When ideology meets conflict-related content: influences on emotion generation and regulation

Pliskin, R.; Halperin, E.; Bar-Tal, D.; Sheppes, G.

Appendix: Supplemental Material for

When ideology meets conflict-related content:

Influences on emotion generation and regulation

Ruthie Pliskin[a,b,c], Eran Halperin[b], Daniel Bar-Tal[a], and Gal Sheppes[a]

[a] Tel Aviv University

[b] Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya

[c] New York University

Study 1: Right-Left Differences in the Intensity of Emotional Reactions

Study 1 examined the interactive influence of political ideology and conflict-related content on emotion generation. Below are descriptions of the stimuli used in the study (as well as in Study 2), followed by full details of the questionnaire used for this study. All labels and items were originally in Hebrew, but are included here in English translation. Finally, we report supplementary analyses at the end of this section.

The stimuli

Due to copyright concerns, we cannot include the actual stimuli used in the studies here. Instead, we provide descriptions of the content of these stimuli below:

Conflict-irrelevant images (taken from the International Affective Picture Service)

1. Dog revealing its teeth (IAPS image 1301), labeled "Denmark, 2007"
2. New-born on life support (IAPS image 2053), labeled "England, 2001"
3. Woman and child cowering (IAPS image 2278). Labeled "Nepal, 2003"
4. Woman with crying child (IAPS image 2312), labeled "Georgia, 1999"
5. Elderly man with an empty refridgerator (IAPS image 2490), labeled "Baltimore, US, 1989"
6. Women crying (IAPS image 2700), labeled "Aftermath of Princess Dianna's death, England, 1997"
7. Child crying (IAPS image 2800), labeled "Somalia, 1990"
8. Mutilated head (IAPS image 3000), labeled "Assassination in Mexico, 2008"
9. Burned body (IAPS image 3140), labeled "Aftermath of fire in China, 2002"
10. Mutilated hand (IAPS image 3150), labeled "Work accident, France, 2000"
11. Woman with facial bruises (IAPS image 3180), labeled "Latvia, 2004"
12. Undernourished man on life support (IAPS image 3230), labeled "Hospital in Bolivia, 1998"
13. Deformed breasts (IAPS image 3261), labeled "Kenya, 2001"
14. Prisoner behind bars (IAPS image 6010). Labeled "Texas, US, 1996"
15. Man holding a knife to a woman's neck (IAPS image 6350), labeled "New York, US, 2006"
16. Pie with flies on it (IAPS image 7360), labeled "New Orleans, US, 2010"

17. Person injecting drugs (IAPS image 9102), labeled "Berlin, 2009"

18. Dead farm animals (IAPS image 9181), labeled "Indonesia in the aftermath of the tsunami, 2006"

19. Skulls (IAPS image 9440), labeled "Paris, France, 1971"

20. Collapsed building (IAPS image 9470), labeled "Earthquake in Chile, 1982"

Harm to the ingroup

21. Child taking cover under a desk, labeled "Sderot, 2008"

22. Palestinians raising rifles in the air, labeled "Jenin, 2005"

23. Woman hugging a child, labeled "Ashkelon, following a Qassam attack, 2011"

24. Palestinian throwing rocks, labeled "Qalandiya, 2007"

25. Palestinian throwing rocks, labeled "Ni'ilin, 2010"

26. Women and children laying on the sidewalk, covering their heads, labeled "Beer Sheva, 'Red Alert' siren, 2009"

27. Soldier crying, labeled "Funeral of a soldier, 2010"

28. Soldier crying, labeled "Funeral of an officer, 2009"

29. Palestinians marching and setting fire to tires, labeled "Qalandiya, 2011"

30. Woman inspecting damage to her home, labeled "Qassam attach in Sderot, 2009"

31. Palestinians burning an Israeli flag, labeled "Ramallah, 2011"

32. Palestinians throwing rocks, labeled "Nebi Saleh village, 2012"

33. Woman looking out a shattered window, labeled "Bombing in Jerusalem, 2001"

34. Man kneeling and crying at a makeshift memorial, labeled "Bombing at the Jerusalem pedestrian street, 2002"

35. Soldier sitting at a blood-covered bus stop, labeled "Bombing near Beit Lid, 2001"

36. Palestinian throwing rocks near brining tires, labeled "Protest in Ramallah, 2004"

37. Ban with blood-covered face, labeled "Bombing in Haifa, 2009"

38. Woman and children in a dark shelter, labeled "Bomb shelter in Sderot, 2009"

39. Man inspecting damage to his yard, labeled "Sha'ar HaNegev, following a Qassam attack, 2009"

40. Palestinians marching and burning tires, labeled "Ramallah, 2008"

41. Man with blood-covered face, labeled "Rock injury in Jerusalem, 2005"

42. Medics attending to a casualty of a bombing, labeled "Bombing in Netanya, 2004"

43. Medics supporting an injured woman, labeled "Bombing in the Jerusalem market, 2002"

44. Personnel clearing body parts from the scene of a bombing, labeled "Bombing at Mike's Place, 2003"

45. Medics examining the blood-covered body of a dog, labeled, "Qassam attack in Sderot, 2007"

46. Slain man and child, labeled "Murder of a family in Itamar, 2011"

47. People crying at a funeral, labeled "Funeral of a family murdered in Itamar, 2011"

48. Palestinians displaying blood on their hands, labeled "Ramallah, 2000"

49. Uniformed Palestinians preparing to launch rockets, labeled "Gaza, 2008"

50. Medics attending to a severely injured baby, labeled "Bombing in Jerusalem, 2003"

51. People observing blood on the sidewalk, labeled "Bombing in Jerusalem, 2003"

52. Medics treating a child, labeled "Bombing at the Taba Hilton, 2004"

53. Palestinian child dressed as a suicide attacker posing with armed Palestinian militants, labeled "Hamas militants in Gaza, 2008"

54. Medics with body bags, labeled "Bombing in Jerusalem, 2003"

55. Medics taking away an injured person, labeled "Bombing in Tel Aviv, 2005"

56. Medics attending to an injured woman, labeled "Bombing in Tel Aviv, 2005"

57. Medics treating a blood-covered unconscious person, labeled "Bombing in Tel Aviv, 2005"

58. Aftermath of an explosion in a café, labeled "Bombing in Tel Aviv, 2002"

59. An exploded bus with bodies around it, labeled "Bombing in Tel Aviv, 1994"

60. Soldiers treating a child with a blood-covered face, labeled "Rock injury in Jerusalem, 2006"

Harm to the outgroup

61. Family lined up against a wall as soldiers enter their home, labeled "House search in Nablus, 2008"

62. Man weeping as a tractor demolishes his home, labeled "House demolition in Hebron, 2002"

63. Man standing outside mosque with "Price Tag" (Jewish anti-Palestinian militants" graffiti, labeled, "Price Tag attack, Tulkarm, 2012"

64. Sad child waiting as a soldier inspects his ID card at a checkpoint, labeled "Hawara Checkpoint, Nablus, 2009"

65. Shocked child with debris in the background, "Gaza, following an IDF strike, 2009"

66. Child standing before a demolished home, labeled "Demolished home in Bethlehem, 2009"

67. Cuffed, undressed, and blindfolded man standing in front on an army vehicle at a checkpoint, labeled "West Bank checkpoint, 2011"

68. Woman with baby examining the damage to her home, labeled "Gaza, following an air raid, 2011"

69. Women crying at her window, labeled "funeral procession following an Israeli air raid, Gaza, 2011

70. Child's hat on the floor surrounded by debris, labeled "Gaza, following an IDF air raid, 2012"

71. Elderly man surrounded by rubble, labeled "Gaza, 2009"

72. Jewish man throwing a drink at a Palestinian woman walking down the street, labeled "Hebron, 2012"

73. Young women covering their faces as they escape from a cloud, labeled "Tear gas in Nebi Saleh, 2012"

74. Women and children packed at a checkpoint, labeled "Bethlehem checkpoint, 2010"

75. Soldier aiming an automatic weapon at Palestinian schoolgirls, labeled "Checkpoint near Ramallah, 2012"

76. Women crying and covering their faces, labeled "tear gas in Bethlehem, 2008"

77. Jewish women setting fire to a Palestinian flag, labeled "Jewish women in Migron, 2011"

78. Jewish woman polling at an elderly Palestinian woman's head scarf as a Jewish child kicks the Palestinian woman, labeled "Hebron, 2010"

79. Soldiers restraining at swinging a bat at a Palestinian man, labeled "East Jerusalem, 2012"

80. Palestinians lined up and packed at a checkpoint, labeled "Bethlehem checkpoint, 2010"

81. Dead cattle surrounded by debris, labeled "Aftermath of air raid, Gaza, 2012"

82. Girl crying, labeled "Gaza, 2009"

83. Soldier shoving a Palestinian boy with a blood-covered face, labeled "Jenin, 2006"

84. Woman crying over a man's body, labeled "Gaza, 2012"

85. Man carrying a blood-covered little girl, labeled "Gaza, 2009"

86. Man with a mutilated face after being shot, labeled "Protester in Nebi Saleh, 2011"

87. Crying man holding a dead baby, labeled "Gaza, 2011"

88. Small child crying on the backdrop of rubble, labeled "Demolished hom in Beit Hanina, 2011"

89. People gathered around a body and body parts on the ground, labeled "Gaza, 2011"

90. Bodies of young men in morgue drawers, labeled "Gaza, 2012"

91. Injured man crying out, labeled "Gaza, 2012"

92. Soldiers beating up a Palestinian youth, labeled "Nablus, 2008"

93. Soldiers restraining a crying Palestinian child with soiled pants, labeled "Bethlehem, 2009"

94. Undressed young Palestinian looking up at soldiers, labeled "Hawara Checkpoint, Nablus, 2008"

95. Bandaged and blood-covered young child crying, labeled "Gaza, 2009"

96. Men carrying a body from the debris, labeled "Gaza in the aftermath of an air raid, 2008"

97. Injured woman with blood-covered face on a stretcher, labeled "Gaza, 2009"

98. Man being pressed to the ground by soldiers, labeled "Hebron, 2012"

99. Bodies lined up at a funeral, labeled "Funeral of people killed in air raids, Gaza, 2009"

100. Youth crying over a man's body, among other bodies, labeled "Gaza in the aftermath of an air raid, 2008"

Online questionnaire

Questions related to ideology, some included for exploratory purposes:

A. Rated on a 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree) scale:

1. My belonging to the Israeli people (Am Israel) is a central aspect of my identity

2. There is too much criticism of Israel abroad, and we as Israeli citizens must not criticize it.

3. I express my love for Israel by supporting efforts to enact positive changes in it.

4. Our existence as a group and as individuals in under constant threat.

5. Am Israel is better than other peoples in every possible way.

6. The suffering we have undergone as a people cannot be compared to the suffering of any other group.

7. Jews' sole claim to the land stems from its being their historical homeland.

B. Rated on a 1 (not at all) to 6 (very much so) scale:

8. To what extent would you say that the Palestinians have permanent and stable negative attributes?

9. To what extent would you say the Palestinians are less moral than the norm in human society?

10. To what extent would you support a peace agreement leading to a two-state solution that includes the following compromises on behalf of Israel and the Palestinians:

   a. Israel concedes the following: An Israeli return to the 1967 borders with land swaps that would allow a small portion of the settlements to remain while the others are evacuated, a return of the Arab neighborhoods in East Jerusalem to Palestinian control, accepting partial Israeli responsibility for the Palestinian refugee problem.

   b. Israel in awarded the following: An end to all Palestinian claims from Israel, including the demand to recognize the Right of Return, the establishment of a e-militarized Palestinian state, and all Arab states' recognition of Israel as the national home of the Jewish people.

   ?

Demographic information:

1. Age: ____

2. Sex: male/female

3. How would you define your political position? extreme right/right/center/left/extreme left

4. What is your religious affiliation? Jewish/Muslim/Christian/Other: _____

5. How would you define your level of religiosity? Secular/secular with some traditionalism/traditional/religious/Ultra-Orthodox.

6. The average gross income per family in Israel in 13,000 NIS. Is the income in your parents' home: much below average/a little below average/average/a little above average/much above average?

Additional analyses without adjusting for demographic variables:

The interactive influence of ideology and content on emotion generation

To examine our hypothesis that rightists and leftists would differ in their subjective emotional intensity mostly in response to depictions of harm to the outgroup, we ran two mixed effects regression models, specifying stimulus content (conflict-irrelevant, harm to the ingroup, or harm to the outgroup, dummy coded and nested within participant), ideology (mean centered), and their interaction as predictors, with either valence or arousal as the dependent variable. Using Valence ratings as an outcome ($\chi^2_{(9)} = 113.74$, $p < .0001$) , we found a significant Content $\times$ Ideology interaction, such that when harm to the outgroup was used as a reference category, Ideology's influence on Valence in response to it was significantly different from its influence on Valence in response to both conflict-irrelevant stimuli ($B = -.53$, $SE = .1$, $z = -5.27$, $p < .0001$, [CI] = [-.73, -.33]) and harm to the ingroup ($B = -.66$, $SE = .1$, $z = -6.51$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-.85, -.46]). Using harm to the ingroup as the reference category indicated no significant difference between Ideology's simple slope for this category and the one for conflict-irrelevant images ($B = .13$, $SE = .1$, $z = 1.25$, $p = .21$, [CI] = [-.07, .32]).

Further decomposition of the interaction revealed a significant simple effect for Ideology on Valence in response to harm to the outgroup: as we hypothesized, leftists experienced more negative valence than rightists in response to harm to the outgroup ($B = .48$, $SE = .1$, $z = 4.87$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [.29, .67]). Somewhat unexpectedly, the right-left

difference with regard to harm to the ingroup reached marginal significance, with rightists experiencing this content as slightly more negative than leftists (B = -.18, SE = .1, z = -1.82, p = .07, [CI] = [-.37, .01]). The simple effect for conflict-irrelevant images was non-significant (B = -.05, SE = .1, z = -.54, p = .59, [CI] = [-.25, .14]).

To demonstrate the robustness of our findings, we examined Ideology's influence on Valence in response to each of the conflict-relevant categories while holding reactions to the other category constant. To this end, we ran simple regression analyses in which each of the two Valence scores was regressed on Ideology and the other Valence score. This approach did not adversely affect the above-reported effect (B = .57, SE = .11, $t_{(80)}$ = 5.01, p < .001, [CI] = [.35, .8]), whereas regressing the ratings for ingroup harm on Ideology while adjusting for the outgroup harm ratings turned this effect significant (B = -.33, SE = .09, $t_{(80)}$ = -3.5, p = .001, [CI] = [-.52, -.14]). The latter finding indicates that ideological differences in Valence in response to outgroup harm may be masking additional ideological differences in response to ingroup harm.

The same analysis with Arousal as an outcome ($\chi^2_{(9)}$ = 93.17, p < .0001) revealed the expected significant Content × Ideology interaction, with Ideology's influence on Arousal ratings in response to harm to the outgroup significantly different from its influence on both conflict-irrelevant images (B = -.31, SE = .11, z = -2.76, p = .006, [CI] = [-.53, -.09]) and harm to the ingroup (B = -.67, SE = .11, z = -5.93, p < .001, [CI] = [-.89, -.45]). Contrary to Valence ratings, specifying harm to the ingroup as the reference category this time indicated a significant difference between Ideology's influence on ratings for this category and for conflict-irrelevant images (B = .36, SE = .11, z = 3.18, p = .001, [CI] = [.14, .58]). The trend in simple slopes obtained with Valence emerged for Arousal as well, but did not reach significance (B = .29, SE = .21, z = 1.34, p = .18, [CI] = [-.13, .71]). The slope for ingroup harm again reached marginal significance (B = -.38, SE = .21, z = -1.76, p = .08, [CI]

= [-.8, .04];), and the slope for conflict-irrelevant stimuli was non-significant (B = -.02, SE = .21, z = -.1, p = .92, [CI] = [-.44, .4]).

To further examine the robustness of these findings, we again used linear regression to regress Arousal ratings for harm to the outgroup on Ideology while adjusting for Arousal ratings for harm to the ingroup and vice versa, with similar results: Ideology's relationship to Arousal ratings for both categories was significant: ingroup harm B = -.64, SE = .13, $t_{(80)}$ = -5.13, p < .001, [CI] = [-.89, -.39]; outgroup harm B = .59, SE = .12, $t_{(80)}$ = 5.03, p < .001, [CI] = [.36, .82].

Ideology's influence on the intensity gap in responses to ingroup versus outgroup harm

Next, we wanted to examine ideological differences in the intensity gap when confronted with harm to the ingroup versus the outgroup, as these indicate the magnitude of ingroup favoritism in emotion generation—a gap that may help us predict for whom such gaps would emerge in emotion regulation choice in Study 2. To this end, we examined ideological differences in the ingroup-outgroup gap in intensity for both Valence and Arousal. Regressing the Valence difference score on Ideology (alongside the demographics variables listed above) revealed Ideology as a strong and significant predictor (B = -.66, SE = .12, $t_{(81)}$ = -5.49, p < .001, [CI] = [-.9, -.42]), indicating that the gap was smaller for leftists than for rightists, in accordance with previous findings (e.g. Waytz et al., 2016). The same analysis for the Arousal difference score yielded similar results, with leftist ideology predicting a significantly smaller Arousal gap between the two types of conflict-related stimuli (B = -.67, SE = .12, $t_{(81)}$ = -5.36, p < .001, [CI] = [-.91, -.42]). The larger intensity gaps among rightists fall in line with previous work on the ingroup-outgroup empathy gap, indicating that in the context of intractable conflict, rightists are more likely than leftists to demostrate ingroup favoritism in emotional intensity.

Study 2: Right-Left Differences in Emotion Regulation Choice

Beyond replicating the main findings obtained in Study 1, the main goal of Study 2 was to examine our second hypothesis pertaining to differences in regulatory choice. Below are details on the changes made to the online questionnaire from Study 1, as well as supplementary analyses.

Changes to the online questionnaire:

The online questionnaire, answered prior to participants' arrival in the lab, included all items above, with a slight change to the ideology item, which now included a 7-point scale: extreme right/right/moderate right/center/moderate left/left/extreme left. This was done to increase the likelihood participants would select options placing them either on the left or right, rather than the center. Two additional measures were included for exploratory purposes, all in their Hebrew versions:

- The first eight items from the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9, Kroenke & Spitzer, 2002), with frequency of the following depressive symptoms over the preceding two weeks rated on a 4-point scale (Not at all/Several days/More than half the days/Nearly every day).

- The full Trait Anxiety sub-scale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI, Spielberger, 1983), also translated into Hebrew.

For copyright reasons, the items of both measures are not included here.

Additional analyses including participants excluded due to failure to follow instructions:

The interactive influence of ideology and content on emotion generation

Consistent with our first hypothesis and replicating Study 1, a mixed effects regression model defined as in Study 1 but with emotional Intensity as the dependent variable

($\chi^2_{(9)}$ = 267.3, p < .0001) yielded a significant Content × Ideology interaction. More specifically, Ideology's influence on Intensity ratings for outgroup harm was significantly different from its influence on both conflict-irrelevant stimuli (B = -.54, SE = .09, z = -6.29, p < .001, [CI] = [-.71, -.37]) and ingroup harm (B = -.88, SE = .09, z = -10.24, p < .001, [CI] = [-1.05, -.71]), and its influence on the Intensity of responses to ingroup harm also significantly differed from its influence on the Intensity of responses to conflict-irrelevant images (B = .34, SE = .09, z = 3.95, p < .001, [CI] = [.17, .51]).

As in Study 1, decomposition of the interaction revealed that leftists experienced harm to the outgroup with significantly higher Intensity than rightists (B = .52, SE = .12, z = 4.52, p < .001, [CI] = [.3, .75]), but also experienced harm to the ingroup with significantly lower Intensity than rightists (B = -.36, SE = .12, z = -3.08, p = .002, [CI] = [-.58, -.13]). Here too, the simple effect for conflict-irrelevant images was non-significant (B = -.02, SE = .12, z = -.14, p = .89, [CI] = [-.24, .21]). To further probe the robustness of the above findings, we regressed Intensity ratings for harm to the outgroup on Ideology while adjusting for Intensity ratings for harm to the ingroup, and vice versa. We once again found significant relationships between Ideology and Intensity scores for both ingroup harm (B = -.74, SE = .1, $t_{(94)}$ = -7.33, p < .001, [CI] = [-.94, -.54]) and outgroup harm (B = .75, SE = .09, $t_{(94)}$ = 8.2, p < .001, [CI] = [.57, .93]), meaning that the above findings for each category are not explained by differences in reactions to the other category.

The interactive influence of ideology and content on emotion regulation choice

In order to examine the intensity and motivation hypotheses for the direction of right-left differences in regulatory choice, we employed the same mixed-effects regression procedure with proportion of distraction choice as the dependent variable ($\chi^2_{(9)}$ = 35.28, p = .0001). As hypothesized, the analysis revealed a significant Content × Ideology interaction, with Ideology's influence on the proportion of distraction choice when confronted with harm

to the outgroup significantly different from its influence on distraction choice for conflict-irrelevant images ($B = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $z = -3.19$, $p = .001$, [CI] = [-.06, -.02) as well as ingroup harm ($B = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $z = -2.59$, $p = .01$, [CI] = [-.06, -.01]). No such difference emerged in Ideology's influence on choice when comparing these last two categories ($B = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $z = -.6$, $p = .55$, [CI] = [-.03, .02]).

Congruent with the *intensity hypothesis*, but not the *motivation hypothesis*, when confronted with depictions of harm to the outgroup, leftists displayed a significantly greater tendency to *disengage* via distraction relative to rightists ($B = .04$, $SE = .01$, $z = 3.51$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [.02, .07]). There were no emotion regulation choice differences between rightists and leftists for the other two types of Content (conflict-irrelevant $B = .005$, $SE = .01$, $z = 0.42$, $p = .67$, [CI] = [-.02, .03]; harm to ingroup $B = .01$, $SE = .01$, $z = 1.01$, $p = .31$, [CI] = [-.01, .04]).

Nonetheless, follow-up analyses to probe the robustness of the above findings employed linear regression to examine Ideology's influence on the proportion of choice for each of the conflict-relevant categories while adjusting for the other category. These once again revealed that Ideology significantly predicts choice for both categories (ingroup harm $B = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $t_{(92)} = -2.55$, $p = .01$, [CI] = [-.05, -.006]; outgroup harm $B = .04$, $SE = .01$, $t_{(92)} = 4.31$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [.02, .06]). These findings indicate that the differences found for outgroup harm cannot be fully explained by differences for ingroup harm, but that controlling for outgroup harm reveals ideological differences in emotion regulation in response to ingroup harm as well, congruent with our findings for Intensity.

Ideology's influence on the ingroup versus outgroup harm choice gap, as mediated by intensity

As in Study 1, we also wanted to examine right-left differences in the gap between the Intensity of emotion generation in response to ingroup and outgroup harm, as well as

differences in the same gap for emotion regulation choice. Regressing the Intensity difference scores on Ideology, adjusting for our four demographic indicators, revealed a significant association ($B = -.86$, $SE = .1$, $t_{(95)} = -8.83$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-1.06, -.67]), with the gap smaller for leftists than for rightists. In other words, we found a smaller Intensity gap for ingroup versus outgroup harm among leftists than among rightists, indicating that the latter displayed greater ingroup favoritism in Intensity than the former. The same analysis to probe ingroup favoritism in emotion regulation choice, employing the difference score for proportion of distraction choice as the dependent variable, also yielded a significant association with Ideology ($B = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $t_{(93)} = -3.8$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-.06, -.02]). More specifically, the difference in the tendency to choose distraction for ingroup versus outgroup harm was bigger for rightists than for leftists, congruent with the greater magnitude of the intensity gap identified among rightists.

Next, we wanted to examine whether right-left differences in the intensity gap in emotion generation in response to ingroup versus outgroup harm may account for the similar differences found in emotion regulation choice, as per our hypothesis that differences in intensity would translate to differences in choice. We ran a simple mediation analyses, empolying Model 4 of the PROCESS command (Hayes, 2013) with 5,000 iterations, with Ideology as the independent variable, the Intensity difference score as a mediating variable, and the emotion regulation choice proportion difference score as our dependent variable, adjusting for the demographic indicators above. This analysis yielded a marginally significant indirect effect (a×b = -.02, $SE = .01$, [CI] = [-.04, .001]; Sobel a×b = -.02, $SE = .01$, $z = -1.85$, $p = .07$), with Ideology's total effect on the difference in choice scores significant ($B = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $t_{(93)} = -3.8$, $p = .0003$, [CI] = [-.06, -.02]), but its direct effect no longer significant ($B = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $t_{(92)} = -1.59$, $p = .12$, [CI] = [-.05, .005]). In other words, ideological differences in ingroup favoritism in emotion generation fully mediated (to a marginally

significant degree) Ideology's influence on ingroup favoritism in emotion regulation choice patterns, with rightists ideology predicting a greater gap in the proportion of distraction choice through a greater gap in subjective Intensity between ingroup and outgroup harm.

Additional analyses without adjusting for demographic variables:

The interactive influence of ideology and content on emotion generation

Consistent with our first hypothesis and replicating Study 1, a mixed effects regression model defined as in Study 1 but with emotional Intensity as the dependent variable and with no controls ($\chi^2_{(5)} = 256.36$, $p < .0001$) yielded a significant Content $\times$ Ideology interaction. More specifically, Ideology's influence on Intensity ratings for outgroup harm was significantly different from its influence on both conflict-irrelevant stimuli ($B = -.55$, $SE = .09$, $z = -6.38$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-.72, -.38]) and ingroup harm ($B = -.88$, $SE = .09$, $z = -10.22$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-1.05, -.71]), and its influence on the Intensity of responses to ingroup harm also significantly differed from its influence on the Intensity of responses to conflict-irrelevant images ($B = .33$, $SE = .09$, $z = 3.84$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [.16, .5]).

As in Study 1, decomposition of the interaction revealed that leftists experienced harm to the outgroup with significantly higher Intensity than rightists ($B = .62$, $SE = .11$, $z = 5.53$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [.4, .84]), but also experienced harm to the ingroup with significantly lower Intensity than rightists ($B = -.26$, $SE = .11$, $z = -2.3$, $p = .02$, [CI] = [-.48, -.04 potentially indicating we may find differences in emotion regulation choice for this content as well as for harm to the outgroup. As in Study 1, the simple effect for conflict-irrelevant images was non-significant ($B = .07$, $SE = .11$, $z = .64$, $p = .52$, [CI] = [-.15, .29]). To further probe the robustness of the above findings, we regressed Intensity ratings for harm to the outgroup on Ideology while adjusting for Intensity ratings for harm to the ingroup, and vice versa. We once again found significant relationships between Ideology and Intensity scores for both ingroup harm ($B = -.74$, $SE = .1$, $t_{(96)} = -7.43$, $p < .001$, [CI] = [-.94, -.54]) and outgroup harm

(B = .79, SE = .08, $t_{(96)}$ = 9.55, p < .001, [CI] = [.63, .96]), meaning that the above findings for each category are not explained by differences in reactions to the other category.

The interactive influence of ideology and content on emotion regulation choice

In order to examine the *intensity* and *motivation* hypotheses for the direction of right-left differences in regulatory choice, we employed the same mixed-effects regression procedure with proportion of distraction choice as the dependent variable ($\chi^2_{(5)}$ = 30.08, p < .0001). As hypothesized, the analysis revealed a significant Content × Ideology interaction, with Ideology's influence on the proportion of distraction choice when confronted with harm to the outgroup significantly different from its influence on distraction choice for conflict-irrelevant images (B = -.04, SE = .01, z = -3.37, p = .001, [CI] = [-.07, -.02) as well as ingroup harm (B = -.03, SE = .01, z = -2.63, p = .01, [CI] = [-.06, -.01]). No such difference emerged in Ideology's influence on choice when comparing these last two categories (B = -.01, SE = .01, z = -.74, p = .46, [CI] = [-.03, .02]).

Congruent with the *intensity hypothesis*, but not the *motivation hypothesis*, when confronted with depictions of harm to the outgroup, leftists displayed a significantly *greater* tendency to *disengage* via distraction relative to rightists (B = .03, SE = .01, z = 2.95, p = .003, [CI] = [.01, .06]). There were no emotion regulation choice differences between rightists and leftists for the other two types of Content (conflict-irrelevant B = -.008, SE = .01, z = -0.69, p = .49, [CI] = [-.03, .0]; harm to ingroup B = .001, SE = .01, z = .11, p = .91, [CI] = [-.02, .02]), despite the above findings indicating some right-left differences in intensity in response to this category.

Nonetheless, follow-up analyses to probe the robustness of the above findings employed linear regression to examine Ideology's influence on the proportion of choice for each of the conflict-relevant categories while adjusting for the other category. These once again revealed that Ideology significantly predicts choice for both categories (ingroup harm *B*

= -.02, SE = .01, $t_{(94)}$ = -2.33, p = .02, [CI] = [-.04, -.003]; outgroup harm B = .03, SE = .01,

$t_{(94)}$ = 3.64, p < .001, [CI] = [.02, .05]). These findings indicate that the differences found for

outgroup harm cannot be fully explained by differences for ingroup harm, but that controlling

for outgroup harm reveals ideological differences in emotion regulation in response to

ingroup harm as well, congruent with our findings for Intensity.

Ideology's influence on the ingroup versus outgroup harm choice gap, as mediated by

intensity

As in Study 1, we also wanted to examine right-left differences in the gap between the

Intensity of emotion generation in response to ingroup and outgroup harm, as well as

differences in the same gap for emotion regulation choice. Regressing the Intensity difference

scores on Ideology, adjusting for our four demographic indicators, revealed a significant

association (B = -.88, SE = .09, $t_{(97)}$ = -9.66, p < .001, [CI] = [-1.06, -.7]), with the gap smaller

for leftists than for rightists. In other words, we found a smaller Intensity gap for ingroup

versus outgroup harm among leftists than among rightists, indicating that the latter displayed

greater ingroup favoritism in Intensity than the former. The same analysis to probe ingroup

favoritism in emotion regulation choice, employing the difference score for proportion of

distraction choice as the dependent variable, also yielded a significant association with

Ideology (B = -.03, SE = .01, $t_{(95)}$ = -3.34, p = .001, [CI] = [-.05, -.01]). More specifically, the

difference in the tendency to choose distraction for ingroup versus outgroup harm was bigger

for rightists than for leftists, congruent with the greater magnitude of the intensity gap

identified among rightists.

Next, we wanted to examine whether right-left differences in the intensity gap in

emotion generation in response to ingroup versus outgroup harm may account for the similar

differences found in emotion regulation choice, as per our hypothesis that differences in

intensity would translate to differences in choice. We ran a simple mediation analyses,

empolying Model 4 of the PROCESS command (Hayes, 2013) with 5,000 iterations, with

Ideology as the independent variable, the Intensity difference score as a mediating variable,

and the emotion regulation choice proportion difference score as our dependent variable. The

analysis yielded a marginally significant indirect effect (a×b = -.02, SE = .01, [CI] = [-.04,

.004]; Sobel a×b = -.02, SE = .01, z = -1.87, p = .06), with Ideology's total effect on the

difference in choice scores significant (B = -.03, SE = .01, $t_{(95)}$ = -3.3, p = .001, [CI] = [-.05, -

.01]), but its direct effect no longer significant (B = -.01, SE = .01, $t_{(94)}$ = -1.09, p = .28, [CI] =

[-.04, .01]). In other words, ideological differences in ingroup favoritism in emotion

generation fully mediated (albeit to a marginally significant extent) Ideology's influence on

ingroup favoritism in emotion regulation choice patterns, with rightists ideology predicting a

greater gap in the proportion of distraction choice through a greater gap in subjective

Intensity between ingroup and outgroup harm.