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Blinded pre-registration is available at as-predicted: <https://aspredicted.org/blind.php/?x=9uu7u5>

1. **Links to YouTube videos used in Study 2**

Comparison condition (military power):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KAznde9Gco0>

Experimental condition (commemorative video):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M6PFE9bgg8E>

Details about the YouTube videos used in Study 3 are provided below on [page 1](#Sourcing)9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S1  *Linear Regression Predicting the Perceived Value of War from Commemoration Score and Positive Moral Emotions, Study 1.* | | | | | |
|  | Predictors | *B* | 95% CIs | *t* | *p* |
| Step 1 | Constant | 4.23 | (4.05, 4.40) | 47.63 | < .001 |
|  | Commemoration score | 0.09 | (0.06, 0.12) | 5.59 | < .001 |
|  | *Adjusted R2* | .06\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Step 2 | Constant | 4.46 | (4.31, 4.61) | 58.07 | <.001 |
|  | Commemoration score | 0.02 | (-0.01, 0.05) | 1.65 | .100 |
|  | Positive moral emotions | 0.41 | (0.35, 0.47) | 13.50 | <.001 |
|  | *ΔR2* | .27\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Step 3 | Constant | 4.43 | (4.26, 4.61) | 50.312 | <.001 |
|  | Commemoration score | 0.02 | (-0.01, 0.05) | 1.455 | .146 |
|  | Positive moral emotions | 0.34 | (0.28, 0.39) | 11.697 | <.001 |
|  | Age | 0.06 | (-0.14, 0.25) | 0.575 | .565 |
|  | Gender | 0.01 | (-0.00, 0.02) | 1.430 | .153 |
|  | Political orientation | 0.14 | (0.09, 0.18) | 5.802 | <.001 |
|  | Negative emotions | -0.19 | (-0.26, -0.12) | -5.249 | <.001 |
|  | Regret | -0.05 | (-0.12, 0.02) | -1.427 | .154 |
|  | *ΔR2* | .13\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| *Note.* To aid interpretation of the coefficients, positive moral emotions, age, political orientation, negative emotions, and regret were mean centered. Gender was coded 0 = women, 1 = men. | | | | | |

1. **Study 1 Additional Analyses**

In Study 1 we conduct a regression analysis (in addition to the mediation analysis using PROCESS), showing that the relationship between commemoration war and the perceived value of war became non-significant when positive moral emotions were included in the model. However, the relationship between positive moral emotions and the perceived value of war remained significant even as other variables were controlled for, see Table S1 below.

In our pre-registration for Study1, we also predicted a mediational pathway from the commemorative score to the perceived value of war through positive moral emotions (see Figure S1). The indirect effect of commemoration score on the value of war was significant: Indirect effect = 0.063, 95% CIs [0.045, 0.086]. The more commemorative activities a participant had engaged in, the more they valued war, and this effect was partially mediated by the experience of positive moral emotions.
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*Figure S2:* Schematic illustration of mediation models run in studies 1, Pilot, and 2. Path labels correspond to columns in Table S2 (Study 1), below. See details of other studies are provided elsewhere in the supplemental materials.
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*Figure S1:* Summary of mediation model, Study 1. 95% bias corrected and accelerated confidence intervals shown in brackets. The indirect effect was robust to including demographic variables, political orientation, and negative responses to war as additional predictors of positive moral emotions and valuing war, point estimate = 0.045, 95%CI: 0.029, 0.065.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S2 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S2, for Study 1. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the commemoration score on positive moral emotions. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of positive moral emotions on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of the commemoration score on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of the commemoration score on valuing war via positive moral emotions. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. Significant indirect effects are* ***bolded.*** *These relationships are illustrated in Figure S2.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only emotions)* | Positive emotions | 0.150\*\*\* (0.111, 0.190) | 0.421\*\*\* (0.364, 0.479) | **0.063 (0.045, 0.086)** | 0.028\*  (0.0004, 0.055) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | Positive emotions | 0.134\*\*\*  (0.092, 0.176) | 0.337\*\*\*  (0.280, 0.393) | **0.045**  **(0.029, 0.065)** | 0.020  (-0.007, 0.046) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* |  |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.014  (-0.001, 0.028) | 0.006  (-0.002, 0.015) |  |  |
|  | Gender | -0.132  (-0.454, 0.190) | -0.057  (-0.252, 0.138) |  |  |
|  | Politics | 0.182\*\*\*  (0.107, 0.258) | 0.138\*\*\*  (0.091, 0.185) |  |  |
|  | Regret | -0.016  (-0.131, 0.100) | -0.186\*\*\*  (-0.256, -0.117) |  |  |
|  | Negative moral emotions | -0.094  (-0.208, 0.019) | -0.050  (-0.119, 0.019) |  |  |
| *Note:* \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |

The analyses in Table S2 above were pre-registered: We expected, and found, an indirect effect of war commemorations on the perceived value of war, through positive moral emotions. While intriguing, this cannot be interpreted as causal evidence for the effect of war commemorations on the perceived value of war. Given the consistency of this effect, however (see Sections 6 and 13 of these Supplemental Materials), and the generally much weaker relationship between war commemorations, regret, and the perceived value of war, we believe these indirect effects provide convergent evidence for the inspirational account over the preventative account.

1. **Subscale construction**

In all studies, participants were asked the extent to which they experienced a set of 11 emotions. The emotions were *anger, disgust, shame, guilt, anxiety, sadness, pride, admiration, gratitude, awe, happiness.* These emotions were selected based on Haidt’s (2003) taxonomy of moral emotions and previous research on group-based guilt and pride (e.g., Schori-Eyal, Tagar, Saguy, & Halperin, 2015).

Rather than analyse each emotion separately, we wanted to create a smaller subset of emotion clusters, and we therefore undertook an exploratory factor analysis with the data from the Pilot for Study 2, and with Study 2. We followed the guidelines of Sakaluk and Short (2017), and used maximum likelihood (ML) extraction and an oblique rotation (direct oblimin) as we did not have any reason to assume the underlying factors would be uncorrelated.

In all cases (Study 1, Study 2, and Pilot Study 2), three factors had an eigenvalue of greater than 1. As can be seen from the pattern matrix (Table S3), in all studies the factors were readily interpretable: The positive-moral emotions load on one factor, and the negative emotions load on another factor. These two accounted for 56.93 % (Study 1), 55.60% (Pilot Study 2) and 45.51% (Study 2) of the variance. Sadness and happiness, perhaps because they are somewhat more “generic” emotion words, loaded on a third factor (but in opposite directions). For all studies, we therefore created two subscales: One for positive (pride, admiration, gratitude, awe) and one for negative (anger, disgust, shame, guilt, anxiety) items, but leaving sadness and happiness out. For Study 3 we did not repeat the factor analyses, but relied on the same subscales as in the previous studies.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pattern matrix from exploratory factor analysis in all three studies. Loadings < .300 have been suppressed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Items* | Study 1 | | |  | | Pilot Study 2 | | | |  | | Study 2 | | |
|  | Positive | Negative | Factor 3 |  | Positive | | Negative | Factor 3 |  | | Positive | | Negative | Factor 3 |
| Admiration | 0.86 |  |  |  | 0.92 | |  |  |  | | 0.88 | |  |  |
| Gratitude | 0.77 |  |  |  | 0.84 | |  |  |  | | 0.83 | |  |  |
| Pride | 0.79 |  |  |  | 0.77 | |  |  |  | | 0.81 | |  |  |
| Awe | 0.66 |  |  |  | 0.61 | |  |  |  | | 0.66 | |  |  |
| Disgust | -0.43 | 0.60 |  |  |  | | 0.83 |  |  | |  | | 0.70 |  |
| Anger |  | 0.70 |  |  |  | | 0.79 |  |  | |  | | 0.66 |  |
| Anxiety |  | 0.68 |  |  |  | | 0.79 |  |  | |  | | 0.57 |  |
| Guilt |  | 0.67 |  |  |  | | 0.76 |  |  | |  | | 0.65 |  |
| Shame | -0.39 | 0.68 |  |  |  | | 0.75 |  |  | |  | | 0.69 |  |
| Happiness | 0.34 |  | 0.51 |  |  | |  | 0.52 |  | |  | |  | 0.74 |
| Sadness |  | 0.58 | -0.47 |  |  | | 0.41 | -0.49 |  | |  | | 0.34 | -0.58 |
| Note: maximum likelihood extraction, direct oblimin rotation | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | | |

1. **Pilot to Study 2**

This study was conducted prior to Study 2 reported in the manuscript. As the methods were largely similar to those used for Study 2 (in the main manuscript), and the results were highly similar as well, to ease reader burden we report the full study here only.

## **Method**

**Participants.** Two-hundred U.S. participants were recruited using AMT. Sample size was determined based on a desire for 80% power to detect an effect as small as *d* = 0.40, in a between-subjects *t*-test (Faul, et al., 2009).

**Materials and Procedure.** The materials were identical to those reported for Study 2 in the main manuscript, except the manipulation check did not mention *human* cost: “Please give your subjective estimate of how costly wars are for U.S. society, using the scale below” (1 = *not at all costly,* 11 = *extremely costly*). At the end of the survey participants also completed a “fusion” scale (e.g., “I am one with my country”, 1 = *totally disagree*, 7 = *totally agree*, 8 items, α = .965). We included this measure to explore whether the effect of war commemorations might extend to increased fusion with the group. We did not find evidence for such an effect, *t*(183) = -1.177, *p* = .241; war commemoration: *M*= 0.08, *SD =* 0.86; military display: *M* = -0.07, *SD* = 0.92; mean difference = -0.155, 95% CIs [-0.416, 0.105]. This null finding is consistent with the use of this measure as an individual, as opposed to situational, variable a prior research (e.g., Gomez, Brooks, Buhrmester, Vazquez, Jetten, & Swann, 2011).

## **Results and Discussion**

After debriefing, 10 participants opted out of having their data included in the analyses, and 5 reported not having watched the video at all. This left a final sample size of 185; with 71 women, 113 men, 1 other, and with a mean age of 34.48 (*SD* = 9.88). Descriptive statistics are provided in Table S4.

**Manipulation check.** The effect of condition on the manipulation check was not significant, *t*(183) = 1.535, *p*= .127: in both conditions, participants perceived the cost of war to be very high (war commemoration: *M*= 10.26, SD = 1.12; military display: *M =* 9.98, *SD* = 1.30; mean difference = 0.276, 95%CI: 0.079, 0.631). This may have been because our question was too general; we did not specifically ask about the *human* cost of war (e.g., people may have been thinking of the cost of military equipment in the military strength condition). In Study 2 and Study 3 reported in the main manuscript we therefore improve our manipulation check.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S4 | | | | | | | | |
| *Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations for Pilot Study 2* | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | *M (SD)* | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | Gender | *F (0)* = 71 *M (1)*= 113 | -.074 | -.045 | .003 | -.007 | -.022 | -.186\* |
| 2 | Age | 34.48 (9.88) |  | .187\* | .113 | .218\*\* | -.009 | -.061 |
| 3 | Politicsa | 4.16 (2.23) |  |  | .394\*\*\* | .541\*\*\* | -.333\*\*\* | -.247\*\* |
| 4 | Positive moral emotions | 3.83 (1.81) |  |  |  | .592\*\*\* | -.122 | -.152\* |
| 5 | Valuing war | 4.47 (1.41) |  |  |  |  | -.375\*\*\* | -.390\*\*\* |
| 6 | Regret | 5.57 (1.40) |  |  |  |  |  | .470\*\*\* |
| 7 | Negative moral emotions | 3.50 (1.75) |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| *Note*: aFor the continuous politics measure, anyone responding “libertarian” or “apolitical/don’t know” was filtered out. This left an *n* of 168 for any analyses involving this measure. \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p <* .001 | | | | | | | | |

### **Responses to war commemoration.**

As expected, participants reported greater positive moral emotions (α = .871) in the war commemoration (*M* = 4.58, *SD =* 1.65) versus the military display (*M* = 3.17, *SD*= 1.68) condition, *t*(183) = 5.748, *p* < .001; mean difference = 1.412, 95%CI: 0.928, 1.897. The effect of condition on valuing war (α = .943) was not significant, although it was descriptively in the direction consistent with the “inspirational” account, *t*(183) = 1.712, *p* = .089; war commemoration: *M*= 4.66, *SD =* 1.42; military display: *M* = 4.31, *SD*= 1.40; mean difference = 0.355, 95%CI: -0.054, 0.764. The effect of condition on negative emotions (α = .888) in response to sacrifice was not significant, *t*(183) = -0.339, *p*= .735; commemoration: *M*= 3.55, *SD =* 1.75; military: *M* = 3.46, *SD* = 1.76; mean difference = -0.088, 95%CI: -0.599, 0.423, consistent with the lack of a correlation between this measure and participants’ commemorative score in Study 1. However, participants reported greater regret for U.S. involvement in war (α = .898) in the war commemoration (*M*= 5.88, *SD =* 1.30) than the military display (*M*= 5.30, *SD*= 1.44) condition, *t*(183) = -2.841, *p* = .005; mean difference = -0.575, 95%CI: -0.974, -0.176.

1. **Additional Analyses for Pilot Study 2, and Study 2**
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*Figure S2:* Schematic illustration of mediation models run in studies 1, Pilot, and 2. Path labels correspond to columns in Table S2 (Study 1, above), Table S5 (Pilot Study 2), Table S6 (Study 2), Table S9 (Sample 2a), and Table S10 (Sample 2b). “Model 1” in these tables includes only paths indicated by black lines, “Model 2” includes all paths.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S5 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S2, for Pilot Study 2. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the experimental condition on positive moral emotions. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of positive moral emotions on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of experimental condition on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of experimental condition on valuing war via positive moral emotions. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. Significant indirect effects are* ***bolded.*** *These relationships are illustrated in Figure S2.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only emotions)* | Positive emotions | 1.412\*\*\* (0.928, 1.897) | 0.503\*\*\* (0.403, 0.602) | **0.710 (0.460, 0.996)** | -0.354 (-0.713, 0.005) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | Positive emotions | 1.459\*\*\* (0.974, 1.944) | 0.364\*\*\* (0.263, 0.465) | **0.531 (0.336, 0.792)** | -0.185 (-0.532, 0.161) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* |  |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.014 (-0.010, 0.038) | 0.014 (-0.001, 0.029) |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.132 (-0.356, 0.620) | -0.003 (-0.319, 0.313) |  |  |
|  | Politics | 0.246\* (0.132, 0.361) | 0.167\*\*\* (0.089, 0.245) |  |  |
|  | Regret | -0.078 (-0.233, 0.077) | -0.139\*\* (-0.240, -0.038) |  |  |
|  | Negative moral emotions | -0.113 (-0.318, 0.092) | -0.120 (-0.253, 0.013) |  |  |
| *Note:* \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S6 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S2, for Study 2. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the experimental condition on positive moral emotions. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of positive moral emotions on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of experimental condition on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of experimental condition on valuing war via positive moral emotions. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. Significant indirect effects are* ***bolded.*** *These relationships are illustrated in Figure S2.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only emotions)* | Positive emotions | 0.508\*\*  (0.207, 0.809) | 0.491\*\*\*  (0.442, 0.539) | **0.249**  **(0.103, 0.406)** | -0.186\*  (-0.364, -0.007) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | Positive emotions | 0.668\*\*\*  (0.367, 0.969) | 0.381\*\*\*  (0.328, 0.434 | **0.254**  **(0.141, 0.383)** | -0.105  (-0.288, 0.078) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* |  |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.036\*\*\* (0.023, 0.050) | 0.005 (-0.034, 0.013) |  |  |
|  | Gender | -0.001 (-0.298, 0.296) | 0.013 (-0.164, 0.190) |  |  |
|  | Politics | 0.226\*\*\*  (0.158, 0.294) | 0.118\*\*\* (0.075, 0.160) |  |  |
|  | Regret | 0.063 (-0.050, 0.175) | -0.164\*\*\* (-0.231, -0.097) |  |  |
|  | Negative moral emotions | -0.235\*\*\* (-0.349, -0.121) | -0.144\*\*\* (-0.213, -0.075) |  |  |
| *Note:* \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |

1. **Separate analyses for sample 2a and 2b**

We first recruited 300 participants for our Study 2 (sample 2a). The materials for this study were identical to the materials for Pilot Study 2, except for the inclusion of a patriotism scale between the manipulation check and the measure of emotions (instead of the fusion scale, see summary of pilot study above). We were therefore surprised to find that neither of the two outcome measures we were most interested in (i.e., positive moral emotions, valuing war) were influenced by the manipulation, and wondered whether the patriotism scale had somehow “interfered” with the process we were attempting to capture. To follow this up, we recruited a second group of 300 participants (sample 2b). These participants completed the same materials, but the patriotism scale was now moved to the end of the set. In this sample, the manipulation had the same effects as in Pilot Study 2. As described in the main manuscript, we therefore combined the two samples, and report the results of the full sample. However, in this section, we report the results for sample 2a and sample 2b separately (see Tables S6 – S9, see also Figure S1). In the following section (Section 7, p.15) we also report a statistical analysis comparing the two samples.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S7 | | | | | | |
| Descriptive statistics and *t*-tests for differences across condition for all the measures in sample 2a and sample 2b separately. | | | | | | |
| *Measure* | | Military  *M* (*SD*) | Commemoration  *M* (*SD*) | *t* | *p* | *d* |
| Sample 2a | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Regret | 5.14 (1.58) | 5.63 (1.37) | 2.825 | .005 | 0.33 |
|  | Pos. emotions | 3.87 (1.84) | 4.12 (1.83) | 1.124 | .262 | 0.14 |
|  | Neg. emotions | 3.47 (1.37) | 3.30 (1.51) | -0.980 | .328 | 0.12 |
|  | Patriotism | 5.09 (1.39) | 4.91 (1.62) | -1.056 | .292 | 0.12 |
|  | Valuing War | 4.56 (1.42) | 4.54 (1.52) | 0.146 | .884 | 0.01 |
| Sample 2b | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Regret | 5.10 (1.48) | 5.57 (1.36) | 2.813 | .005 | 0.33 |
|  | Pos. emotions | 3.62 (1.87) | 4.40 (1.77) | 3.587 | <.001 | 0.43 |
|  | Neg. emotions | 3.53 (1.64) | 3.37 (1.35) | 0.888 | .375 | 0.11 |
|  | Patriotism | 4.91 (1.60) | 5.22 (1.45) | 1.716 | .087 | 0.20 |
|  | Valuing War | 4.62 (1.40) | 4.78 (1.25) | 1.014 | .312 | 0.12 |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S8 | | | | | | | | | |
| *Zero-order correlations for variables in Study 2. Sample 2A (*n = *287) above the diagonal, Sample 2B (*n = *282) below the diagonal.* | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | *1* | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Gendera |  | .056 | -.009 | .105 | .033 | -.063 | .042 | -.052 |
| 2 | Age | .068 |  | .087 | .279\*\*\* | .065 | .291\*\*\* | -.142\* | .209\*\*\* |
| 3 | Politicsb | -.073 | .002 |  | .415\*\*\* | -.269\*\*\* | .334\*\*\* | -.247\*\*\* | .461\*\*\* |
| 4 | Patriotism | .069 | .157\*\* | .342\*\*\* |  | -.185\*\* | .563\*\*\* | -.229\*\*\* | .665\*\*\* |
| 5 | Regret | .122\* | .110 | -.231\*\*\* | -.151\* |  | -.199\*\* | .335\*\*\* | -.354\*\*\* |
| 6 | Positive Emo. | -.012 | .106 | .312\*\*\* | .546\*\*\* | -.211\*\*\* |  | -.258\*\*\* | .666\*\*\* |
| 7 | Negative Emo. | .069 | -.069 | -.159\* | -.117 | .445\*\*\* | .018 |  | -.332\*\*\* |
| 8 | Value War | -.054 | .116 | .394\*\*\* | .612\*\*\* | -.372\*\*\* | .611\*\*\* | -.274 |  |
| *Notes:*: a Gender codes: Male = 1, Female = 2. bFor the politics measure, anyone responding “libertarian” or “apolitical/not sure” was filtered out. This left an *n* of 257 (Sample 2a) and 240 (Sample 2b) for any analyses involving this measure. \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p <* .001 | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S9 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S2, for Sample 2a. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the experimental condition on positive moral emotions. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of positive moral emotions on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of experimental condition on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of experimental condition on valuing war via positive moral emotions. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. These relationships are illustrated in Figure S2.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only emotions)* | Positive emotions | 0.243  ( -0.183, 0.670) | 0.535\*\*\*  (0.465, 0.605) | 0.130  (-0.094, 0.364) | -0.156  (-0.411, 0.100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | Positive emotions | 0.116  (-0.081, 0.726) | 0.392\*\*\*  (0.311, 0.473) | 0.127  (-0.026, 0.295) | -0.016  (-0.279, 0.246) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* |  |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.044\*\*\*  (0.027, 0.061) | 0.004  (-0.007, 0.016) |  |  |
|  | Gender | -0.277  (-0.677, 0.124) | 0.033  (-0.227, 0.293) |  |  |
|  | Politics | 0.203\*\*\*  (0.111, 0.296) | 0.144\*\*\*  (0.082, 0.206) |  |  |
|  | Regret | -0.177\*  (-0.329, -0.026) | -0.109\*  (-0.208, -0.009) |  |  |
|  | Negative moral emotions | -0.105  (-0.253, 0.043) | -0.144\*\*  (-0.240, -0.048) |  |  |
| *Note:* \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S10 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S2, for Sample 2b. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the experimental condition on positive moral emotions. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of positive moral emotions on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of experimental condition on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of experimental condition on valuing war via positive moral emotions. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. Significant indirect effects are* ***bolded.*** *These relationships are illustrated in Figure S2.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only emotions)* | Positive emotions | 0.778\*\*\*  (0.351, 1.204) | 0. 46\*\*\*  (0.379, 0.514) | **0.347**  **(0.158, 0.561)** | -0.187  (-0.439, 0.064) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | Positive emotions | 1.058\*\*\*  (0.627, 1.488) | 0.394\*\*\*  (0.319, 0.468) | **0.416**  **(0.239, 0.641)** | -0.215  (-0.476, 0.045) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* |  |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.022\*  (0.002, 0.043 | 0.005  (-0.007, 0.017) |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.306  (-0.120, 0.732) | -0.028  (-0.274, 0.219) |  |  |
|  | Politics | 0.231\*\*\*  (0.134, 0.327) | 0.093\*\*  (0.034, 0.151) |  |  |
|  | Regret | 0.317\*\*\*  (0.158, 0.477) | -0.216\*\*\*  (-0.312, -0.121) |  |  |
|  | Negative moral emotions | -0.418\*\*\*  (-0.587, -0.249) | -0.127\*  (-0.230, -0.025) |  |  |
| *Note:* \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |

1. **C****omparison of sample 2a and 2b**

The two samples did not differ on age or political orientation, although the proportion of women in sample 2a was slightly higher than in sample 2b (see Table S10). Nor did the two samples differ in their overall responses to the various measures used in the present study.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S11 | | | | | | |
| Descriptive statistics and *t*-tests for differences across the two samples for all the measures. | | | | | | |
|  | | Sample 2a  *M* (*SD*) | Sample 2b  *M* (*SD*) | *t* | *p* | *d* |
| Participants | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender a | *F* = 119, *M* = 168 | *F* = 142, *M* = 140 | 4.529 | .033 | 0.38 |
|  | Age | 35.62 (11.61) | 35.59 (10.29) | 0.034 | .973 | <0.01 |
|  | Political orientation | 4.48 (2.23) | 4.36 (2.25) | 0.613 | .540 | 0.05 |
| Measures | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Manipulation check | 9.38 (1.93) | 9.38 (1.92) | -0.041 | .967 | <0.01 |
|  | Regret | 5.39 (1.49) | 5.34 (1.43) | 0.462 | .644 | 0.04 |
|  | Positive emotions | 4.00 (1.83) | 4.01 (1.86) | -0.068 | .946 | <0.01 |
|  | Negative emotions | 3.39 (1.45) | 3.45 (1.50) | -0.558 | .577 | 0.05 |
|  | Patriotism | 5.00 (1.51) | 5.07 (1.53) | -0.542 | .588 | 0.05 |
|  | Valuing War | 4.55 (1.47) | 4.70 (1.33) | -1.272 | .204 | 0.11 |
| Note: a For gender, the statistic reported is Pearson’s χ2 | | | | | | |

However, when combining two data sets, the important thing to investigate is whether the *effect* of interest is significantly different across the two samples – that is, whether sample (as a categorical variable) moderates the effect of condition on positive moral emotions (for example). Although the effect *appears* different in the two samples – in sample 2a it is significant, in sample 2b it is not – this difference in significance may not itself be significant.

To clarify: you can imagine this as an experiment, testing the following question: “does the position of the patriotism scale influence the effect of the condition (military vs. commemorative video) on our measures of interest?” The potential interaction effect is illustrated in Figure S2.

Condition

(Commemoration = 1, Military = 0)

Positive moral emotions

Sample   
(2a vs. 2b)

Valuing war

Path *a*

Path *b*

Path *c’*

*Figure S3:* Schematic illustration of moderation model combining samples from study 2a and 2b, to test statistically whether the position of the patriotism scale matters for any of the effects in the mediation model.

Importantly, when testing this possibility, none of the interaction terms were significant. Sample (*a* vs. *b*) did not significantly moderate the effect of condition on positive emotions (path *a;* interaction term point estimate = 0.534, SE = 0.31, *p* = .082, 95%CI: -0.068, 1.136), nor the effect of condition on valuing war (path *c’;* interaction term point estimate = -0.032, SE = 0.18, *p* = .863, 95%CI: -0.389, 0.326), nor the relationship between positive emotions and valuing war (path *b;* interaction term point estimate = -0.089, SE = 0.05, *p* = .073, 95%CI: -0.186, 0.008)

Furthermore, given an alpha level of .05, and power of 80%, observing 2 out of 3 significant results is far more likely if H1 is true than if H0 is true (Likelihood Ratio = 53.89, Lakens & Etz, 2017). Overall we can be confident that taken together, the two experimental studies (three samples) reported thus far provide evidence for the effect of condition on positive moral emotions, and for the indirect effect of condition on valuing war via positive moral emotions.

1. **Details of video sourcing, Study 3**

In order to “crowdsource” videos for our third study, we recruited 30 participants using MTurk, and gave them one of the following prompts:

In this study we would like you to find three YouTube videos for us.

These videos should be *commemoration videos,* that is, videos that commemorate veterans or the lives of U.S. soldiers lost in war. Ideally, they highlight the cost of war and “tug at your heartstrings” because they show grieving families and friends, or because they demonstrate the sacrifices U.S. soldiers make. This would be the kind of video that might be created or viewed for Memorial Day or Remembrance Day, by someone who thinks the U.S. military is worth our support.

Or:

In this study we would like you to find three YouTube videos for us.

These videos should be *military display videos,* that is, videos that display the power of the U.S. military. Ideally, they highlight the powerful technology – including weapons, ships, and aircraft – commanded by the U.S. military, as well as the competence, professionalism, and dedication of the men and women in the military. This would be the kind of video that might be created or viewed by someone who thinks the U.S. military is awe-inspiring and worth our support.

Participants were also asked to include only videos between 1 minute and 5 minutes long, and avoid videos with a lot of text. Some people provided more than 3 videos (and some fewer), so the total set was 60 unique commemoration videos (high cost), and 50 unique military videos (low cost). From these, we selected 10 of each; excluding videos that were too long, videos that featured news stories or documentaries, videos that were clips from movies, videos from foreign countries, videos that only featured veterans talking about their experiences, and videos that had an overly political message. Any video that was nominated more than once (i.e., by at least 2 different participants) was always included. The full list of videos is provided in the table below; dark orange and green shading indicates that this video was selected. (Lighter shading indicates a candidate video that was not included in the study.)

The number in brackets in the rightmost column indicates how many participants viewed each video.

1. **L****ist of commemorative videos sourced for Study 3**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Link: Commemorative Videos** | **Length** | **Comments** | **Used As** |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dqn3GJMjwgE | 1:45 | Music; names, faces, rank and dates | A1 (23) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=poC1NbkRKQY | 1:16 | Documentary describing Vietnam War Memorial |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SawLh6vo55w | 2:20 | News Report on Vault of Vietnam War Memorial |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DmblV8URfrw | 4:32 | Music; starts with babies (mostly sad, but text says “military tribute… remember”) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FM89miYtknw | 4:05 | Shawn Thomas widow and coffin (x2) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S5ugPVW6YIY | 1:11 | Jarhead |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uFFlHFgYmpU |  | Saving Private Ryan |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSRr7wUjLxw |  | Saving Private Ryan |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a77DhwalG6A | 3:26 | Music, images, flags, Veteran’s Day Tribute (x2) | A2 (25) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NOcl17HIa7c | 3:21 | Music, images, flags, faces Memorial Day Tribute | A3 (24) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wlTtL1FlDV4 | 3:12 | Music, images, flags; WWII (specific) | A4 (20) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i-ZCvBct6lA | 2:34 | Music, images, flags (x2) | A5 (26) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HzGFOfBbGxA | 3:11 | A bit more military; NOT SAD AT ALL |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1lG8GDYdKsc | 5:06 | Good but a bit long |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aVr0MSEW2SU | 4:11 | Anti-war documentary about *other* people’s lives (civilian enemy) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WxJf9ZezTZE | 4:26 | Music, images, etc |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=epjBKfVI54s | 4:38 | Good |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vXJmvncHNWA | 4:08 | Specifically for Navy Seals, coffins at the end |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nhGuhfBk5xk | 2:59 | Bagpipes (Amazing Grace) (x2) | A6 (22) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5leo7IWAQQQ | 0:59 | News story about commemorating veterans (still kind of moving) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TJalzuZ0JnA | 7:14 | Australian news story, super hokey |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BnSnMKwSeWE | 2:59 | Home video of service to Vietnam Veterans (bad sound quality) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jF3ExJQv4qQ | 1:03 | No sound; honoring specific man |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T7GyBG9qfN8 | 1:47 | Veterans and other military-connected people talking, music in background (intention is to say thanks) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cIyNzuhtoJ0 | 4:53 | Good (somewhat religious) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w9JRm26I2O0 | 1:12 | Veteran talking about wanting to die (after war) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_HeMB\_qyXKA | 2:58 | Good | A7 (22) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UUZHTE1jMXg | 3:02 | Bagpipes again! Argh (Good otherwise) (x2) | A8 (24) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ikq0YNzZles | 10:16 | Soldiers coming home (too long, also so sad) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ROtxDncNNh4 | 0:43 | Home video of service at Vietnam War Memorial (Might be good because it’s “real”) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UHAjUPy7kCI | 2:42 | Pearl Harbor Specifically; veterans talking about being proud |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_egQbU\_X1Cc | 2:30 | Documentary about Laying Wreaths on the cemetery |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0VYAKH3Mjyw | 0:50 | Obama speech about WWII |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cLHJ2rtvV4I | 4:37 | Music Video SGT Dunson (Cost of War) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WYVroWYUI9s | 6:16 | Excerpt from documentary about War Dogs |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=96149LGrei8 | 1:28 | Russian/Latvian Video of commemorative service |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DHfXWi56kSE | 1:24 | British (documentary) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wuom2Z69aS4 | 1:30 | British WWI |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M\_TUup-0emM | 1:15 | Pearl Harbor Anniversary (probably not ideal, since it emphasizes threat) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sbhxjff10bM | 3:21 | Commemorating Falklands |  |
| <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_INr2JqT_TQ> | 2:46 | D-day reunion; news story |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0y\_a\_V1QD3U | 2:41 | War dog/PTSD |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nq6k-gTAJjk | 2:13 | Veteran talking about how/why he signed up (quite political) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yEAI1V6rKgU | 3:09 | One-legged vet going back to Afghanistan (news story) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d1NkQhzZXDE | 4:05 | Documentary about dog |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C49YBNyLolo | 3:00 | Speech by Joe Galloway (Vietnam Vet) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VhEGNbO7hJo | 3:58 | Veteran of Vietnam talking about his experiences |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_E6gnxFUNPs | 2:57 | Veteran of Vietnam talking about his experiences |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n174qkorvag | 3:09 | Veteran of Vietnam talking about his experiences |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eTeLfH\_75x0 | 3:47 | Veteran of Vietnam talking about his experiences |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-ljRY4nmqA | 10:20 | Too long |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sCXAfJBVHJ0 | 1:41 | Vet talks about not leaving people behind |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1fF-TJPzgck | 3:19 | Surprise home-comings |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZsRGYK-B1Z4 | 1:00 | Good | A9 (26) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=crNJIGMws1Y | 4:32 | Good |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZogGAgiLHFg | 4:45 | Good |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suJ-\_p98fKU | 1:15 | Specifically Vietnam, speech by Veterans Affairs Secretary |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dcZVJsU5wtI | 3:51 | Good |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C5GYzsrcVvM | 3:45 | Good | A10 (26) |

1. **List** **of military display videos sourced for Study 3**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Link: Military Display Videos** | **Time** | **Comment** | **Use As** |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z\_klMTpsE9M&app=desktop | 4:09 | Recruitment? | B1 (21) |
| https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=QQnWE0SCsj0 | 14:41 | Too long (training video) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UyDguGo316M&app=desktop | 4:11 | Too much like the commemorative ones |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xW2ijF2ya1c | 3:06 | Good (x4) | B2 (24) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u2q4lqpwKWw | 3:52 | Showing off helicopter (not great) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b8kZo2xByPY | 1:27 | Showing off railgun (alright) | B3 (24) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=johyMpuo1gk | 3:23 | News story |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6rpO7IP\_0yI | 10:37 | Too long (showing off guns) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XnFgoeekL0s | 9min+ | Documentary about guns |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rmbk0Gu3f\_M | 11:04 | Spending on weapons |  |
| <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xW2ijF2ya1c> |  |  |  |
| <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uVm0AfZdkA4> | 4:25 | Too much like commemorative (although it ends with “give em hell” |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KAznde9Gco0 | 3:54 | Good (the one used previously!) (2016) | B4 (21) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sla8TD9IwVQ | 3:34 | Good (2018) | B5 (25) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5HF11AFHBM | 3:49 | Good (2017) x2 | B6 (22) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BzccgMy0P6s | 3:37 | Marines (too much like the other ones) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bwnymjMUFp8 | 2:52 | Some talking; little music “marine corps weapons” |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AbfPj00pTNY | 2:30 | Advertisement for national guard |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LKH\_M2nPBKE | 2:43 | News story on gear |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G-8F26IXgG8 | 2:28 | News story – about technology, cool gear |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bqf6u\_TAtNE | 2:42 | Music and promo of new gear (v cool) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IcvQbxMSF90 | 4:35 | Too boring (news story) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G62WlXpSmy0 | 3:18 | Perfect x3 | B7 (22) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ouhfQXSZ\_QY | 2:15 | Show of force (exactly what Trump wants?) | B8 (27) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lv0d5LQWQNE | 1:51 | Show of force (but no music, bad sound |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fLORMdb8iyg | 2:37 | News story |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EMNEBzCyhFg | 3:24 | Training exercise “home video” (no music) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mb3owEcZZ2s | 2:38 | Show off military helicopter (with music) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_zVgfiz08ng | 3:31 | Show off helicopter (no music) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MAIpTUbcZIU | 3:36 | Kenyan |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BNn8vku7I8I | 2:07 | News story-ish, weapon |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aVphXcWog6k | 1:26 | Good | B9 (25) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yhiWOXF5dzs | 10:20 | too long, but very detailed – could play from late? |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i737rM6FxqE | 7:41 | Too long, cool gun |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wjnrkVdQwZc | 4:00 | Showing off military |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k0ZUMTP\_d30 |  | Too long |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K3TJkbARxf4 | 4:05 | Showing off |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e0L11Bf4Y\_Q | 2:41 | Showing off (x2) | B10 (27) |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8EwuHoN-HO4 | Too long |  |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FSWL8rsCJxk | 2:48 | Good |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lOpLcqGWAbs | Too long |  |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oeIqcSFTuZM | Too long |  |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b75MkU\_0QwA | Too long |  |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ouhfQXSZ\_QY | 2:14 | (see above!) |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xjuP2T84ths | Too long |  |  |
| https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=YS8YP7mtNss | 4:50 | Okay |  |
| https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=xMqb7G36\_nY | 5:50 | Too long, but pretty good |  |
| https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=fhztcQKgpbc | 4:37 | Metallica, abstract |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tyUh\_xSjvXQ | 1:35 | Laser weapon |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qo2mNFF6uGw | 1:03 | Ad for pulse weapon |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0\_\_mQLYOYWo | 1:40 | Military robots |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QFZdiOCf8Xg | 2:27 | Documentary |  |
| https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ElNjgZCDpQ | 3:01 | News story |  |

1. **Scripts for STATA Multilevel Models, Study 3**

The do-file for these STATA scripts, and the .txt data, and the output, are all available on the project’s OSF page.

/\* LEST WE FORGET Study 3 \*/

////////////////////////////

/\* UNFILTERED DATA \*/

import delim "~\LWF Unfiltered.txt", clear

/\* FILTERED DATA: \*/

import delim "~\LWF Filtered.txt", clear

d

sum

/\* first look at ICC (rho), but is a bit weird - because condition isn't included, so the video variable "captures"/"includes" the difference between two conditions \*/

xtreg check, i(video) mle

xtreg bad, i(video) mle

xtreg pos, i(video) mle

xtreg neg, i(video) mle

xtreg value, i(video) mle

/\* the results of these analyses are summarized in Table S11 below \*/

/\* then for each variable, we run a multilevel "null" model \*/

/\* - that is, only predicting the variable from video \*/

/\* and then run the same model including condition as a predictor \*/

/\* We then compare the two models, using a Likelihood Ratio Test \*/

/\* In all cases, we calculate robust standard errors \*/

/\* (To account for some non-normality in the residuals) \*/

/\* 1. THE MANIPULATION CHECK \*/

gllamm check, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m1C

gllamm check condition, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m2C

lrtest m1C m2C

/\* 2. REGRET \*/

gllamm bad, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m1B

gllamm bad condition, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m2B

lrtest m1B m2B

/\* 3. POSITIVE EMOTIONS \*/

gllamm pos, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m1P

gllamm pos condition, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m2P

lrtest m1P m2P

/\* 4. NEGATIVE EMOTIONS \*/

gllamm neg, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m1N

gllamm neg condition, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m2N

lrtest m1N m2N

/\* 5. VALUE \*/

gllamm value, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m1V

gllamm value condition, i(video) adapt

gllamm, robust

estimates store m2V

lrtest m1V m2V

/\* The results of these analyses are the ones summarized in the main manuscript \*/

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S12  *Summary of calculation of the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for each outcome measure (STATA script provided above). The ICC is a measure of how much variance can be attributed to the clustering of responses into different groups (in this case, videos).* | | | | | |
| *Variable* | Rho/ICC | Lower | Upper | *̅χ*2(1) | *p* |
| Perceived Value | (basically zero) | - | - | - | - |
| Negative moral emotion | (basically zero) | - | - | - | - |
| Positive moral emotions | 0.0291 (2.91%) | 0.0058 | 0.1024 | 3.63 | .028 |
| Regret | 0.0246 (2.46%) | 0.0041 | 0.0978 | 2.76 | .048 |
| Manipulation check | 0.0270 (2.70%) | 0.0049 | 0.1013 | 3.12 | .039 |

1. **Additional Mediation Analyses, Study 3**

In the manuscript we have refrained from interpreting the indirect effect of condition on the perceived value of war via positive moral emotions, as a) there was no direct effect of condition on valuing war, and b) we cannot in any case make causal claims about the relationship between these emotions and the perceived value of war. However, indirect effects can be meaningful in the absence of direct effect, if the experimental manipulation (in this case, the videos) can be expected to have diverse effects on a number of different processes, and these processes in turn influence the outcome measure in contradictory ways (Rucker et al., 2011; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). To illustrate this possibility, consider the model below (Figure S4, and Table S13).

Condition (Commemoration = 1, Military Display = 0)

Positive moral emotions

Perceived value of war

Controls

Path *a1*

Path *b1*

Path *d*

Path *e*

Path *c’*

*Figure S4:* Schematic illustration of mediation models run in Study 3. Pilot, and 2. Path labels correspond to columns in Table S11. “Model 1” in these tables includes only paths indicated by black lines, “Model 2” includes all paths.

Regret

Path *a2*

Path *b2*

Path *f*

In Study 3, the commemorative videos increased positive moral emotions relative to the military display video, and had a non-significant negative effect on regret. Positive moral emotions were in turn *positively* related to the perceived value of war, and regret was *negatively* related to the perceived value of war. The total effect of condition on the perceived value of war is (in this model) the sum of the direct effect (*c’*), and the two indirect effects (*a1b1***+** *a2b2* ). Since *a1b1* is positive, and *a2b2* and *c’* are negative, the total effect is null. Again, the design of our study does not provide causalevidence for these indirect effects, but future research could manipulate positive moral emotions and/or regret directly, and thus investigate the “second step” of this hypothesised chain.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S13 | | | | | |
| *Path coefficients for the two mediation models illustrated in Figure S4, for Study 3. Unstandardized effect estimates are presented, along with their bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals in brackets. The ‘path a’ column is the effect of the experimental condition on the two parallel mediators. The ‘path b’ column is the effect of the mediators on valuing war. The ‘path c’’ column is the direct effect of experimental condition on valuing war. The indirect effects are the indirect effects of experimental condition on valuing war via each of the mediators. The ‘path d’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on positive moral emotions. The ‘path e’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on valuing war. The ‘path f’ column is the effect of each of the control variables on regret. Significant indirect effects are* ***bolded.*** *These relationships are illustrated in Figure S4.* | | | | | |
|  |  | *Path a* | *Path b* | *Indirect effect* | *Path c’* |
| *Model 1*  *(only mediators)* | 1. Pos. moral emotions | 0.549\*\*  (0.206, 0.893) | 0.438\*\*\*  (0.386, 0.491) | **0.241**  **(0.090, 0.294)** | -0.172  (-0.369, 0.025) |
|  | 2. Regret | 0.229  (-0.034, 0.493) | -0.241\*\*\*  (-0.310, -0.173) | -0.055  (-0.126, 0.004) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Model 2*  *(with controls)* | 1. Pos. moral emotions | 0.525\*\*  (0.191, 0.859) | 0.390\*\*\*  (0.334, 0.445) | **0.205**  **(0.075, 0.338)** | -0.222\*  (-0.415, -0.029) |
|  | 2. Regret | 0.216  (-0.012, 0.443) | -0.078  (-0.160, 0.004) | -0.017  (-0.055, 0.000) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *Path d* | *Path e* | *Path f* |  |
| *Controls* | Age | 0.027\*\*\* (0.015, 0.040) | 0.011\*\* (0.004, 0.019) | 0.004  (-0.005, 0.013) |  |
|  | Gender | 0.082 (-0.257, 0.421) | -0.110 (-0.304, 0.085) | 0.324\*\*  (0.093, 0.555) |  |
|  | Politics | 0.266\*\*\*  (0.192, 0.340) | 0.147\*\*\* (0.102, 0.192) | -0.136\*\*\*  (-0.186, -0.085) |  |
|  | Neg. moral emotions | -0.090 (-0.198, 0.018) | -0.154\*\*\* (-0.221, -0.086) | 0.363\*\*\*  (0.290, 0.437) |  |
| *Note.* In Model 2, anyone responding “other” to the gender question, or “apolitical/not interested” or “libertarian” to the politics question, were filtered out; leaving *n* = 422.  \* *p* < .05,\*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001 | | | | | |
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