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**Appendix 1 Full Models and Predicted Probabilities**

**Table A1.1: Aggregate Distribution Moral Foundations Violated in the Vignettes in % (Pre-test)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QCAREV3.1** | **QFAIRV2.1** | **QLOYALV2.1** | **QAUTHV4.1** | **QSANCV5.1** |
| Care | 77.3 | 2.4 | 38.6 | 6.1 | 24.0 |
| Fairness | 4.4 | 84.5 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 13.8 |
| Loyalty | 0.8 | 3.6 | 42.5 | 37.8 | 34.3 |
| Authority | 7.2 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 45.4 | 1.2 |
| Sanctity | 10.0 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 24.4 |
| Not Wrong | 0.4 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 2.4 |
| N | 263 | 265 | 267 | 261 | 262 |

*Note: Question asked: Why is the behavior morally wrong? Please choose the ONE response that BEST describes why you think this behavior is morally wrong. (1) It violates norms of harm or care (e.g., unkindness, causing pain to another), (2) It violates norms of fairness or justice (e.g., cheating or reducing equality), (3) It violates norms of loyalty (e.g., betrayal of a group), (4) It violates norms of respecting authority (e.g., subversion, lack of respect for tradition), (5) It violates norms of purity (e.g., degrading or disgusting acts),(6)It is not morally wrong and does not apply to any of the provided choices. Data collected with MTurk where 648 respondents each rated a random subset of ten vignettes.*

**Table A1.2: Voters’ Moral Judgment of Moral Violations in %**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Label** | **Statement** | **Not at all wrong** | **Not too wrong** | **Some-what wrong** | **Very wrong** | **Ext Wrong** | **Mean** | **N** |
| Care | You see a politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate. | 3.40 | 5.76 | 18.85 | 31.41 | 40.85 | 4.00 | 382 |
| Fairness | You see a politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs. | 5.77 | 9.19 | 29.66 | 30.45 | 24.93 | 3.59 | 381 |
| Loyalty | You see a politician joke about the stupidity of Americans. | 5.57 | 10.90 | 35.84 | 26.39 | 21.31 | 3.47 | 413 |
| Authority | You see a politician turn his back and ignore his party leader. | 18.56 | 20.66 | 27.54 | 22.46 | 10.78 | 2.86 | 334 |
| Sanctity | You see a married politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships. | 4.90 | 5.88 | 24.51 | 28.92 | 35.78 | 3.85 | 408 |

**Table A1.3: Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Exposure to the Meaning Components in the Vignettes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anger** | **Disgust** | **Contempt** | **Shame** | **Pride** | **Elevation** | **Sympathy** |
| Care Component | .846\*\*(.032) | .907\*\*(.034) | .493\*\*(.030) | .694\*\*(.032) | -.292\*\*(.037) | -.507\*\*(.034) | -.108\*\* (.031) |
| Fairness Component | .701\*\*(.032) | .748\*\*(.032) | .439\*\*(.030) | .541\*\*(.311) | -.227\*\*(.035) | -.389\*\*(.032) | -.319\*\* (.033) |
| Loyalty Component | .778\*\*(.051) | .830\*\*(.052) | .432\*\*(.048) | .611\*\*(.050) | -.294\*\*(.060) | -.607\*\*(.057) | -.646\*\* (.055) |
| Authority Component | .560\*\*(.062)\_ | .615\*\*(.063) | .371\*\*(.062) | .527\*\*(.063) | -.231\*\*(.074) | -.355\*\*(.069) | -.048 (.069) |
| Sanctity Component | -.242\*\*(.088) | -.020(.090) | -.131(.088) | -.117(.089) | -.601\*\*(.123) | -.423\*\*(.109) | .080 (.103) |
| Foundation Care | -.137\*\*(.045) | -.053(.045) | .007(045) | -.078(.045) | .042(.056) | .102\*(.050) | .117\*\*(.049) |
| Foundation Fairness | .107\*(.049) | -.001(.049) | -.008(.048) | .069(.049) | -.060(.060) | -.045(.054) | -.005 (.052) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .110\*\*(.044) | .030(.045) | .115\*\*(.043) | .048(.044) | .292\*\*(.055) | .282\*\*(.049) | .185\*\* (.047) |
| Foundation Authority | -.029(.050) | -.039(.051) | -.034(.049) | .019(.050) | -.069(.062) | -.112\*(.055) | -.041 (.053) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .111\*\*(.035) | .135\*\*(.036) | .050(.035) | .096\*\*(.035) | .151\*\*(.044) | .197\*\*(.039) | .060(.038) |
| Republican | .052(.078) | .051(.078) | .091(.077) | .144(.078) | .096(.095) | .135(.086)\_ | .202\*\*(.085) |
| Democrat | .170\*(.072) | .066(.073) | .181\*\*(.072) | .208\*\*(.073) | .069(.089) | .128(.080) | .223\*\*(.079) |
| Gender | -.047(.053) | -.050(.054) | -.203\*\*(.053) | -.130\*\*(.053) | -.410\*\*(.065) | -.404\*\*(.059) | -.223\*\* (.057) |
| Age | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.001(.002) | -.002(.002) | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.018\*\*(.002) | -.016\*\* (.002) | -.012\*\* (.002) |
| White | .054(.094)\_ | .074(.095)\_ | .075(.092) | -.012(.094) | .038(.108) | .137(.101) | .226\* (.099) |
| Hispanic | -.000(.117) | .179(.117) | -.057(.115) | .074(.117) | .013(.013) | .004(.125) | .022(.125) |
| African | -.266\*(.124) | -.121(.124) | -.018(.122) | -.072(.124) | .284(.140) | .361\*\*(.130) | .537\*\* (.129) |
| Bachelor degree | .088(.060) | .072(.060) | .254\*\*(.059) | -.050(.060) | .005(.073) | -.005 (.066) | .068 (.064) |
| Postgraduate degree | .127(.073) | .087(.074) | .243\*\*.(073) | -.004(.074) | .163(.089) | .083( .081) | .154(.078) |
| Adjusted RSquare | .151 | .167 | .069 | .109 | .105 | .101 | .070 |

*Note: N=1918 Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors between parentheses \*\*Significant at 0.01 \* Significant at 0.05*

**Table A1.4: Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Anger** | **Model 2****Anger** | **Model 3****Anger** | **Model 4****Anger** | **Model 5****Anger** |
| Vignette Care | -.393(.345) | .741\*\*(.077) | .740\*\*(.077) | .740\*\*(.077) | .894\*\*(.082)` |
| Vignette Fairness | .245\*\*(.076) | .466(.400) | .245\*\*(.076) | .247\*\*(.076) | .393\*\*(.081) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .401\*\*(.075) | .405\*\*(.075) | -.029(.286) | .403\*\*(.075) | .550\*\*(.079) |
| Vignette Authority | -.146(.080) | -.144(.080) | -.146(.080) | -.532(.348) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.087\*\*(.231) |
| Foundation Care | -.108\*(.046) | -.058(.044) | -.058(.043) | -.061(.044) | -.054(.043) |
| Foundation Fairness | .146\*(.047) | .045\*\*(.048) | .149\*\*(.048) | .148\*(.048) | .161\*\*(.048) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .080(.043) | .164(.034) | .051(.045) | .072(.042) | .073(.042) |
| Foundation Authority | .039(.049) | .045(.048) | .045(.048) | .030(.050) | .043(.049) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .167\*\*(.034) | .164(.034) | .164\*\*(.034) | .165\*\*(.034) | .096\*\*(.037) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | .247\*\*(.073) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | -.048(.086) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | .107(.068) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | .090(.079) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | .253\*\*(.054) |
| Republican | -.039(.075) | -.047(.075) | -.048(.075) | -.048(.075) | -.058(.075) |
| Democrat | .162\*(.070) | .157\*(.070) | .155\*(.070) | .156\*(.070) | .149\*(.070) |
| Age | -.004\*(.002) | -.004\*(.002) | -.004\*(.002) | -.004(.002) | -.004\*(.002) |
| Gender | .076(.052) | .069(.051) | .066\*(.052) | .070(.052) | .065(.051) |
| White  | .201\*(.091) | .202\*(.091) | .203\*(.091) | .199\*(.091) | .206\*(.091) |
| Hispanic | .097(.114) | .100(.114) | .099(.114) | .095(.114) | .083(.114) |
| African | -.153\*\*(.121) | -.158(.121) | -.155(.121) | -.168(.121) | -.160(.121) |
| Bachelor degree | .042\*\*(.058) | .041(.058) | .044(.058) | .039(.058) | .041(.058) |
| Postgraduate degree | .042(.071) | .043(.071) | .043(.071) | .040(.071) | .038(.071) |
| Adjusted R square | .049 | .047 | .048 | .048 | .051 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Disgust** | **Model 2****Disgust** | **Model 3****Disgust** | **Model 4****Disgust** | **Model 5****Disgust** |
| Vignette Care | -.472 (.350) | .670\*\*(.078) | .668\*\*(.078) | .668\*\*(.078) | 1.003\*\*(.083) |
| Vignette Fairness | .119 (.077) | .706(.399) | .120(.077) | .120(.077) | .442\*\*(.081) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .280\*\* (.075) | .286\*\*(.075) | .168(.286) | .283\*\*(.075) | .604\*\*(.080) |
| Vignette Authority | -.319\*\* (.081) | -.317\*\*(.081) | -.318\*\*(.081) | -.803\*(.347) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -1.205\*\*(.233) |
| Foundation Care | -.037 (.046) | .011(.044) | .011(.044) | .007(.044) | .020(.044) |
| Foundation Fairness | .060 (.048) | .083(.050) | .062(.048) | .062(.048) | .077(.048) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .020 (.043) | .017(.043) | .009(.045) | .013(.043) | .017(.043) |
| Foundation Authority | .035 (.049) | .041(.049) | .042(.049) | .022(.051) | .041(.049) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .185\*\* (.035) | .182\*\*(.034) | .182\*\*(.034) | .184\*\*(.034) | .079\*(.038) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | .250\*\* (.075) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | -.128(.086) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | .029(.068) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | .113(.079) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | .384\*\*(.055) |
| Republican | -.043 (.076) | -.052(.076) | -.052(.076) | -.053(.076) | -.069(.076) |
| Democrat | .077 (.071) | .074(.070) | .072(.070) | .072(.070) | .061(.071) |
| Age | -.001 (.001) | -.001(.002) | -.001(.002) | -.001(.002) | -.001(.002) |
| Gender | .085 (.052) | .079(.052) | .078(.052) | .080(.052) | .072(.052) |
| White  | .234\*\* (.091) | .236\*\*(.091) | .235\*(.091) | .231\*(.091) | .242\*\*(.091) |
| Hispanic | .248\* (.114) | .253\*(.114) | .249\*(.114) | .245\*(.114) | .237\*(.114) |
| African | -.006 (.121) | -.005(.121) | -.010(.121) | -.022(.121) | -.007(.121) |
| Bachelor degree | .019(.059) | .018(.059) | .019(.059) | .015(.059) | .017(.059) |
| Postgraduate degree | .004 (.072) | .006(.072) | .004(.072) | -.001(.072) | -.005(.072) |
| Adjusted R square | .047 | .045 | .045 | .045 | .052 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Contempt** | **Model 2****Contempt** | **Model 3****Contempt** | **Model 4****Contempt** | **Model 5****Contempt** |
| Vignette Care | -.075 (.343) | .528\*\*(.077) | .527\*\*(.077) | .526\*\*(.077) | .607\*\*(.082) |
| Vignette Fairness | .278\*\* (.078) | .680(.400) | .278\*\*(.076) | .278\*\*(.078) | .354\*\*(.082) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .246\*\* (.076) | .249(.076) | .125(.287) | .246\*\*(.076) | .323\*\*(.080) |
| Vignette Authority | -.076 (.082) | -.075(.082) | -.075(.082) | -.700\*(.355) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.622\*\*(.231) |
| Foundation Care | .015 (.047) | .042(.044) | .042(.044) | .037(.044) | .046(.044) |
| Foundation Fairness | .032(.048) | .047(.050) | .032(.048) | .032(.048) | .040(.048) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .097\* (.043) | .096\*(.043) | .088\*(.045) | .092\*(.043) | .095\*(.043) |
| Foundation Authority | .008(.049) | .011(.049) | .011(.049) | -.012(.051) | .010(.049) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .093\* (.034) | .092\*\*(.034) | .092\*\*(.034) | .094\*\*(.034) | .044(.037) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | .131 (.073) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | -.088(.086) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | .030(.068) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | -.700(.355) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | .174\*\*(.054) |
| Republican | .033 (.076) | .028(.076) | .028(.076) | .028(.076) | .020(.076) |
| Democrat | .179\* (.071) | .177\*(.071) | .176\*(.071) | .177\*\*(.071) | .172\*(.071) |
| Age | -.002 (.002) | -.001(.002) | -.001 (.002) | -.001(.002) | -.001(.002) |
| Gender | -.112\*.052 | -.116\*(.052) | -.117\* (.052) | -.115\*(.052) | -.120\*(.052) |
| White  | .162 (.091) | .163(.091) | .163 (.091) | .158(.091) | .165(.091) |
| Hispanic | .005 (.114) | .008(.114) | .006(.114) | .003(.114) | -.001(.114) |
| African | .025 (.121) | .025(.121) | .023(.121) | .008(.121) | .023(.121) |
| Bachelor degree | .216\*\* (.058) | .216\*\*(.058) | .216\*\* (.058) | .212\*\*(.058) | .215\*\*(.058) |
| Postgraduate degree | .186\*\* (.072) | .187\*\*(.072) | .186\*\* (.072) | .180\*(.072) | .182(.072) |
| Adjusted R square | .029 | .029 | .029 | .029 | .031 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Shame** | **Model 2****Shame** | **Model 3****Shame** | **Model 4****Shame** | **Model 5****Shame** |
| Vignette Care | -.496(.349) | .655\*\*(.078) | .654\*\*(.078) | .653\*\*(.078) | .786\*8(.083) |
| Vignette Fairness | .106(.078) | .459(.401) | .108(.078) | .107(.078) | .234\*\*(.082) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .317\*\*(.076) | .322\*\*(.076) | .373(.287) | .319\*\*(.076) | .446\*\*(.081) |
| Vignette Authority | -.129(.082) | -.126(.082) | -.126(.082) | -.838\*(.359) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.610\*\*(.236) |
| Foundation Care | -.072(.047) | -.021(.044) | -.021(.044) | -.027(.044) | -.017(.044) |
| Foundation Fairness | .111\*(.048) | .124\*(.050) | .111\*(.048) | .112\*\*(.048) | .120\*\*(.048) |
| Foundation Loyalty | 033(.043) | .029(.043) | .031(.045) | .026(.043) | .029(.043) |
| Foundation Authority | .075(.049) | .080(.049) | .081(.049) | .054(.051) | .080(.049) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .143\*\*(.035) | .140\*\*(.035) | .140\*\*(.035) | .142\*\*(.035) | .091\*(.038) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | .251\*\*(.074) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | -.077(.086) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | -.013(.068) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | .165\*(.081) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | .183\*\*(.055) |
| Republican | .057(.076) | .049(.076) | .049(.076) | .048(.076) | .042(.076) |
| Democrat | .207\*\*(.071) | .201\*\*(.071) | .201\*\*(.701) | .201\*\*(.071) | .197\*\*(.071) |
| Age | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.005\*\*(.002) | -.005\*\*(.002) |
| Gender | -.015(.052) | -.021(.052) | -.021(.052) | 0-.020(.052) | -.026(.052) |
| White  | .123(.092) | .124(.092) | .123(.092) | .118(.092) | .124(.092) |
| Hispanic | .149(.115) | .152(.115) | .149(.115) | .146(.115) | .140(.115) |
| African | -.003(.122) | -.005(.122) | -.009(.122) | -.023(.122) | -.007(.122) |
| Bachelor degree | -.071(.059) | -.071(.059) | -.071(.059) | -.075(.059) | -.072(.059) |
| Postgraduate degree | -.058(.073) | -.057(.073) | -.058(.073) | -.065(.073) | -.064(.073) |
| Adjusted R square | .040 | .038 | .038 | .039 | .040 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Pride** | **Model 2****Pride** | **Model 3****Pride** | **Model 4****Pride** | **Model 5****Pride** |
| Vignette Care | .686(.421) | .137(.102) | .138(.102) | .138(.102) | -.442\*\*(.098) |
| Vignette Fairness | .500\*\*(.097) | .352(.457) | .499\*\*(.097) | .499\*\*(.100) | -.079(.092) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .275\*\*(.097) | .272\*\*(.098) | .376(.367) | .273\*\*(.097) | -.304\*\*(.094) |
| Vignette Authority | .578\*\*(.099) | .576\*\*(.099) | .577\*\*(.099) | .627(.395) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.249(.302) |
| Foundation Care | .042(.057) | .020(.055) | .020(.055) | .020(.055) | .017(.055) |
| Foundation Fairness | -.072(.059) | -.080(.062) | -.074(.059) | .074(.059) | -.076(.059) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .269\*\*(.054) | .272\*\*(.054) | .277\*\*(.056) | .273\*(.054) | .273\*\*(.054) |
| Foundation Authority | -.094(.061) | -.098(.061) | -.098(.061) | .095(.064) | -.097(.061) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .106\*(.043) | .107\*(.043) | .107\*(.043) | .107\*(.043) | .126\*\*(.046) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | -.120(.090) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | .032(.097) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | -.025(.086) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | .012(.089) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.081(.071) |
| Republican | .118(.094) | .119(.094) | .120(.094) | .119(.094) | .120(.094) |
| Democrat | .047(.087) | .048(.087) | .048(.087) | .048(.087) | .048(.087) |
| Age | -.017(.002) | -.017\*\*(.002) | -.017\*\*(.002) | .017\*\*(.002) | -.017\*\*(.002) |
| Gender | -.451\*\*(.064) | -.448\*\*(.064) | -.447\*\*(.064) | -\*.448\*\*(.064) | -.447\*\*(.064) |
| White  | -.034(107) | -.035(.107) | -.035(.107) | .034(.107) | -.035(.107) |
| Hispanic | -.030(.133) | -.033(.133) | -.033(.133) | .032(.133) | -.030(.133) |
| African | .236(.139) | .235(.139) | .235(.139) | .237(.139) | .234(.139) |
| Bachelor degree | .024(.072) | .027(.072) | .026(.072) | .027(.072) | .025(.072) |
| Postgraduate degree | .194\*(.087) | .194\*(.087) | .194\*(.087) | .195\*(.088) | .194(.087) |
| Adjusted R square | .074 | .073 | .073 | .073 | .073 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1****Elevation** | **Model 2****Elevation** | **Model 3****Elevation** | **Model 4****Elevation** | **Model 5****Elevation** |
| Vignette Care | .571(.387) | -.023(.089) | -.022(.089) | -.022(.089) | -.596\*\*(.089) |
| Vignette Fairness | .496\*\*(.085) | .081(.421) | .494\*\*(.085) | .494\*\*(.085) | -.078(.084) |
| Vignette Loyalty | .054(.086) | .049(.086) | -.047(.334) | .052(.086) | -.521\*\*(.086) |
| Vignette Authority | .573\*\*(.087) | .571\*\*(.087) | .571\*\*(.087) | 1.029\*\*(.359) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.314(.262) |
| Foundation Care | .075(.051) | .052(.049) | .051(.049) | .054(.049) | .050(.049) |
| Foundation Fairness | -.060\*\*(.053) | -.078(.055) | -.062(.053) | -.065(.053) | -.065(.053) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .238\*\*(.047) | .240\*\*(.047) | .237\*\*(.049) | .243\*\*(.047) | .242\*\*(.047) |
| Foundation Authority | -.141\*\*(.054) | -.145\*\*(.054) | -.145\*\*(.054) | -.123\*\*(.056) | -.145\*\*(.054) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .123\*\*(.038) | .125\*\*(.038) | .125\*\*(.038) | .124\*\*(.038) | .141\*\*(.041) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | -.129(.082) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | .090(.090) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | .024(.078) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | -.107(.081) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.064(.062) |
| Republican | .164\*(.084) | .166\*(.084) | .166\*(.084) | .166\*(.084) | .168\*(.084) |
| Democrat | .085(.078) | .084(.078) | .085(.078) | .086(.078) | .087(.078) |
| Age | -.014\*\*(.002) | -.014\*\*(.002) | -.014\*\*(.002) | -.014\*\*(.002) | -.014\*\*(.002) |
| Gender | -.458\*\*(.058) | -.454\*\*(.057) | -.455\*\*(.057) | -.455\*\*(.057) | -.452\*\*(.057) |
| White  | .012(.098) | .010(.098) | .011(.098) | .012(.098) | .009(.098) |
| Hispanic | -.058(.123) | -.062(.123) | -.058(.123) | -.057(.123) | -.057(.123) |
| African | .258\*(.128) | .255\*(.128) | .261\*(.128) | .267\*(.128) | .258\*(.128) |
| Bachelor degree | .034(.065) | .037(.065) | .037(.065) | .039(.065) | .036(.065) |
| Postgraduate degree | .123(.080) | .124(.080) | .125(.080) | .130(.080) | .126(.080) |
| Adjusted R square | .048 | .049 | .049 | .049 | .049 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.4: (Continued) Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions for Different Moral Foundations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1Sympathy | Model 2Sympathy | Model 3Sympathy | Model 4Sympathy | Model 5Sympathy |
| Vignette Care | .503(.360) | .560\*\*(.082) | .561\*\*(.082) | .560\*\*(.082) | .349\*\*(.085) |
| Vignette Fairness | -.020(.085) | -.087(.443) | -.019(.085) | -.020(.085) | -.230\*\*(.088) |
| Vignette Loyalty | -.142(.084) | -.141(.084) | -.304(.329) | -.141(.084) | -.349\*\*(.088)\*\* |
| Vignette Authority | .205\*(.086) | .205\*(.086) | .204\*(.086) | .227(.365) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity |  |  |  |  | .768\*\*(.244) |
| Foundation Care | .095(.051) | .098\*(.048) | .098\*(.048) | .098\*(.048) | .093\*(.048) |
| Foundation Fairness | -.019(.051) | -.021(.054) | -.018(.052) | -.018(.052) | -.033(.052) |
| Foundation Loyalty | .165\*\*(.047) | .164\*\*(.047) | .157\*\*(.049) | .165\*\*(.047) | .164\*\*(.047) |
| Foundation Authority | -.064(.052) | -.064(.052) | -.064(.052) | -.063(.055) | -.060(.053) |
| Foundation Sanctity | .028(.037) | .028(.037) | .028(.037) | .028(.037) | .098\*(.041) |
| Vignette Care x Foundation Care | .012(.076) |  |  |  |  |
| Vignette Fairness x Foundation Fairness |  | .015(.095) |  |  |  |
| Vignette Loyalty x Foundation Loyalty |  |  | .040(.078) |  |  |
| Vignette Authority x Foundation Authority |  |  |  | -.005(.083) |  |
| Vignette Sanctity x Foundation Sanctity |  |  |  |  | -.247\*\*(.058) |
| Republican | .207\*(.083) | .207\*(.083) | .206\*(.083) | .207\*(.083) | .213\*(.083) |
| Democrat | .196\*(.078) | .196\*(.078) | .195\*(.078) | .196\*(.078) | .199\*(.078) |
| Age | -.011\*\*(.002) | -.011\*\*(.002) | -.011\*\*(.002) | -.011\*\*(.002) | -.011\*\*(.002) |
| Gender | -.264\*\*(.056) | -.264\*\*(.056) | -.266\*\*(.056) | -.265\*\*(.056) | -.263\*\*(.056) |
| White  | .163(.098) | .163(.098) | .164(.098) | .163(.098) | .162(.098) |
| Hispanic | -.017(.124) | -.017(.124) | -.016(.124) | -.017(.124) | -.002(.124) |
| African | .479\*\*(.128) | .479\*\*(.128) | .482\*\*(.128) | .480\*(.128) | .479\*(.128) |
| Bachelor degree | .097(.063) | .097(.063) | .098(.063) | .097(.063) | .094(.063) |
| Postgraduate degree | .188\*(.077) | .188\*(.077) | .188\*(.077) | .188\*(.078) | .191\*(.078) |
| Adjusted R square | .045 | .045 | .045 | .045 | .048 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the vignette Sanctity is the baseline category with exception of model 5.*

**Table A1.5: Voters’ Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions by Shared Partisanship**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anger** | **Disgust** | **Contempt** | **Shame** | **Pride** | **Elevation** | **Sympathy** |
| Partisanship | -.274\*\*(.054) | -.265\*\*(.054) | -.216\*\*(.054) | -.199\*\*(.054) | .238\*\*(.065) | .190\*\*(.058) | .120\*\*(.058) |  |
| Vignette Republican | .090(.059) | .030(.060) | .049(.060) | .099(.060) | -.001\*\*(.073) | .099(.066) | .006(.065) |  |
| Vignette Democrat | .111(.062) | .092(.062) | .108(.063) | .214\*\*(.063) | -.060(.077) | .044(.069) | .038(.068) |  |
| Republican | .106(.072) | .095(.072) | .147\*(.073) | .181\*(.073) | .253(.090) | .253\*\*(.080) | .293\*\*(.080) |  |
| Democrat | .167\*(.068) | .080(.068) | .208\*\*(.069) | .210\*\*(.069) | .080(.085) | .108(.076) | .241\*\*(.076) |  |
| Age | .000(.002) | .003(.002) | .001(.002) | -.001(.002) | -.016\*\*(.002) | -.013(.002) | .010(.002) |  |
| Gender | .069(.050) | .095(.050) | -.096(.050) | -.007(.051) | -.448\*\*(.061) | .424(.055) | .206\*\*(.054) |  |
| White  | .203\*(.090) | .239(.090) | .170(.090) | .135(.090) | -.029(.105) | .003(.096) | .127\*\*(.097) |  |
| Hispanic | .137(.113) | .287(.113) | .032(.113) | .182(.114) | -.028(.131) | .069(.121) | .017(.122) |  |
| African | -.058(.119) | .100(.119) | .059(.119) | .068(.120) | .202(.135) | .199(.125) | .386\*\*(.125) |  |
| Bachelor degree | .000(.057) | -.012(.058) | .184\*\*(.058) | -.103(.058) | .007(.071) | .011(.064) | .084(.062) |  |
| Postgraduate degree | -.024(.071) | -.061(.071) | .125(.071) | -.123(.072) | .155(.086) | .084(.078) | .156\*(.076) |  |
| Adjusted R Square | .008 | .008 | .039 | ..023 | .128 | .025 | .056 |

*Note: N=1914 \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression To simplify the model we combined two variables into one variable called In-Party. We combined the partisanship of the politician displayed in the vignette with the partisanship of the respondent. The variable In-Party takes the value of 1 if the partisanship of the politicians displayed in the vignettes and the partisanship of the respondent are the same and In-Party takes a values of 0 if that is not the case. Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Exposure to the non-partisan vignette is the baseline category.*

**Table A1.6: Predicted Probabilities of Experiencing Specific Emotions when Exposed to In-Party and Out-Party Moral Violations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Not at all** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Extremely** |
|  | **Anger** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .221 | .173 | .203 | .196 | .207 |
| **In-party** | .305 | .190 | .197 | .166 | .142 |
|  | **Disgust** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .190 | .150 | .180 | .192 | .289 |
| **In-party** | .265 | .170 | .182 | .172 | .210 |
|  | **Contempt** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .308 | .191 | .262 | .125 | .114 |
| **In-party** | .379 | .196 | .241 | .103 | .082 |
|  | **Shame** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .294 | .168 | .174 | .172 | .191 |
| **In-party** | .353 | .173 | .167 | .154 | .152 |
|  | **Pride** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .754 | .085 | .089 | .046 | .026 |
| **In-party** | .683 | .099 | .112 | .064 | .041 |
|  | **Elevation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .633 | .184 | .106 | .056 | .021 |
| **In-party** | .556 | .203 | .130 | .077 | .034 |
|  | **Sympathy** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .585 | .166 | .136 | .066 | .045 |
| **In-party** | .544 | .173 | .149 | .077 | .057 |

*Note: N=1914. This table displays predicted probabilities of experiencing various levels of specific emotions when exposed to in-party or out-party moral violations while holding the other predictor variables at their means. Predicted probabilities are calculated on the basis of the ordered probit model in Table A1.5*.

**Table A1.7: Effect of Party Id and Strength Party Id on Voters’ Moral Emotional Responses to Politicians’ Moral Transgressions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anger** | **Disgust** | **Contempt** | **Shame** | **Pride** | **Elevation** | **Sympathy** |
| In-Party | -.441\*\*(.097) | -.533\*\*(.098) | -.263\*\*(.097) | -.348\*\*(.098) | .470\*\*(.112) | .479 \*\*(.103) | .280\*\*(.102) |
| Strength Party Id (Weak) | -.148\*(.075) | -.150\*(.076) | -.250\*\*(.075) | -.225\*\*(.076) | -.175(.094) | -.092(.084) | -.080(.082) |
| Strength Party Id (Leaning) | -.241\*\*(.089) | -.282\*\*(.090) | -.231\*\*(.089) | -.331\*\*(.090) | -.405\*\*(.116) | -.219\*(.101) | -.097(.097) |
| In-Party (In)\* Strength Party Id (Weak) | .161(.133) | .259\*(.133) | .089(.134) | .194(.134) | -.392\*\*(.160) | -.429\*\*(.144) | -.315\*(.143) |
| In-Party (In)\* Strength Party Id (Leaning) | .173(.153) | .152(.154) | -.014(.154) | .127(.155) | -.051(.187) | -.192 (.167) | -.119(.164) |
| Vignette Republican | .143\*(.072) | .132(.072) | .077(.072) | .146(.072) | -.076(.090) | .032 (.080) | -.021(.078) |
| Vignette Democrat | .199\*(.078) | .258\*(.079) | .136(.078) | .293\*\*(.078) | -.169(.097) | -.079 (.087) | -.064(.085) |
| Republican | -.036(.058) | .035(.058) | -.043(.058) | -.008(.058) | .160(.072) | .131\* (.064) | .048(.063) |
| Age | -.001(.002) | .001(.002) | -.001(.002) | -.003(.002) | -019\*\*(.002) | -.015 \*\* (.002) | -.012\*\*(.002) |
| Gender | .076(.056) | .135(.056) | -.092(.056) | .007(.056) | -.506\*\*(.069) | -.492\*\* (.062) | -.240\*\*(.060) |
| White  | .110(.102) | .157(.102) | .047(.101) | .024(.103) | -.078(.118) | -.037 (.109) | .120(.109) |
| Hispanic | .064(.130) | .235(.131)\_ | -.082(.130) | .074(.131) | -.245(.151) | -.235 (.140) | -.094(.140) |
| African | -.108(.135) | -.009(.135) | -.116(.135) | -.018(.136) | .137(.152) | .137 (.142) | .363\*\*(.141) |
| Bachelor degree | -.033(.064) | -.035(.065) | .123(.064) | -.152\*\*(.065) | .069(.079) | .038 (.071) | .108(.069) |
| Postgraduate degree | .000(.075) | -.040(.076) | .135(.076) | -.125(.077) | .156(.093) | .063 (.084) | .139(.082) |
| Adjusted R Square | .033 | .050 | .030 | .038 | .184 | .037 | .069 |

*Note: N=1533 (only Republican and Democrat respondents) \*significant at level 0.05 \*\*significant at level 0.01. Model: Ordered Probit Regression. To simplify the model we combined two variables into one variable called In-Party. We combined the partisanship of the politician displayed in the vignette with the partisanship of the respondent. The variable In-Party takes the value of 1 if the partisanship of the politicians displayed in the vignettes and the partisanship of the respondent are the same and In-Party takes a values of 0 if that is not the case. Table displays regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. The reference category for the variable Party Strength is Strong Partisan.*

**Table A1.8: Predicted Probabilities of Experiencing Specific Emotions when Exposed to In-Party and Out-Party Moral Violations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Not at all** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Extremely** |
|  | **Anger** |
| **Out-party** | .202 | .17 | .205 | .206 | .217 |
| **In-party** | .311 | .195 | .199 | .165 | .129 |
|  | **Disgust** |
| **Out-party** | .168 | .147 | .175 | .208 | .303 |
| **In-party** | .287 | .181 | .179 | .175 | .178 |
|  | **Contempt** |
| **Out-party** | .281 | .196 | .278 | .126 | .12 |
| **In-party** | .363 | .206 | .253 | .099 | .079 |
|  | **Shame** |
| **Out-party** | .267 | .168 | .173 | .189 | .204 |
| **In-party** | .353 | .18 | .166 | .161 | .14 |
|  | **Pride** |  |  |  |  |
| **Out-party** | .753 | .087 | .088 | .047 | .025 |
| **In-party** | .649 | .105 | .119 | .075 | .052 |
|  | **Elevation** |
| **Out-party** | .63 | .183 | .105 | .059 | .022 |
| **In-party** | .524 | .204 | .136 | .091 | .045 |
|  | **Sympathy** |
| **Out-party** | .57 | .169 | .141 | .071 | .05 |
| **In-party** | .513 | .175 | .157 | .086 | .069 |

*Note: N=1533. This table displays predicted probabilities of experiencing various levels of specific emotions when exposed to in-party or out-party moral violations while holding the other predictor variables at their means. Predicted probabilities are calculated on the basis of the ordered probit model in Table A1.7*.

**Table A1.9: Predicted Probabilities of Experiencing Specific Emotions for Varying Levels of Party Strength**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Not at all** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Extremely** |
|  | **Anger** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .215 | .172 | .204 | .201 | .208 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .241 | .182 | .205 | .192 | .18 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .27 | .188 | .204 | .181 | 0157 |
|  | **Disgust** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .185 | .152 | .175 | .203 | .285 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .2 | .16 | .179 | .201 | .26 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .25 | .173 | .18 | .186 | .211 |
|  | **Contempt** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .263 | .193 | .282 | .132 | .13 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .339 | .205 | .262 | .106 | .088 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .344 | .205 | .259 | .105 | .087 |
|  | **Shame** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .254 | .166 | .174 | .193 | .213 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .307 | .176 | .172 | .177 | .168 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .353 | .181 | .167 | .161 | .139 |
|  | **Pride** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .66 | .105 | .117 | .071 | .047 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .756 | .087 | .087 | .046 | .024 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .787 | .079 | .076 | .039 | .02 |
|  | **Elevation** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .547 | .2 | .13 | 0.084 | .039 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .631 | .183 | .105 | 0.059 | .022 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .641 | .179 | .102 | 0.057 | .021 |
|  | **Sympathy** |
| **Strong Partisan** | .517 | .176 | .157 | 0.085 | .066 |
| **Weak Partisan** | .586 | .166 | .136 | 0.067 | .046 |
| **Leaning Partisan** | .568 | .169 | .141 | 0.071 | .05 |

*Note: N=1533. This table displays predicted probabilities of experiencing various levels of specific emotions for different levels of party identity strength while holding the other predictor variables at their means. Predicted probabilities are calculated on the basis of the ordered probit model in Table A1.7.*

**Table A1.10: Predicted Probabilities of Experiencing Specific Emotions when Exposed to In-Party or Out-Party Moral Violations for Different Levels of Party Identity Strength**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **1 Not at all** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Extremely** |
|  |  | **Anger** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .180 | .163 | .204 | .214 | .239 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .288 | .193 | .203 | .174 | .143 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .220 | .177 | .207 | .199 | .196 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .283 | .192 | .203 | .176 | .146 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .250 | .184 | .206 | .189 | .171 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .311 | .196 | .199 | .165 | .128 |
|  |  | **Disgust** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .148 | .139 | .172 | .212 | .329 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .266 | .179 | .181 | .182 | .192 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .185 | .155 | .178 | .205 | .277 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .231 | .171 | .182 | .193 | .223 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .222 | .167 | .181 | .195 | .235 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .310 | .186 | .178 | .167 | .159 |
|  |  | **Contempt** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .242 | .189 | .288 | .139 | .143 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .309 | .202 | .271 | .116 | .102 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .325 | .204 | .266 | .110 | .094 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .368 | .207 | .252 | .097 | .076 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .318 | .203 | .268 | .113 | .097 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .399 | .208 | .240 | .088 | .065 |
|  |  | **Shame** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .230 | .161 | .174 | .201 | .234 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .304 | .176 | .173 | .178 | .170 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .303 | .175 | .172 | .178 | .171 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .315 | .177 | .172 | .174 | .162 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .341 | .180 | .168 | .165 | .146 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .378 | .183 | .168 | .153 | .123 |
|  |  | **Pride** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .714 | .098 | .104 | .059 | .035 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .566 | .118 | .144 | .098 | .075 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .757 | .087 | .087 | .046 | .024 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .753 | .088 | .088 | .047 | .025 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .818 | .071 | .066 | .031 | .014 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .720 | .095 | .099 | .055 | .031 |
|  |  | **Elevation** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .603 | .191 | .113 | .066 | .026 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .428 | .219 | .164 | .122 | .068 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .636 | .182 | .103 | .057 | .021 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .621 | .186 | .108 | .062 | .024 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .668 | .172 | .093 | .049 | .017 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .581 | .196 | .120 | .073 | .030 |
|  |  | **Sympathy** |
| **Out-Party** | **Strong Partisan** | .548 | .173 | .148 | .076 | .055 |
| **In-party** | **Strong Partisan** | .449 | .182 | .176 | .103 | .090 |
| **Out-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .579 | .168 | .138 | .069 | .047 |
| **In-party** | **Weak Partisan** | .601 | .163 | .131 | .063 | .042 |
| **Out-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .585 | .166 | .136 | .067 | .046 |
| **In-party** | **Leaning Partisan** | .553 | .175 | .152 | .080 | .060 |

*Note: N=1533.* *This table displays predicted probabilities of experiencing various levels of specific emotions when exposed to in-party or out-party moral violations for different levels of party identity strength while holding the other predictor variables at their means. Predicted probabilities are calculated on the basis of the ordered probit model in Table A1.7.*

**Appendix 2 Study Details**

**Table A2.1: Treatment Groups Vignette Study**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Moral Foundation Violated** | **Partisanship Actor** |
| 1 | Care | Republican |
| 2 | Care | Democrat |
| 3 | Care | Non-partisan |
| 4 | Fairness | Republican |
| 5 | Fairness | Democrat |
| 6 | Fairness | Non-partisan |
| 7 | Loyalty | Republican |
| 8 | Loyalty | Democrat |
| 9 | Loyalty | Non-partisan |
| 10 | Authority | Republican |
| 11 | Authority | Democrat |
| 12 | Authority | Non-partisan |
| 13 | Sanctity | Republican |
| 14 | Sanctity | Democrat |
| 15 | Sanctity | Non-partisan |

**Table A2.2: Voters’ Moral Judgment of Moral Violations in %**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Label** | **Statement** | **Not at all wrong** | **Not too wrong** | **Some-what wrong** | **Very wrong** | **Ext Wrong** | **Mean** | **N** |
| Care | You see a politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate. | 3.40 | 5.76 | 18.85 | 31.41 | 40.85 | 4.00 | 382 |
| Fairness | You see a politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs. | 5.77 | 9.19 | 29.66 | 30.45 | 24.93 | 3.59 | 381 |
| Loyalty | You see a politician joke about the stupidity of Americans. | 5.57 | 10.90 | 35.84 | 26.39 | 21.31 | 3.47 | 413 |
| Authority | You see a politician turn his back and ignore his party leader. | 18.56 | 20.66 | 27.54 | 22.46 | 10.78 | 2.86 | 334 |
| Sanctity | You see a married politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships. | 4.90 | 5.88 | 24.51 | 28.92 | 35.78 | 3.85 | 408 |

**Table A2.3: Sample Demographics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** |  |
| % Male | 46.14 |
| % White | 72.05 |
| % African | 8.65 |
| % Hispanic | 10.48 |
| Mean Age (st.dev) | .45.80 (.39) |
| % No college graduate  | 44.35 |
| % Bachelor degree | 26.96 |
| % Postgraduate degree | 16.01 |
| % Republican | 35.04 |
| % Democrat | 46.82 |
| % Independent | 4.80 |

*N=1918*

**Table A2.4: Randomization Checks**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Chi Square (p.value) at 12 degrees of freedom** |
| Male (0-1) | 17.01 (.255) |
| White (0-1) | 12.01 (.605) |
| African (0-1) | 9.61 (.790) |
| Hispanic (0-1) | 11.34 (.659) |
| Age (Anova) | 0.99 (.464) |
| Education (Anova) | 1.02 (.678) |
| Democrat (0-1) | 13.61 (.479) |
| Republican (0-1) | 13.82 (.463) |
| Independent (0-1) | *8.62 (.854)* |

*Note: To further assess balance, we estimated a multinomial logistic regression model using the variables in the table to predict treatment assignment. The chi-square from this model is 147.22 (.321) indicating that the variables do not jointly predict treatment assignment. N=1918.*

**Table A2.5: Correlations between emotions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anger** | **Disgust** | **Contempt** | **Shame** | **Elevation** | **Admiration** | **Sympathy** | **Pride** |
| **Anger** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Disgust** | .769 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Contempt** | .544 | .517 | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Shame** | .637 | .662 | .492 | X |  |  |  |  |
| **Elevation** | -.192 | -.260 | .030 | .132 | X |  |  |  |
| **Admiration** | -.175 | -.255 | .026 | -.134 | .814 | X |  |  |
| **Sympathy** | -.112 | -.076 | .114 | .035 | .525 | .486 | X |  |
| **Pride** | -.074 | -.122 | .140 | -.014 | .736 | .657 | .442 | X |

***N=1918***

**Appendix 3 Stimulus Material**

 **Vignette 1 Harm/Care, Republican**

You see a Republican politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate.

**Vignette 2 Harm/Care, Democrat**

You see a Democratic politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate.

**Vignette 3 Harm/Care, Non-partisan**

You see a politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate.

**Vignette 4 Fairness/Reciprocity, Republican**

You see a Republican politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs.

**Vignette 5 Fairness/Reciprocity, Democrat**

You see a Democratic politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs.

**Vignette 6 Fairness/Reciprocity, Non-partisan**

You see a politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs.

**Vignette 7** **Ingroup/Loyalty, Republican**

You see a Republican politician joke about the stupidity of Americans.

**Vignette 8** **Ingroup/Loyalty, Democrat**

You see a Democratic politician joke about the stupidity of Americans.

**Vignette 9 Ingroup/Loyalty, Non-partisan**

You see a politician joke about the stupidity of Americans.

**Vignette 10 Authority/Respect, Republican**

You see a Republican politician turn his back and ignore his party leader.

**Vignette 11 Authority/Respect, Democrat**

You see a Democratic politician turn his back and ignore his party leader.

**Vignette 12** **Authority/Respect, Non-partisan**

You see a politician turn his back and ignore his party leader.

**Vignette 13 Purity/Sanctity, Republican**

You see a married Republican politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships.

**Vignette 14 Purity/Sanctity, Democrat**

You see a married Democratic politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships.

**Vignette 15 Purity/Sanctity, Non-partisan**

You see a married politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships.

**Appendix 4 Selection of Vignettes and Pre-test**

In our survey of voters’ response to moral transgression by politicians we randomly presented respondents with a single vignette out of a set of 15 vignettes. The vignettes differ in violation of moral foundation (Care, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, Sanctity) and whether or not partisan labels were used (None, Democrat, or Republican). The five moral values vignettes were developed and pre-tested by the authors, selected from a total of 25 vignettes. These 25 vignettes presented different scenarios in which a politician violates one of the five different moral foundations. The vignettes were tested without partisan labels to avoid association with the moral foundation Loyalty. These 25 vignettes were developed on the basis of work by Clifford et al. (2015) that presents a standardized stimulus database of scenarios based on moral foundations theory. However, these stimuli needed to be translated to the realm of politics and contain scenarios that could plausibly occur in everyday politics, therefore we adapted some vignettes and developed some ourselves, respectively Vignette Loyalty 1.1, Loyalty 5.1.

Like Clifford et al. (2015) we made an effort to eliminate any reference to other foundations to increase the likelihood of isolating the influence of a particular moral foundation. In addition, we stick to Clifford et al. (2015)’s vignette formulation of “You see…” to encourage respondents to visualize themselves as third party witnesses. So in this case all the vignettes start with You see a politician… See Table A3.2 for the complete list of vignettes that were pre-tested. Three vignettes are direct adaptations of Clifford et al. (2015), we only replaced the beginning with “You see a politician.” These are three vignettes representing the moral foundation Loyalty (QLOYALV1.1, QLOYALV2.1, QLOYALV5.1). The moral foundation Care has three forms of harm, namely emotional harm to a human, physical harm to a human, and physical harm to a non-human animal. In this study we focus solely on emotional harm to a human as the other forms are less likely to occur in everyday politics.

The 25 vignettes were pretested using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). We had a sample of 648 MTurk respondents, see Table A4.1 for the sample demographics. Each respondent was presented with a random set of ten of the vignettes such that each vignettes was approximately rated by 260 respondents to ensure stability of average ratings and enable further psychometric analyses. After exposure to each vignette the respondents were asked to rate how morally wrong the behavior is on a 5-point scale labeled not at all wrong, not too wrong, somewhat wrong, very wrong, extremely wrong. Table A4.2 includes the respondent ratings for each vignette. After asking how morally wrong the scenarios in the vignette were, respondents were asked how understandable the scenario is and how easily they could imagine what happened in the scenario. Both questions provided a 4-point response scale ranging from very easy to very difficult. These results are not displayed, as all vignettes were rated by the respondents as easy to understand and easy to imagine. Even so, some vignettes had more than 5 per cent reporting them somewhat difficult to very difficult to understand: QCAREV5.1 (5.6%). QFAIRV3.1 (5.2%), QLOYALV4.1 (5.9%), QLOYALV5.1 (8.5%), QAUTHV1.1 (5.6%), QAUTHV5.1 (6.4%), QSANCV1.1 (5.9%) and QSANCV2.1 (6.0%). Several vignettes were rated by more than 5 per cent of the respondents as somewhat difficult to very difficult to imagine, these were QLOYALVV5.1 (8.5%), QAUTHV1.1 (5.2%), QAUTHV3.1 (6.0%), QAUTHV4.1 (7.5%), QSANCV1.1 (9.6%) and QSANCV2.1 (9.8%).

The five vignettes actually used in our experimental study are selected out of this pool of 25 vignettes on the basis of the following criteria: 1) The *distribution of response scores* of the respondents on the vignettes. We want the distribution of the response scores to not be skewed as we strive to select items that will give us variance. We want to avoid scenarios that respondents agree on in terms of how morally wrong they are. Therefore, items that average lower than 1 and higher than 4 are not considered. See Table A4.2 for the distributions of the responses for each item. 2) The *homogeneity coefficient* of the vignette. The homogeneity coefficients were derived conducting Mokken scale analysis, which is a stochastic cumulative scaling model for ordinal variables (Mokken, 1971). Mokken scale analysis is used to determine the number of underlying foundations of the 25 vignettes and the homogeneity coefficients indicate the degree to which the vignettes reflect the underlying moral foundations. Mokken scale analysis can thus be used to determine how well we were able to operationalize the five moral foundations. The homogeneity coefficient needs to be higher than 0.3 to be scalable. When the homogeneity coefficient lies between 0.3 and 0.4 the items are considered weak, between 0.4 and 0.5 the items are considered moderate and the items are considered strong when it is higher than 0.5. Ideally one selects from each set of five vignettes the vignette with the highest homogeneity coefficient as it is the vignette that best represents the underlying dimension, i.e. moral foundation. Since not all vignettes were rated by all respondents we performed the Mokken scale analysis in two steps. We first calculated for all possible pairs of vignettes the Hij coefficient. Second we run Mokken scale analysis on the basis of the matrix with Hij coefficients. See Table A4.3 for the homogeneity coefficients for the individual items and the items as a scale. In the next part of this appendix the results of the Mokken scale analysis and the considerations leading to our selection of the five vignettes for our experiment are discussed in detail.

When we look at Table A43.2 for the first set five scenario we see that the five vignettes labelled ‘CARE’ are very strong intercorrelated and all evoke the same latent reaction. The homogeneity coefficient for all five vignettes as a set is 0.54 which is considered a strong scale. The strength with which each vignette reflects this single latent attitude is slightly different, see the individual homogeneity coefficients. The strongest items is the first item and the fourth item is the weakest. However, vignettes CARE3.1 and CARE4.1 are most attractive in terms of their response distribution. Taking both considerations together, the most useful item of these five vignettes is vignette QCAREV3.1 (Hᵢ = 0.54, Average = 3.68).

The five vignettes labelled ‘FAIR’ do not reflect a single underlying attitude or reaction. The homogeneity coefficients for the vignettes as pairs not presented here are very weak. In particular vignette 4.1 and 5.1 are hardly correlated. The homogeneity coefficient for all five vignettes together is 0.34. Vignette 1.1 reflects strongest the moral foundation Fairness. Since its response distribution is very skewed (Average =4.43) we select vignette QFAIRV2.1 as the ‘best’ Hᵢ = 0.32, Average = 3.69)

The five vignettes labelled ‘LOYAL’ are very strongly intercorrelated, and all evoke the same latent reaction. The homogeneity coefficient for all five vignettes as a set is 0.41, although some of their pairwise homogeneity coefficients are weak. Vignettes LOYAL3.1 and LOYAL4.1 are strongest, yet also the most skewed in their response distributions. When looking at both criteria in conjunction, items 2.1 or 5.1 seem the most useful. Both items stem from the original set of scenarios developed by Clifford et al. (2015). We select vignette QLOYALV2.1 (Hᵢ = 0.37, Average = 3.01) as vignette QLOYALV5.1 was for more difficult for respondents to understand and to imagine.

The five developed vignettes labelled ‘AUTH’ are relatively weakly intercorrelated, and do not all evoke the same latent reaction. The homogeneity coefficient for all five vignettes as a set is 0.25. Vignettes AUTH2.1 and AUTH4.1 have homogeneity coefficients that are scalable and therefore seem to reflect the strongest the moral foundation Authority. These two vignettes also have the most attractive response distributions, so either one of these two would make a good choice. We chose vignette QAUTHV4.1 (Hᵢ = 0.36, Average = 2.36) that has a slightly better homogeneity coefficient and distribution than QAUTHV5.1, although respondents found this first vignette more difficult to imagine in real life than the latter.

The five vignettes labelled ‘SANC’ are strongly intercorrelated and do all evoke the same latent reaction. The homogeneity coefficient for all five vignettes as a set is 0.49. Vignettes SANC2.1, SANC4.1 and SANC5.1 have the best homogeneity coefficients therefore reflecting better the moral foundation Sanctity. Vignettes SANC2.1 and SANC4.1 seem to reflect strongest what we aimed for with the formulation of the 5 vignettes. For all items except for vignette SANC3.1 the response distributions are quite skewed. We selected vignette QSANCV5.1 as this vignette had the most attractive distribution, a strong homogeneity coefficient and was not difficult to imagine according to the respondents (Hᵢ = 0.56, Average = 4.00).

**Table A4.1: MTurk Sample Demographics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable**  | **%** |
| Male | 52.5 |
| Democrat | 54.9% |
| Republican | 25.3% |
| Mean Age (st.dev) | 37.3 (11.2) |
| Mean Education (st.dev) | 5.2 (1.4) |

*N=648*

**Table A4.2. Voters’ judgements of politicians’ moral violations in %: Pretest
Highlighted vignettes were used in this study**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Label** | **Statement** | **Not at all wrong** | **Not too wrong** | **Some-****what wrong** | **Very wrong** | **Extremely Wrong** | **Mean** | **N** |
| QCAREV1.1 | You see a politician laugh at a homeless person whom his motorcade passes on the street. | 2.23 | 4.09 | 20.45 | 36.06 | 37.17 | 4.03 | 269 |
| QCAREV2.1 | You see a politician treat a disabled person with disdain in conversation with his staff. | 1.16 | 3.10 | 17.83 | 42.25 | 35.66 | 4.08 | 258 |
| **QCAREV3.1** | **You see a politician mocking his opponent when the opponent stutters during a debate.** | **4.56** | **6.08** | **33.08** | **30.42** | **25.86** | **3.68** | **263** |
| QCAREV4.1 | You see a politician say that his opponent is “too dumb for the job.” | 14.07 | 31.56 | 33.08  | 17.11 | 4.18 | 2.65 | 263 |
| QCAREV5.1 | You see a politician step back when a severely burned supporter tries to shake his hand. | 5.93 | 12.96 | 31.11 | 30.37 | 19.63 | 3.45 | 268 |
| QFAIRV1.1 | You see that a politician took a bribe and agreed to approve a development project. | 0.37 | 1.12 | 8.24 | 35.21 | 55.06 | 4.45 | 267 |
| **QFAIRV2.1** | **You see a politician making sure that those who voted for him get first access to jobs.** | **5.28** | **7.92** | **27.17** | **31.70** | **27.92** | **3.69** | **265** |
| QFAIRV3.1 | You see that a politician gave a valuable contract to a company run by his son-in-law. | 5.64 | 6.02 | 23.68 | 31.58 | 33.08 | 3.80 | 266 |
| QFAIRV4.1 | You see a politician continuously interrupting his opponent during a debate. | 11.79 | 25.10 | 46.10 | 10.65 | 6.46 | 2.74 | 263 |
| QFAIRV5.1 | You see a politician using federal tax dollars to build an extension on his home. | 0.37 | 0.75 | 1.49 | 22.39 | 75.0 | 4.71 | 268 |
| QLOYALV1.1 | You see a politician in your town say the neighboring town is better. | 39.23 | 31.15 | 27.69 | 1.92 | 0.0 | 1.92 | 260 |
| **QLOYALV2.1** | **You see a politician joke about the stupidity of Americans.** | **12.73** | **20.22** | **32.96** | **20.97** | **13.11** | **3.01** | **267** |
| QLOYALV3.1 | You see a politician leave his party to join another party. | 56.67 | 25.86 | 13.31 | 3.04 | 1.52 | 1.68 | 263 |
| QLOYALV4.1 | You see a politician say that another country does more for its citizens. | 63.67 | 21.35 | 10.86 | 2.62 | 1.50 | 1.57 | 267 |
| QLOYALV5.1 | You see a former politician publicly give up his American citizenship. | 41.26 | 21.19 | 16.73 | 10.41 | 10.41 | 2.78 | 269 |
| QAUTHV1.1 | You see a politician refuse to carry out a U.S. Supreme Court decision. | 4.91 | 7.92 | 19.62 | 35.47 | 32.08 | 3.83 | 265 |
| QAUTHV2.1 | You see a local politician talking loudly to his staff during the governor’s speech. | 19.70 | 29.74 | 34.57 | 14.38 | 2.60 | 2.50 | 269 |
| QAUTHV3.1 | You see a Catholic politician challenge the leadership of the Pope. | 38.78 | 25.48 | 21.29 | 10.65 | 3.80 | 2.15 | 263 |
| **QAUTHV4.1** | **You see a politician turn his back and ignore his party leader.** | **25.67** | **27.59** | **34.48** | **9.96** | **2.30** | **2.36** | **261** |
| QAUTHV5.1 | You see a politician ignoring safety regulations ordered by the Chief of Police at a disaster. | 2.02 | 9.47 | 34.85 | 29.55 | 23.11 | 3.60 | 264 |
| QSANCV1.1 | You see that a politician was discovered having sex with a teenager. | 1.49 | 2.23 | 7.81 | 15.99 | 72.49 | 4.55 | 269 |
| QSANCV2.1 | You see a politician using his phone to watch people having sex with animals. | 3.42 | 4.18 | 10.65 | 22.81 | 58.94 | 4.30 | 263 |
| QSANCV3.1 | You see a politician getting drunk and vomiting at an official event. | 6.34 | 16.79 | 28.36 | 26.87 | 21.64 | 3.41 | 268 |
| QSANCV4.1 | You see that a married politician is having sex with a prostitute. | 2.97 | 4.46 | 17.47 | 32.71 | 42.38 | 4.71 | 269 |
| **QSANCV5.1** | **You see a married politician was discovered having extramarital homosexual relationships.** | **3.44** | **3.05** | **22.52** | **32.44** | **38.55** | **4.00** | **262** |

*Note: Question asked: How morally wrong is the behaviour described in the statement? Responses on a 5-point scale labeled not at all wrong, not too wrong, somewhat wrong, very wrong, extremely wrong. Data collected with MTurk where 48 respondents each rated a random subset of ten vignettes.*

**Table A4.3 Scalability Scenarios**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | **Hᵢ** | **Items** | **Hᵢ** | **Items** | **Hᵢ** | **Items** | **Hᵢ** | **Items** | **Hᵢ** |
| QCAREV1.1 | 0.60 | QFAIR1.1 | 0.41 | QLOYALV1.1 | 0.37 | QAUTHV1.1 | 0.09 | QSANCV1.1 | 0.44 |
| QCAREV2.1 | 0.57 | QFAIR2.1 | 0.32 | QLOYALV2.1 | 0.37 | QAUTHV2.1 | 0.32 | QSANCV2.1 | 0.47 |
| QCAREV3.1 | 0.54 | QFAIR3.1 | 0.34 | QLOYALV3.1 | 0.49 | QAUTHV3.1 | 0.23 | QSANCV3.1 | 0.44 |
| QCAREV4.1 | 0.46 | QFAIR4.1 | 0.09 | QLOYALV4.1 | 0.45 | QAUTHV4.1 | 0.36 | QSANCV4.1 | 0.56 |
| QCAREV5.1 | 0.53 | QFAIR5.1 | 0.20 | QLOYALV5.1 | 0.37 | QAUTHV5.1 | 0.23 | QSANCV5.1 | 0.56 |
|  | **Scale** |  | **Scale** |  | **Scale** |  | **Scale** |  | **Scale** |
| H | 0.57 | H | 0.34 | H | 0.41 | H | 0.25 | H | 0.49 |

*N=648*

**Appendix 5 Questionnaire**

Q1 This is a study about how people respond to information about politicians, and your participation in the study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you will answer questions about how you would feel if a politician exhibited certain behaviors. You will also be asked to provide some demographic information, such as your age and gender. You must be at least 18 years old and a US Citizen to participate in this study. The study should take approximately 10 minutes, and needs to be completed in a single session (without taking breaks). Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate, and you may choose not to answer any questions with which you are not comfortable. You may also withdraw at any time during the study procedures, but unless you participate in the study until the end you will not receive payment for participation. The research team and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews research studies in order to safeguard the welfare of research participants) at the University of Delaware are the only parties that will be allowed to see the data, except as required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated—the identity of individual participants will not be disclosed. All study data will be kept for at least three years. There are only minimal risks associated with this study. You may be exposed to information about political policies or positions that you dislike or are uncomfortable with. You will receive payment for your time as specified by SSI. You may also receive an indirect benefit by learning more about the thoughts and feelings you have in response to political candidates. Finally, there may be a general societal benefit in that we will learn more about responses to candidates and communications during political campaigns. If you have any questions about the study or study procedures, you may contact XXX. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact XXX. Do you wish to continue? Clicking "YES" will indicate your consent to use your responses in our study.

o Yes (1)

o No (2)

Q2 What is the highest level of school you have completed?

o High school diploma or equivalent (1)

o Some college, no degree (2)

o Associate degree (3)

o Bachelor's degree (4)

o Master's degree (5)

o Professional degree (J.D., M.B.A., M.D. or similar) (6)

o Doctoral degree (7)

Q3 In what year were you born?

Q4 What is your gender?

o Male (1)

o Female (2)

o Other, please specify (3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Q5 Please indicate your ethnicity or race. Check as many as apply to you.

o White (1)

o Hispanic or Latino (2)

o Black or African American (3)

o Native American or American Indian (4)

o Asian / Pacific Islander (5)

o Other (please specify) (6) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Exposure to a randomly selected treatment was placed here]

Q37 When you think about this politician’s behavior, how does it make you feel?

 Not at all (0) Slightly (1) Moderately (2) Quite a bit (3) Extremely (4)

Anxious (1) o o o o o

Optimistic about humanity (2) o o o o o

Contemptuous (3) o o o o o

Warm-hearted (4) o o o o o

Hopeful (5) o o o o o

Enthusiastic (6) o o o o o

Shameful (7) o o o o o

Sad (8) o o o o o

Admiration (9) o o o o o

Sympathetic (10) o o o o o

Prideful (11) o o o o o

Disgusted (12) o o o o o

Uplifted (13) o o o o o

Angry (14) o o o o o

Q38 How would you rate the politician in the scenario on the following characteristics?

 1 (0) 2 (0) 3 (1) 4 (2) 5 (3) 6 (4) 7 (6)

Immoral (1) o o o o o o o Moral

Incompetent (2) o o o o o o o Competent

Unfit for Office (3) o o o o o o o Fit for Office

Unsympathetic (4) o o o o o o o Sympathetic

Unlikeable (5) o o o o o o o Likeable

Dishonest (6) o o o o o o o Honest

Weak Leader (7) o o o o o o o Strong Leader

Uncompassionate (8) o o o o o o o Compassionate

Uninspiring (9) o o o o o o o Inspiring

Q39 How likely is it that you would vote for this politician?

o 0 (0) Not at all likely

o 1 (1)

o 2 (2)

o 3 (3)

o 4 (4)

o 5 (5)

o 6 (6)

o 7 (7)

o 8 (8)

o 9 (9)

o 10 (10) Extremely likely

Q44 Thinking back to the scenario about the politician you read earlier, how morally wrong is the behavior described in the scenario?

o Not at all wrong (1)

o Not too wrong (2)

o Somewhat wrong (3)

o Very wrong (4)

o Extremely wrong (5)

Q45 Again, thinking back to the scenario about the politician you read earlier, how politically relevant is the behavior described in the scenario?

o Not at all relevant (1)

o Not too relevant (2)

o Somewhat relevant (3)

o Very relevant (4)

o Extremely relevant (5)

Q47 Now, we have just a few more questions for purposes of categorizing your responses to the previous questions. As a reminder, your individual responses will not be shared with anyone outside of the research team.

In general, how interested are you in politics and public affairs?

o Very interested (1)

o Somewhat interested (2)

o Slightly interested (3)

o Not at all interested (4)

Q48 How often do you pay attention to what's going on in government and politics?

o Always (1)

o Most of the time (2)

o About half the time (3)

o Some of the time (4)

o Never (5)

Q52 In general, how would you describe your political views?

o Very conservative (1)

o Conservative (2)

o Moderate (3)

o Liberal (4)

o Very liberal (5)

Q53 Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent or what?

o Republican (1)

o Democrat (2)

o Independent (3)

o Something else (4)

[If Q53 is Republican] Q54 Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?

o Strong (1)

o Not very strong (2)

[IF Q53 is Democrat] Q55 Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or not a very strong Democrat?

o Strong (1)

o Not very strong (2)

[If Q53 is Independent] Q56 Do you think of yourself closer to the Republicans or the Democrats, or Neither?

o Republican (1)

o Democrat (2)

o Neither (3)

[If Q53 is Something Else] Q57 Do you think of yourself closer to the Republicans or the Democrats, or Neither?

o Republican (1)

o Democrat (2)

o Neither (3)

Q58 When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using the following scale: Not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong) Not very relevant Slightly relevant Somewhat relevant, Very relevant, Extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

Not at all relevant (0) Not very relevant (1) Slightly relevant (2) Somewhat relevant (3) Very Relevant (4) Extremely Relevant (5)\

Whether or not someone suffered emotionally (1) o o o o o o

Whether or not some people were treated differently than others (2) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone’s action showed love for his or her country (3) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority (4) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency (5) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone was good at math (6) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable (7) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone acted unfairly (8) o o o o o o

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

Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society (10) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone did something disgusting (11) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone was cruel (12) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights (13) o o o o o o

Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty (14) o o o o o o

Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder (15) o o o o o o

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

Q59 Please read the following sentences and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each:

 Strongly disagree (0) Moderately disagree (1) Slightly disagree (2) Slightly agree (3) Moderately agree (4) Strongly agree (5)

Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue. (1) o o o o o o

When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly. (2) o o o o o o

I am proud of my country’s history. (3) o o o o o o

Respect for authority is something all children need to learn. (4) o o o o o o

People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed. (5) o o o o o o

It is better to do good than to do bad. (6) o o o o o o

One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal. (7) o o o o o o

Justice is the most important requirement for a society. (8) o o o o o o

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

Men and women each have different roles to play in society. (10) o o o o o o

I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural. (11) o o o o o o

It can never be right to kill a human being. (12) o o o o o o

I think it’s morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing. (13) o o o o o o

It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself. (14) o o o o o o

If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer’s orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty. (15) o o o o o o

Chastity is an important and valuable virtue. (16) o o o o o o

People who are successful in business have a right to enjoy their wealth as they see fit. (17)

 o o o o o o

Society works best when it lets individuals take responsibility for their own lives without telling them what to do. (18) o o o o o o

The government should do more to advance the common good, even if that means limiting the freedom and choices of individuals. (19) o o o o o o

Property owners should be allowed to develop their land or build their homes in any way they choose, as long as they don't endanger their neighbors. (20) o o o o o o

Whether or not everyone was free to do as they wanted. (21) o o o o o o

I think everyone should be free to do as they choose, so long as they don't infringe upon the equal freedom of others. (22) o o o o o o

People should be free to decide what group norms or traditions they themselves want to follow. (23) o o o o o o