**SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

**SECTION 1: FULL INSTRUCTIONS AND SCALE ITEMS**

**Data collection**

Data for Study 1 were collected through M-Turk (U.S. sample), Crowd-flower and university fora of the psychology faculty in a university in the Southeast of England (U.K. sample), Crowd-flower, Facebook, and snowballing among university students (Belgian sample), and among university students through e-mails and Facebook (French sample). Data for Study 2 were collected in the university lab during 1-hour sessions with about 50 students in each session.

**Pre-experimental measures**

**Cover story.**

The cover story was identical to the one used by Saleem and colleagues (2015) and read as follows: “The purpose of the research is to understand the relationship between visualization, personalities, and political opinions”.

**Control measures.**

A trait avoidance, trait anxiety (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000), ingroup identification, and political orientation measure were administered as control variables. Also, mood (Saleem et al., 2015; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was assessed immediately after the experimental manipulation. For trait avoidance and trait anxiety, respondents were given the following instruction: “Please answer the following questions about your dating or marital partner. Note: If you are not currently in a dating or marital relationship with someone, answer these questions with respect to a former partner or a relationship that you would like to have with someone”.

*Trait avoidance:*

Study 1: *α* =.83; *M* = 25.63 (*SD* = 19.59)

Study 2: *α* =.79; *M* = 2.55 (*SD* = 0.99)

1. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person
2. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down
3. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person (*reverse coded*)
4. I talk things over with this person (*reverse coded*)
5. I find it easy to depend on this person (*reverse coded*)
6. It helps to turn to this person in times of need (*reverse coded*)

*Trait anxiety*:

Study 1: *α* =.86; *M* = 33.75 (*SD* = 28.68)

Study 2: *α* =.87; *M* = 3.62 (*SD* = 1.63)

1. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me
2. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me
3. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her

*Ingroup identification*:

Study 1: *α* = .92, *M* = 73.25 (*SD* = 23.43)

Study 2: *α* = .85, *M* = 5.13 (*SD* = 1.16)

1. I see myself as [citizen of country]
2. I am pleased to be [citizen of country]
3. I feel strong ties with fellow [countrymen]
4. I identify with other [countrymen]

*Political orientation*

Participant’s *political orientation* was assessed by asking “What is your political identity” (Study 1: *M* = 50.13, *SD* = 24.32; Study 2: *M* = 2.94, *SD* = 1.47; with lower versus higher scores representing a strongly liberal versus conservative orientation).

 *Mood*

Study 1: *α* = .79, *M* = 54.57 (*SD* = 21.18)

Study 2: *α* =.79; *M* = 4.97 (*SD* = 0.84)

Finally, respondents had to indicate “How are you feeling at this moment in time”.

Five positive and five negative emotions were assessed:

1. Pleasant
2. Alert
3. Inspired
4. Determined
5. Active
6. Upset (*reverse coded*)
7. Hostile (*reverse coded*)
8. Ashamed (*reverse coded*)
9. Nervous (*reverse coded*)
10. Afraid (*reverse coded*)

**Intervention instructions**

**Self-Affirmation** (identical to Čehajić-Clancy, Effron, Halperin, Liberman, & Ross, 2011; Study 2).

“Think about your greatest personal strength of which you are really proud. Recall a time when you used this personal strength to achieve a personal goal. Please briefly describe what this experience was like” (p.261).

**Secure attachment** (identical to Saleem et al., 2015; Study 3; originally from Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001).

“Recall a time when someone close to you was available, supportive, and loving. This could be a family member, relationship partner, or close friend. Please briefly describe what this experience was like below” (Online Appendix, p.26).

**Reminder of ingroup potential for harm-doing** (modelled on Exline, Baumeister, Zell, Kraft, & Witvliet, 2008; Study 4;).

“Recall a time when your country unjustly harmed another nation. Please briefly describe the impact of this event on the harmed nation below” (p. 504).

**Control condition** (identical to Saleem et al., 2015; Study 3;).

“Recall an uneventful, normal day in your week. Please briefly describe what your routine activities are during such a day” (Online Appendix, p.26).

**Post-experimental measures**

*Negative emotions.*

Negative emotions towards ISIS terrorists, Muslims, and one’s own government were measured (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000).

*Negative emotions towards ISIS members*:

Study 1: *α* = .88, *M* = 68.28 (*SD* = 23.88)

Study 2: *α* = .88, *M* = 5.02 (*SD* = 1.14)

1. I feel angry at ISIS members
2. I feel furious by ISIS members
3. I feel hostile of ISIS members
4. I feel disgusted towards ISIS members
5. I feel sickened towards ISIS members
6. I feel threatened by ISIS members
7. I feel fearful towards ISIS members
8. I feel afraid towards ISIS members

*Negative emotions towards Muslims who are not ISIS*:

Study 1: *α* = .87, *M* = 16.05 (*SD* = 18.63)

Study 2: *α* = .71, *M* = 1.84, (*SD* = 0.70)

1. How angry do you feel about Muslims who do not belong to ISIS (terrorist organization)?
2. How furious do you feel about Muslims who do not belong to ISIS (terrorist organization)?
3. How disgusted do you feel about Muslims who do not belong to ISIS (terrorist organization)?
4. How sickened do you feel about Muslims who do not belong to ISIS (terrorist organization)?
5. How warm do you feel about Muslims who do not belong to ISIS (terrorist organization)?(*reverse coded*)

*Negative emotions towards one’s own government*:

Study 1: *α =* .75, *M* = *M* = 54.53 (*SD* = 24.92)

Study 2: *α =* .69, *M* = 4.18 (*SD* = 0.97)

1. When thinking of the ISIS attacks, how angry do you feel about your Government and its foreign policies?
2. When thinking of the ISIS attacks, how furious do you feel about your Government and its foreign policies?
3. When thinking of the ISIS attacks, how proud do you feel about your Government and its foreign policies?
4. When thinking of the ISIS attacks, how pleased do you feel about your Government and its foreign policies? (*reverse coded*)

*Dehumanization*:

Study 1: *α =* .83, *M* = 43.56 (*SD* = 30.50)

Study 2: *α =* .80, *M* = 4.58 (*SD* = 1.29)

Three items were administered for dehumanization of ISIS members, using the pictorial stimulus developed by Kteily, Bruneau, Waytz, and Cotterill (2015).

1. How evolved do you consider ISIS to be? (*reverse coded*)
2. How evolved do you consider ISIS to be in terms of their level of intellectual maturity (sophistication)? (*reverse coded*)
3. How evolved do you consider ISIS to be in terms of their level of moral maturity (sophistication)? (*reverse coded*)

*Competitive victimhood*:

Study 1: *α =* .73, *M* = 0.75 (*SD* = 9.35)

Study 2: *α =* .81, *M* = -0.04 (*SD* = 0.39)

A 5-item intergroup competitive victimhood scale (Shnabel, Halabi, & Noor, 2013) was measured towards the November 13 attacks in Paris, France (i.e., ingroup victimhood), and towards the November 12 attacks in Beirut, Lebanon (i.e., outgroup victimhood). Responses for each outgroup item were subtracted from responses for each ingroup item, as such yielding a relative competitive victimhood index with higher scores indicating greater beliefs that ingroup victims suffered more than outgroup victims

1. To what extent do you believe the victims have suffered from the casualties?
2. To what extent do you believe the victims have suffered from the physical damage?
3. To what extent do you believe the victims have suffered from the psychological trauma?
4. To what extent do you believe the victims have suffered from the emotional pain?
5. To what extent do you believe the victims have suffered from morally indefensible atrocities?

*Check question.*

At this point in the survey, respondents were asked to move the slider all the way to the right. Participants who failed to do so correctly, or did not complete this item, were omitted from the analyses (Study 1: *N* = 8 U.S., 30 U.K., 3 French, and 3 Belgian respondents, Study 2: *N* = 0 respondents).

*Perceived responsibility.*

We tapped into perceptions of both ingroup (i.e., one’s own government) and outgroup (i.e., Muslims) responsibility (see also Čehajić-Clancy et al., 2011).

*Own government’s responsibility*:

Study 1: *r =* .72, *M* = 48.44 (*SD* = 27.64)

Study 2: *r =* .61, *M* = 3.64 (*SD* = 1.23)

1. My Government cannot deny a degree of responsibility for the ISIS terror attacks
2. My Government's foreign policies have directly contributed to the ISIS terror attacks

*Perceived outgroup responsibility*:

Study 1: *r =* .63, *M* = 26.33 (*SD* = 27.64)

Study 2: *r =* .56, *M* = 2.49 (*SD* = 1.32)

1. Muslims in the world cannot deny a degree of responsibility for the ISIS terror attacks
2. Islam has directly contributed to the ISIS terror attacks

*Reconciliation*:

Study 1: *r =* .53, *M* = 79.41 (*SD* = 30.23)

Study 2: *r =* .35, *M* = 5.87 (*SD* = 0.98)

1. Despite the terrorist attacks, I will continue to respect Muslims
2. We must work together with other decent Muslims to defeat the extremists of any religious background

*Future forgiveness*:

Study 1: *r =* .73, *M* = 22.54 (*SD* = 27.30)

Study 2: *r =* .56, *M* = 2.89 (*SD* = 1.35)

1. It may take me a long time, but at some point in the future I will be able to let go of my resentment towards ISIS members
2. It may take me a long time but at some point in the future I will be able to forgive the harm done by ISIS members

*Punitiveness*:

Study 1: *α =* .68, *M* = 30.67 (*SD* = 25.81)

Study 2: *α =* .60, *M* = 2.57 (*SD* = 1.01)

Finally, three items tapped into torture justification or punitiveness (Kteily et al., 2015).

1. To put an end to terrorist acts by ISIS, I think it is OK to use torture
2. To put an end to terrorist acts by ISIS, I think it is OK to bomb an entire country if it is known to harbor ISIS terrorists
3. We should spend more time on diplomatic efforts as opposed to engaging in military activity towards ISIS (*reverse coded*)

**SECTION 2: FULL DETAILS OF ANALYSES**

**Table A.**

*F-values of ANOVA analyses testing the effects of the manipulation, country, and manipulation\*country effect on each outcome in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable | Manipulation | Country | Manipulation\*Country |
| Negative emotions towards terrorists | 0.33 | 3.71\* | 0.45 |
| Negative emotions towards Muslims | 0.20 | 15.51\*\*\* | 0.59 |
| Negative emotions towards own government | 0.45 | 113.62\*\*\* | 0.51 |
| Dehumanization of terrorists | 1.76 | 77.87\*\*\* | 0.88 |
| Competitive victimhood | 1.90 | 4.69\*\* | 1.06 |
| Ingroup government responsibility | 0.46 | 2.36 | 1.05 |
| Outgroup (non-ISIS Muslim) responsibility | 0.62 | 18.50\*\*\* | 1.07 |
| Reconciliation towards non-ISIS Muslims | 0.94 | 32.22\*\*\* | 0.83 |
| Future forgiveness of ISIS | 0.38 | 1.52 | 0.38 |
| Punitiveness (torture justification) | 0.05 | 46.10\*\*\* | 0.95 |

*Note: \*: p <.05; \*\*: p <.01; \*\*\*: p <.001*

**Table B.**

*Descriptive statistics of each outcome in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Self-Affirmation | SecureAttachment | Reminder of Ingroup Potential to Harm | ControlCondition |
| Country | UK | FR | BE | US | UK | FR | BE | US | UK | FR | BE | US | UK | FR | BE | US |
| *N* | 160 | 93 | 39 | 107 | 176 | 97 | 48 | 114 | 154 | 77 | 34 | 97 | 194 | 114 | 48 | 120 |
| Negative emotions towards terrorists | 74.08 | 64.97 | 70.53 | 67.49 | 70.13 | 65.69 | 73.17 | 64.78 | 68.00 | 64.29 | 74.27 | 64.80 | 70.34 | 66.04 | 68.67 | 64.95 |
| Negative emotions towards Muslims | 12.14 | 17.23 | 15.85 | 21.75 | 11.26 | 15.51 | 17..27 | 22.70 | 11.32 | 19.57 | 16.68 | 19.71 | 11.59 | 17.96 | 19.67 | 21.23 |
| Negative emotions towards government | 61.19 | 59.67 | 63.06 | 32.92 | 63.61 | 63.96 | 60.09 | 35.72 | 60.45 | 62.58 | 63.85 | 32.92 | 61.72 | 63.01 | 65.57 | 32.56 |
| Dehumanization of terrorists | 30.39 | 44.48 | 40.83 | 63.36 | 30.64 | 45.54 | 38.06 | 58.68 | 32.80 | 43.47 | 47.06 | 55.18 | 34.46 | 44.69 | 47.98 | 64.09 |
| Competitive victimhood | 0.91 | 0.67 | 0.25 | 2.67 | -0.25 | 0.31 | -2.40 | 1.01 | -0.03 | 3.38 | -1.91 | 1.25 | 0.43 | 1.83 | 1.12 | 1.08 |
| Ingroup government responsibility | 44.91 | 53.91 | 59.66 | 39.29 | 48.45 | 56.43 | 54.00 | 47.87 | 44.61 | 52.01 | 54.97 | 48.95 | 45.95 | 54.55 | 50.78 | 44.53 |
| Outgroup responsibility | 23.47 | 18.08 | 19.46 | 36.18 | 21.11 | 21.00 | 24.55 | 36.87 | 24.26 | 28.03 | 14.55 | 35.29 | 25.78 | 21.07 | 22.84 | 37.74 |
| Reconciliationtowards Muslims | 81.84 | 84.38 | 86.59 | 65.73 | 82.01 | 84.07 | 85.69 | 69.27 | 85.90 | 80.99 | 86.19 | 72.52 | 81.86 | 84.3 | 79.12 | 69.01 |
| Future forgiveness of ISIS | 21.65 | 19.66 | 16.46 | 20.80 | 25.37 | 21.75 | 15.74 | 26.00 | 24.15 | 20.77 | 15.87 | 22.46 | 27.20 | 20.52 | 15.95 | 22.40 |
| Punitiveness (torture justification) | 24.84 | 33.91 | 22.64 | 42.98 | 22.43 | 29.69 | 25.35 | 44.62 | 24.93 | 34.65 | 25.03 | 39.31 | 24.61 | 29.59 | 29.25 | 42.11 |

*Note: UK = United Kingdom; FR = France; BE = Belgium; US= United States*

**Table C.**

*Correlations between study variables in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1. Negative emotions towards terrorists
 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Negative emotions towards Muslims
 | .08\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Negative emotions towards government
 | .11\*\*\* | -.02 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Dehumanization of terrorists
 | .17\*\*\* | .08\*\* | -.08\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Competitive victimhood
 | .01 | .12\*\*\* | -.04 | .01 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ingroup government responsibility
 | -.12\*\*\* | -.02 | .32\*\*\* | .04 | -.07\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 1. Outgroup responsibility
 | .09\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | -.09\*\*\* | .08\*\* | .12\*\*\* | -.01 | - |  |  |
| 1. Reconciliation towards Muslims
 | -.01 | -.56\*\*\* | .08\*\*\* | -.12\*\*\* | -.10\*\*\* | .09\*\*\* | -.54\*\*\* | - |  |
| 1. Future forgiveness of ISIS
 | -.32\*\*\* | -.08\*\* | .03 | -.12\*\*\* | -.07\*\* | .14\*\*\* | -.06\* | .10\*\*\* | - |
| 1. Punitiveness
 | .22\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | -.15\*\*\* | .05\* | .12\*\*\* | -.20\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | -.39\*\*\* | -.30\*\*\* |

*Note: \*: p <.05; \*\*: p <.01; \*\*\*: p <.001*

**Table D.**

*F-values of ANOVA analyses testing the effects of the manipulation on each outcome in Study 2.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable | Manipulation |
| Negative emotions towards terrorists | 0.48 |
| Negative emotions towards Muslims | 1.19 |
| Negative emotions towards own government | 0.28 |
| Dehumanization of terrorists | 1.65 |
| Competitive victimhood | 0.92 |
| Ingroup government responsibility | 0.13 |
| Outgroup (non-ISIS Muslim) responsibility | 0.83 |
| Reconciliation towards non-ISIS Muslims | 2.58a |
| Future forgiveness of ISIS | 0.09 |
| Punitiveness (torture justification) | 3.46\* |

*Note: a: p <.10; \*: p <.05*

**Table E.**

*Descriptive statistics of each outcome in Study 2.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable | Self-Affirmation | Secure Attachment | Reminder of Ingroup Potential to Harm | Control Condition |
| Negative emotions towards terrorists | 5.02 | 4.98 | 5.10 | 4.99 |
| Negative emotions towards Muslims | 1.81 | 1.96 | 1.79 | 1.79 |
| Negative emotions towards government | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| Dehumanization of terrorists | 4.57 | 4.87 | 4.31 | 4.55 |
| Competitive victimhood | 0.01 | -0.08 | -0.06 | 0.00 |
| Ingroup government responsibility | 3.56 | 3.76 | 3.64 | 3.61 |
| Outgroup responsibility | 2.46 | 2.74 | 2.33 | 2.41 |
| Reconciliation towards Muslims | 5.86 | 6.09 | 5.88 | 5.67 |
| Future forgiveness of ISIS | 2.83 | 2.86 | 2.92 | 2.90 |
| Punitiveness (torture justification) | 2.59 | 2.32 | 2.67 | 2.74 |

**Table F.**

*Correlations between study variables in Study 2.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1. Negative emotions towards terrorists
 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Negative emotions towards Muslims
 | .07 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Negative emotions towards government
 | .13\* | .10a | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Dehumanization of terrorists
 | .33\*\*\* | .05 | .07 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Competitive victimhood
 | .03 | .06 | -.02 | .07 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ingroup government responsibility
 | -.01 | .08 | .36\*\*\* | .08 | .09 | - |  |  |  |
| 1. Outgroup responsibility
 | .00 | .47\*\*\* | .07 | .13\* | .12a | .27\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 1. Reconciliation towards Muslims
 | -.01 | -.53\*\*\* | -.08 | -.04 | -.13\* | -.08 | -.39\*\*\* | - |  |
| 1. Future forgiveness of ISIS
 | -.37\*\*\* | -.11a | .04 | -.21\*\*\* | -.09 | .06 | -.09 | .09\*\*\* | - |
| 1. Punitiveness
 | .10a | .29\*\*\* | .05 | .14\* | .10a | -.02 | .30\*\*\* | -.26\*\*\* | -.12\* |

*Note: a: p <.10; \*: p <.05; \*\*: p <.01; \*\*\*: p <.001*

**Study 1: Results of the second measured factor (country)**

Our second factor (i.e., country) did yield main effects on negative emotions towards ISIS (*F* = 3.71, *p* = .01; *η* = .007), Muslims (*F* = 15.51, *p* < .001; *η* = .028), and one’s own government (*F* = 133.66, *p* < .001; *η* = .177), on dehumanization (*F* = 77.87, *p* < .001; *η* = .128), competitive victimhood (*F* = 4.69, *p* = .003; *η* = .009), outgroup responsibility (*F* = 18.50, *p* < .001; *η* = .034), reconciliation (*F* = 32.22, *p* < .001; *η* = .057), and torture justification (*F* = 46.10, *p* < .001; *η* = .081; see Table A). Specifically, respondents in the U.S. and UK tended to be more biased than those in France and Belgium, regardless of the intervention strategy they were assigned to (see Table B).

In particular, respondents in the UK were higher in negative emotions towards ISIS compared to those in France (ΔUK-France = 7.52, *p* = .009). Moreover, respondents in the U.S. were higher in negative emotions towards Muslims and lower in negative emotions towards their own government compared to those in the UK (ΔU.S.-UK = 6.47, *p* < .001; and ΔU.S.-UK = -25.94, *p* < .001, respectively), France (ΔU.S.-France = 11.28, *p* < .001; and ΔU.S.-France = -25.96, *p* < .001, respectively), and Belgium (ΔU.S.-Belgium = 9.21, *p* < .001; and ΔU.S.- Belgium = -25.13, *p* < .001, respectively).

American respondents also scored lower in reconciliation and higher in outgroup responsibility and outgroup harm compared to UK (ΔU.S.-UK = -11.75, *p* < .001; ΔU.S.-UK = 5.30, *p* = .018; and ΔU.S.-UK = 14.46, *p* < .001, respectively), French (ΔU.S.-France = -21.72, *p* < .001; ΔU.S.-France = 21.16, *p* < .001; and ΔU.S.-France = 25.27, *p* < .001, respectively), and Belgian respondents (ΔU.S.-Belgium = -20.59, *p* < .001; ΔU.S.- Belgium = 18.09, *p* < .001; and ΔU.S.- Belgium = 30.15, *p* < .001, respectively). Moreover, on these three outcomes, UK scores significantly differed from French (ΔUK-France = -9.97, *p* < .001; ΔUK-France = 15.87, *p* < .001; and ΔUK-France = 11.11, *p* < .001, respectively), and Belgian scores (ΔUK-Belgium = -8.84, *p* = .01; ΔUK- Belgium = 12.79, *p* < .001, and ΔUK- Belgium = 15.68, *p* < .001, respectively).

Furthermore, UK and U.S. respondents scored lower on dehumanization than French respondents (ΔUK-France = -23.41, *p* < .001; ΔU.S.-France = -22.73, *p* < .001, respectively), and UK respondents were also lower than Belgians (ΔUK-Belgium = -28.24, *p* < .001). Finally, Belgians were lower in competitive victimhood than UK (ΔBelgium-UK = -3.80, *p* = .005) and U.S. respondents (ΔBelgium-US = -4.45, *p* = .001).
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