk US sample | US representative sample (probability weighting) |
| N per condition | 450 | 150 |
|  |  |  |
| conditions | 3: nuclear, chemical, conventional strike | 2: nuclear, conventional strike |
|  |  |  |
| target | Al Qaeda WMD development facility in Afghanistan | Al Qaeda nuclear weapons development facility in Syria |
| number of fatalities | 1000 |
| number of injured | 1200 |
| format | simple text | mock newspaper story |
| length | approx. 150 words | approx. 450 words |
| perspective | retrospective (i.e., the attack already happened) |
| dependent variable | How much do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. military operation described in the scenario? |
| scale | 6-point scale from strongly disapprove to strongly approve |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Study 2** | **SV2017 Study 1** |
| sample | Amazon Mechanical Turk US sample | US representative sample (probability weighting) |
| N per condition | 250 | 260 |
|  |  |  |
| conditions | 4 conditions (2x2 factorial design): 80k / 20k US fatalities x 2000k / 100k Iranian fatalities | 3 conditions: 20k US fatalities (in all conditions); i) nuclear strike 2000k Iranian fatalities; ii) nuclear strike 100k Iranian fatalities, iii) conventional strike 100k Iranian fatalities |
|  |  |  |
| target | Iran |
|  |  |  |
| format | simple text | mock newspaper story |
| length | approx. 160 words | approx. 540 words |
| perspective | prospective (i.e., the attack had not happened yet) |
| dependent variable 1 | Given the facts described in the scenario, if you had to choose between launching the strike against the Iranian city or continuing the ground war against Iran, which option would you prefer? |
| scale 1 | 6-point scale from strongly prefer to continue the ground war to strongly prefer to launch a strike |
| dependent variable 2 | Regardless of which option you preferred, if the United States decided to conduct the strike against the Iranian city, how much would you approve or disapprove of that decision? |
| scale 2 | 6-point scale from strongly disapprove to strongly approve |

**Appendix 2**

Study 1

**Nuclear Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

In 2010, the United States used nuclear weapons – two nuclear-tipped cruise missiles – against an Al Qaeda weapons facility in Afghanistan. Several sources confirmed that the site had been used for the development of weapons of mass destruction. U.S. officials stated that the U.S. strike successfully managed to stop the imminent use of these weapons in a terrorist attack.

The total death toll from the U.S. strike eventually reached 1,000 civilians, including long-term deaths from radiation exposure. An additional 1,200 civilians suffered burns due to the strike and had to be treated in local hospitals.

According to an independent expert, a terrorist attack with weapons produced by the Al Qaeda facility could kill 50,000 to 70,000 people in a crowded urban area. He also stated that it would be very difficult to destroy this specific Al Qaeda site without the employment of nuclear weapons.”

**Chemical Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

In 2010, the United States used a new type of odorless chemical agent attacking central nervous system against an Al Qaeda weapons facility in Afghanistan. Several sources confirmed that the site had been used for the development of weapons of mass destruction. U.S. officials stated that the U.S. strike successfully managed to stop the imminent use of these weapons in a terrorist attack.

The total death toll from the U.S. strike eventually reached 1,000 civilians, including long-term deaths from intoxication. An additional 1,200 civilians suffered injuries due to intoxication and had to be treated in local hospitals.

According to an independent expert, a terrorist attack with weapons produced by the Al Qaeda facility could kill 50,000 to 70,000 people in a crowded urban area. He also stated that it would be very difficult to destroy this specific Al Qaeda site without the employment of the chemical agent.”

**Conventional Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

In 2010, the United States ordered a massive U.S. air strike (100 conventionally armed cruise missiles) against an Al Qaeda weapons facility in Afghanistan. Several sources confirmed that the site had been used for the development of weapons of mass destruction. U.S. officials stated that the U.S. strike successfully managed to stop the imminent use of these weapons in a terrorist attack.

The total death toll from the U.S. strike eventually reached 1,000 civilians, including long-term deaths due to the strike. An additional 1,200 civilians suffered burns due to the strike and had to be treated in local hospitals.

According to an independent expert, a terrorist attack with weapons produced by the Al Qaeda facility could kill 50,000 to 70,000 people in a crowded urban area. He also stated that it would be very difficult to destroy this specific Al Qaeda site without the employment of a massive air strike.”

**Appendix 3**

Study 1

**Attention Check:[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Against whom was the operation aimed?

against the Al Qaeda weapons facility in Afghanistan (1)

against Iran (2)

against the ISIS training camp in Syria (3)

**Evaluation:**

How much do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. military operation described in the scenario?

strongly disapprove (1)

moderately disapprove (2)

slightly disapprove (3)

slightly approve (4)

moderately approve (5)

strongly approve (6)

*(recoded as Approve = 4, 5, 6, Disapprove = 1, 2, 3)*

**Moral Foundations Questionnaire**

Part 1

Scale: not at all relevant (1)

not very relevant (2)

slightly relevant (3)

somewhat relevant (4)

very relevant (5)

extremely relevant (6)

Items:

Whether or not someone was good at math (1) ***(Attention Check item)***

Whether or not someone suffered emotionally (2)

Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable (3)

Whether or not someone was cruel (4)

Whether or not some people were treated differently than others (5)

Whether or not someone acted unfairly (6)

Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights (7)

Whether or not someone’s action showed love for his or her country (8)

Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group (9)

Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty (10)

Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority (11)

Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society (12)

Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder (13)

Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency (14)

Whether or not someone did something disgusting (15)

Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of (16)

Part 2

Scale: Strongly disagree (1)

Moderately disagree (2)

Slightly disagree (3)

Slightly agree (4)

Moderately agree (5)

Strongly agree (6)

Items:

It is better to do good than to do bad. (1) ***(Attention check item)***

Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue. (2)

One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal. (3)

It can never be right to kill a human being. (4)

When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly. (5)

Justice is the most important requirement for a society. (6)

I think it’s morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing. (7)

I am proud of my country’s history. (8)

People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong. (9)

It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself. (10)

Respect for authority is something all children need to learn. (11)

Men and women each have different roles to play in society. (12)

If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer’s orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty. (13)

People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed. (14)

I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural. (15)

Chastity is an important and valuable virtue. (16)

**Socio-demographic Items**

What is your age? (number of years)

What is your gender?

Male (1)

Female (2)

Other (4)

Prefer not to answer (3)

*(recoded as Male = 1, Other = 2, 3, 4)*

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

Did Not Complete High School (1)

High School/GED (2)

Some College, no degree (3)

Bachelor's Degree (4)

Master's Degree (5)

Advanced Graduate work or Ph.D. (6)

*(recoded as College Graduate = 4, 5, 6, Other = 1, 2, 3)*

In which of these groups did your total household income, from all sources before taxes, fall last year?

Less than $10,000 (1)

$10,000 - $19,999 (2)

$20,000 - $34,999 (3)

$35,000 - $49,999 (4)

$50,000 - $74,999 (5)

$75,000 - $99,999 (6)

$100,000 - $149,999 (7)

More than $150,000 (8)

*(recoded as Less than 35k = 1, 2, 3, Between 35k and 75k = 4, 5, More than 75k = 6, 7, 8)*

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what?

Strong Democrat (1)

Not strong Democrat (2)

Independent, near Democrat (3)

Independent (4)

Independent, near Republican (5)

Not strong Republican (6)

Strong Republican (7)

Other (8)

*(recoded as Republican = 5, 6, 7, Other = 1, 2, 3, 4, 8)*

How interested are you in politics and national affairs?

very interested (1)

somewhat interested (2)

only slightly interested (3)

not at all interested (4)

*(recoded as Political Interest = 1, 2, Other = 3, 4)*

Any comments *(optional)*:

**Appendix 4**

Study 2

**Low U.S. Fatalities, Low Iranian Fatalities Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

UN inspectors discovered that Iran had been secretly developing nuclear weapons. After Iran destroyed a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf in response to the imposition of U.S. economic sanctions, war broke out between the United States and Iran. The ground invasion by the U.S. army slowed down after the first three months, and the number of U.S. fatalities eventually reached 10,000. To achieve a goal of Iran’s unconditional surrender, the U.S. government is now facing a choice:

either (1) continue ground invasion supported by conventional strikes, which will likely result in additional 20,000 fatalities on the U.S. side, with limited fatalities among Iranian civilians;

or (2) resort to a “shock strategy”, using a single nuclear weapon against the second largest Iranian city Mashhad, which is likely to cause massive destruction and kill up to 100,000 Iranian civilians, with minimum additional fatalities on the U.S. side.

Both options are equally likely to achieve the goal of U.S. victory in the war.”

**Low U.S. Fatalities, High Iranian Fatalities Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

UN inspectors discovered that Iran had been secretly developing nuclear weapons. After Iran destroyed a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf in response to the imposition of U.S. economic sanctions, war broke out between the United States and Iran. The following ground invasion by the U.S. army slowed down after the first three months, and the number of U.S. fatalities eventually reached 10,000. To achieve a goal of Iran’s unconditional surrender, the U.S. government is now facing a choice:

either (1) continue ground invasion supported by conventional strikes, which will likely result in additional 20,000 fatalities on the U.S. side, with limited fatalities among Iranian civilians;

or (2) resort to a “shock strategy”, using a single nuclear weapon against the second largest Iranian city Mashhad, which is likely to cause massive destruction and kill up to 2,000,000 Iranian civilians, with minimum additional fatalities on the U.S. side.

Both options are equally likely to achieve the goal of U.S. victory in the war.”

**High U.S. Fatalities, High Iranian Fatalities Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

UN inspectors discovered that Iran had been secretly developing nuclear weapons. After Iran destroyed a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf in response to the imposition of U.S. economic sanctions, war broke out between the United States and Iran. The following ground invasion by the U.S. army slowed down after the first three months, and the number of U.S. fatalities eventually reached 10,000. To achieve a goal of Iran’s unconditional surrender, the U.S. government is now facing a choice:

either (1) continue ground invasion supported by conventional strikes, which will likely result in additional 80,000 fatalities on the U.S. side, with limited fatalities among Iranian civilians;

or (2) resort to a “shock strategy”, using a single nuclear weapon against the second largest Iranian city Mashhad, which is likely to cause massive destruction and kill up to 2,000,000 Iranian civilians, with minimum additional fatalities on the U.S. side.

Both options are equally likely to achieve the goal of U.S. victory in the war.”

**High U.S. Fatalities, Low Iranian Fatalities Scenario**

“Imagine the following scenario.

UN inspectors discovered that Iran had been secretly developing nuclear weapons. After Iran destroyed a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf in response to the imposition of U.S. economic sanctions, war broke out between the United States and Iran. The following ground invasion by the U.S. army slowed down after the first three months, and the number of U.S. fatalities eventually reached 10,000. To achieve a goal of Iran’s unconditional surrender, the U.S. government is now facing a choice:

either (1) continue ground invasion supported by conventional strikes, which will likely result in additional 80,000 fatalities on the U.S. side, with limited fatalities among Iranian civilians;

or (2) resort to a “shock strategy”, using a single nuclear weapon against the second largest Iranian city Mashhad, which is likely to cause massive destruction and kill up to 100,000 Iranian civilians, with minimum additional fatalities on the U.S. side.

Both options are equally likely to achieve the goal of U.S. victory in the war.”

**Attention Check:**

In the scenario, Iran destroyed a...

U.S. military base in Afghanistan (1)

U.S. aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf (2)

U.S. embassy Kabul (3)

**Evaluation:**

Given the facts described in the scenario, if you had to choose between launching the strike against the Iranian city or continuing the ground war against Iran, which option would you prefer?

strongly prefer to continue the ground war 1 (1)

2 (2)

3 (3)

4 (4)

5 (5)

strongly prefer to launch a strike 6 (6)

*(recoded as Prefer strike = 4, 5, 6, Prefer ground war = 1, 2, 3)*

Regardless of which option you preferred, if the United States decided to conduct the strike against the Iranian city, how much would you approve or disapprove of that decision?

strongly disapprove 1 (1)

2 (2)

3 (3)

4 (4)

5 (5)

strongly approve 6 (6)

*(recoded as Approve = 4, 5, 6, Disapprove = 1, 2, 3)*

+ the same **Moral Foundation Questionnaire** and **Socio-demographic Items** as in Study 1 described in Appendix 3 above + the following item:

Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?

strongly favor (1)

favor (2)

oppose (3)

strongly oppose (4)

*(recoded as Approvoppose (Favor death penalty = 1, 2, Oppose death penalty = 3, 4)*

**Appendix 5**

**Computation of the factor scores for individualizing and binding moral foundations**

Although the MFQ measures five distinct moral foundations, the first two (care/harm and fairness/cheating) and the remaining three (loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation) are strongly intercorrelated (Graham *et al.* 2011). This indicates that they might be measuring only two distinct latent factors instead of five – these two high order factors are commonly grouped together as individualizing and binding foundations. In addition, the intercorrelations cause serious multicollinearity which affects the stability and interpretability of the regression results. Therefore, we reduced the number of MFQ variables by using factor analysis with the scores of the five MFQ subscales. The parallel analysis supported the extraction of two factors which explained 80.5% of the variance in the scores of the five subscales. We used the principal axis factoring method for the extraction. After oblique oblimin rotation, the first two foundations loaded highly on the first factor (*rcare* = .83 and *rfairness* = .79), while the remaining three foundations loaded highly on the second factor (*rs* between .78 and .91). Despite using the oblique rotation that allows correlation between factors, the rotated factors were virtually orthogonal (*r* = .08), which is in line with previous findings regarding the factor structure of moral foundations (Graham *et al.* 2013). We used the regression method for the computation of factor scores, which we subsequently added to the logistic regression model. Using confirmatory factor analysis for the score computation leads to virtually identical results.

**Appendix 6**

**Supplementary results**

Study 1

The approval of the strike significantly differed between the conditions (Kruskal-Wallis *χ2*(2) = 59.4, *p* < .001). Dwass-Steel-Critchlow-Fligner pairwise comparisons showed that conventional strike was more approved than both nuclear (W = 6.47, p < .001) and chemical strike (W = 10.87, *p* < .001) and that chemical strike was approved significantly less than the nuclear strike (W = -4.37, *p* = .006).

**Table S1. Approval of Military Strike (Logit Model 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| Conventional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    Chemical |  | -1.01 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.36 |  | < .001 |
|  Nuclear |  | -0.58 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.56 |  | < .001 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.15 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.86 |  | 0.223 |
| Republican  |  | 1.15 |  | 0.13 |  | 3.15 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.20 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.82 |  | 0.225 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.27 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.31 |  | 0.049 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.71 |  | 0.16 |  | 2.04 |  | < .001 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.398 |
| Male  |  | -0.08 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.93 |  | 0.514 |
| Constant  |   | 0.43 |   | 0.26 |   | 1.54 |   | 0.102 |

*Note*. Conventional strike and income below $35k serve as reference categories. *N* = 1394. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

The model with the moral foundations variables fitted the data significantly better, (*χ2*(2) = 102.861, *p* < .001, than the previous model.

**Table S2. Approval of Military Strike (Logit Model 2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| Conventional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    Chemical |  | -1.11 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.33 |  | < .001 |
|  Nuclear |  | -0.66 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.52 |  | < .001 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.12 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.89 |  | 0.331 |
| Republican  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.91 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.03 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.97 |  | 0.836 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.22 |  | 0.168 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.67 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.95 |  | < .001 |
| Male  |  | -0.17 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.158 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.404 |
| Binding foundations |  | 0.49 |  | 0.07 |  | 1.63 |  | < .001 |
| Individualizing foundations |  | -0.43 |  | 0.07 |  | 0.65 |  | < .001 |
| Constant  |   | 0.58 |   | 0.27 |   | 1.78 |   | 0.035 |

*Note*. Conventional strike and income below $35k serve as reference categories. *N* = 1394. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S3. Approval of Military Strike (Logit Model 3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| Conventional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    Chemical |  | -1.09 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.34 |  | < .001 |
|  Nuclear |  | -0.64 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.53 |  | < .001 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.12 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.88 |  | 0.330 |
| Republican  |  | 0.64 |  | 0.15 |  | 1.90 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.04 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.96 |  | 0.813 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.22 |  | 0.156 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.67 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.95 |  | < .001 |
| Male  |  | -0.18 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.83 |  | 0.141 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.411 |
| Binding foundations |  | 0.39 |  | 0.11 |  | 1.48 |  | < .001 |
| Individualizing foundations |  | -0.42 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.66 |  | < .001 |
| BF\*chemical-conventional |  | 0.11 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.12 |  | 0.490 |
| BF\*nuclear-conventional |  | 0.20 |  | 0.15 |  | 1.22 |  | 0.205 |
| IF\*chemical-conventional |  | 0.11 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.12 |  | 0.480 |
| IF\*nuclear-conventional |  | -0.16 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.85 |  | 0.315 |
| Constant  |   | 0.57 |   | 0.27 |   | 1.77 |   | 0.037 |

*Note*. Conventional strike and income below $35k serve as reference categories. *N* = 1394. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

Study 2

**Table S4. Effects of Number of Fatalities on Preference for and Approval of a Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preference for the strike** | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities |  | 0.32 |  | 0.13 |  | 1.37 |  | 0.016 |
| High Iranian fatalities |  | -0.37 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.69 |  | 0.005 |
| Constant  |  | -0.47 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.63 |  | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approval of the strike** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| High U.S. fatalities |  | 0.28 |  | 0.13 |  | 1.32 |  | 0.037 |
| High Iranian fatalities |  | -0.26 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.77 |  | 0.048 |
| Constant  |   | -0.55 |   | 0.11 |   | 0.58 |   | < .001 |

*Note.**N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S5. Effects of Number of Fatalities on Preference for and Approval of a Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preference for the strike** | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities |  | 0.35 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.42 |  | 0.056 |
| High Iranian fatalities |  | -0.33 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.72 |  | 0.079 |
| U.S. \* Iranian fatalities |  | -0.07 |  | 0.26 |  | 0.94 |  | 0.799 |
| Constant  |  | -0.48 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.62 |  | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Approval of the strike** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High U.S. fatalities |  | 0.37 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.45 |  | 0.043 |
| High Iranian fatalities |  | -0.16 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.86 |  | 0.411 |
| U.S. ­\* Iranian fatalities |  | -0.20 |  | 0.26 |  | 0.82 |  | 0.450 |
| Constant  |  | -0.60 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.55 |  | < .001 |

*Note.**N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S6. Effects of Demographic Variables on Number of Fatalities on Approval of Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities  |  | 0.26 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.30 |  | 0.055 |
| High Iranian fatalities  |  | -0.37 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.69 |  | 0.007 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.10 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.90 |  | 0.492 |
| Republican  |  | 1.27 |  | 0.15 |  | 3.56 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.15 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.86 |  | 0.427 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.08 |  | 0.17 |  | 1.09 |  | 0.631 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.28 |  | 0.19 |  | 1.32 |  | 0.143 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.575 |
| Male  |  | -0.05 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.95 |  | 0.706 |
| Constant  |   | -0.91 |   | 0.32 |   | 0.40 |   | 0.004 |

*Note*: Income below $35k serves as reference category. *N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S7. Effects of Demographic Variables and Number of Fatalities on Preference for Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities  |  | 0.30 |  | 0.13 |  | 1.36 |  | 0.025 |
| High Iranian fatalities  |  | -0.46 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.63 |  | < .001 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.15 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.86 |  | 0.312 |
| Republican  |  | 0.92 |  | 0.15 |  | 2.50 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.35 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.71 |  | 0.06 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.17 |  | 1.12 |  | 0.492 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.33 |  | 0.19 |  | 1.40 |  | 0.075 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.623 |
| Male  |  | -0.09 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.91 |  | 0.497 |
| Constant  |   | -0.51 |   | 0.31 |   | 0.60 |   | 0.094 |

*Note*: Income below $35k serves as reference category. *N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S8. Effects of Moral Foundations and Their Interactions with Number of Fatalities on Approval of Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities  |  | 0.45 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.56 |  | 0.005 |
| High Iranian fatalities  |  | -0.43 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.65 |  | 0.006 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.05 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.95 |  | 0.734 |
| Republican  |  | 0.70 |  | 0.16 |  | 2.02 |  | < .001 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.01 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.99 |  | 0.966 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.996 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.22 |  | 0.20 |  | 1.24 |  | 0.283 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.472 |
| Male  |  | -0.13 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.88 |  | 0.394 |
| Binding foundations (BF) |  | 1.19 |  | 0.18 |  | 3.28 |  | < .001 |
| Individualizing foundations (IF) |  | -0.50 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.61 |  | < .001 |
| High U.S. fatalities \* BF |  | -0.55 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.58 |  | 0.003 |
| High U.S. fatalities \* IF |  | 0.08 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.08 |  | 0.621 |
| High Iranian fatalities \* BF |  | -0.14 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.87 |  | 0.426 |
| High Iranian fatalities \* IF |  | -0.08 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.92 |  | 0.613 |
| Constant  |   | -1.07 |   | 0.34 |   | 0.34 |   | 0.001 |

*Note*: Income below $35k serves as reference category. *N* = 1000. *N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Table S9. Effects of Demographic Variables, Number of Fatalities, and Moral Foundations on Preference for Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Coef.** |   | **SE** |   | **OR** |   | ***p*-value** |
| High U.S. fatalities  |  | 0.47 |  | 0.15 |  | 1.60 |  | 0.002 |
| High Iranian fatalities  |  | -0.60 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.55 |  | < .001 |
| College graduate  |  | -0.09 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.91 |  | 0.551 |
| Republican  |  | 0.33 |  | 0.16 |  | 1.39 |  | 0.046 |
| Political interest  |  | -0.26 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.77 |  | 0.185 |
| Income below $35k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Income between $35k and $75k  |  | 0.05 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.06 |  | 0.758 |
|  Income above $75k  |  | 0.32 |  | 0.20 |  | 1.38 |  | 0.104 |
| Age  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.539 |
| Male  |  | -0.12 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.88 |  | 0.401 |
| Binding foundations (BF) |  | 0.96 |  | 0.16 |  | 2.62 |  | < .001 |
| Individualizing foundations (IF) |  | -0.42 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.002 |
| High U.S. fatalities \* BF |  | -0.41 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.02 |
| High U.S. fatalities \* IF |  | 0.20 |  | 0.15 |  | 1.22 |  | 0.191 |
| High Iranian fatalities \* BF |  | 0.19 |  | 0.17 |  | 1.21 |  | 0.266 |
| High Iranian fatalities \* IF |  | -0.10 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.91 |  | 0.515 |
| Constant  |   | -0.61 |   | 0.32 |   | 0.54 |   | 0.06 |

*Note*: Income below $35k serves as reference category. *N* = 1000. SE = Standard Error, OR = Odds Ratio.

**Figure S1. Interaction effect of Binding Moral Foundation and the Number of US fatalities on Approval of Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 2)**



*Note.* Participants with binding moral foundations 1 SD above the mean and higher approve of the nuclear strike similarly, regardless of the number of US fatalities. Those with average and below average binding moral foundations approve of the strike more when US fatalities are high than when they are low. *N* = 1000. Error bars represent 95% CI.

**Figure S2. Interaction effect of Binding Moral Foundation and the Number of US fatalities on Preference for Nuclear Strike (Logit Model 2)**



*Note.* Participants with binding moral foundations 1 SD above the mean and higher prefer the nuclear strike similarly, regardless of the number of US fatalities. Those with average and below average binding moral foundations prefer the strike more when US fatalities are high than when they are low. *N* = 1000. Error bars represent 95% CI.

1. Two other attention check items are part of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)