**Method**

Study 2 analyzed the effects of moral conviction manipulation using a between-subjects design. Our measures were collected after the moral conviction intervention, with support for a given highly polarized topic as our main outcome measure. Participants were given a survey, then were randomized into one of four moral conviction manipulations or a control condition. The Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri reviewed and approved all submitted materials for Study 2.

***Participants***

A total of 125 undergraduate students 18 years of age or older at the University of Missouri participated in this study. Participants were recruited through an online survey platform and were offered psychology course credit in exchange for their participation. For this study, we did not collect any demographic information.

***Materials and Procedure***

To manipulate the perception of moral conviction, participants were randomized into a ‘moral responsibility’, ‘moral piggybacking’, ‘pragmatic’, ‘hedonic’, or control condition. The condition that our participants are assigned to is our independent variable (IV). In all four intervention conditions, participants were asked to read a brief essay on each of our four highly polarized topics and then complete the outcome measures. Participants in the ‘moral responsibility’ condition were given essays that consisted of language emphasizing moral concepts such as ‘obligation’ or ‘responsibility’, and explicitly emphasizing moral costs and benefits. Participants in the ‘moral piggybacking’ condition were given essays that directly linked the highly polarized topic to another commonly understood moral concept, such as ‘freedom of speech’, ‘justice for all’, or the ‘inherent value of human life’. Participants in the ‘pragmatic’ condition were given essays that directly highlighted the personal economic and rational benefits, such as reduced taxes, increased income, or increased health. Participants in the ‘hedonic’ condition were given essays that emphasized personal enjoyment or pleasure based benefits such as ‘improved mood and health’ or ‘visiting a beautiful beach’. Finally, participants in the control condition were not presented with any essays, and only gave answers to the outcome measures. All essays were readable at a high school level, as assessed by a Flesh-Kincaid readability score, additionally, essays within categories had comparable word counts.

***Measures***

**Primary Outcome.** Moral conviction levels regarding the level of support for ‘highly polarized issue’ were assessed using eight items, scored as an average, with the second item reverse scored (e.g., My position on [highly polarized issue] is a moral stance). All items were captured as continuous variables ranging from strong disagreement (-50), to neither agree nor disagree (0), to strong agreement (50). In addition, participant support levels for each ‘highly polarized issue’ were captured using similar methods to Study 1, except support was scored from strong disagreement (-50), to neither agree nor disagree (0), to strong agreement (50) with the following statements: “Greenhouse gas emissions generated by human activity has and will continue to change Earth's climate” (*Climate Change*), “The US government needs to implement Universal Health Care because basic population needs are not being met.” (*Universal Healthcare*), “Capital Punishment (the Death Penalty) is necessary in the US” (*Death Penalty*), and “Regular exercise is necessary for Americans.” (*Exercise*).

Additionally, participants were assessed on openness to belief change on each highly polarized issue (e.g., How open are you to changing your mind about [highly polarized issue]). Participant agreement with this statement was measured on a continuous scale ranging from extremely unlikely (-50), to neither likely nor unlikely (0), to extremely likely (50). Furthermore, participants were also measured on how persuasive each essay was (e.g., How persuasive was the above essay on your beliefs regarding [highly polarized issue]). Agreement with this statement was measured on a continuous scale ranging from extremely unpersuasive (-50), to neither persuasive nor unpersuasive (0), to extremely persuasive (50).

***Power and Statistical Analysis***

An adequate sample size of 157 was determined using G-power 3.1.9.7 with the following parameters: ANOVA – repeated measures, an effect size of .35, an alpha of .05, and a power of .95, for a linear multiple regression. The four beliefs that were surveyed (climate change, death penalty, support for UHC, exercise) were all treated as continuous variables. We examined the effects of experimental condition (four moral conviction intervention conditions and a control) on our outcome measures. We examined the main effect. All tests were conducted in R and considered statistically significant when P <.05.

***Study 2 Hypothesis:***

Hypothesis 1: The moral conviction manipulation will result in different levels of support for highly polarized issues.

Hypothesis 2: The ‘moral piggybacking’ and ‘moral responsibility’ interventions (H2a) will result in an increase in moral conviction behind belief for highly polarized issues and the ‘pragmatic’ and ‘hedonic’ interventions will result in a decrease in moral conviction behind belief for highly polarized issues.