**Supplementary Materials**

**Appendix**

**Table A1.** The Effect of Group Empathy on One’s Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* – Sensitivity Analyses with Parsimonious and Expanded Models

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parsimonious Model | | Expanded Model | |
|  | β | S.E. | β | S.E. |
| Group Empathy | 1.83\*\*\* | .36 | 1.00\* | .51 |
| Party ID (Democrat-Republican) |  |  | -1.42\*\*\* | .34 |
| Ideology (Liberal-Conservative) |  |  | -2.68\*\*\* | .64 |
| Female | .14 | .15 | .63\*\* | .20 |
| Minority Race/Ethnicity | .47\* | .19 | .25 | .23 |
| Age | -.52 | .34 | 1.44\*\* | .48 |
| Education | .25 | .29 | -.17 | .33 |
| Income | .17 | .38 | -.54 | .48 |
| Church Attendance | -2.64\*\*\* | .26 | -.46 | .40 |
| Religiosity |  |  | -2.42\*\*\* | .49 |
| Catholic |  |  | .21 | .20 |
| Married |  |  | .18 | .21 |
| Knows someone who had abortion |  |  | .18 | .23 |
| Has children under 18 |  |  | -.22 | .23 |
| Fully Employed |  |  | .24 | .20 |
| *Cut1* | -1.04 | .37 | -3.70 | .59 |
| *Cut2* | -.31 | .35 | -2.79 | .56 |
| *Cut3* | .43 | .35 | -1.92 | .54 |
| *Cut4* | .77 | .35 | -1.41 | .53 |
| *N* | 852 |  | 692 |  |

*Note.* Coefficients estimated via ordered logistic regression. Data are weighted. All variables in the models are linearized to run from 0 to 1. †p ≤ .10, \*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, and \*\*\*p ≤ .001, two-tailed.

*Source:* 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Table A2.** The Main Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* and Group Empathy on Voter Mobilization – Sensitivity Analyses with Parsimonious and Expanded Models

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Campaign Participation | | | | Voter Turnout | | | |
|  | Parsimonious Model | | Expanded Model | | Parsimonious Model | | Expanded Model | |
|  | β | S.E. | β | S.E. | β | S.E. | β | S.E. |
| Oppose Overturning *Roe v. Wade* | .01 | .02 | -.03 | .03 | -.02 | .27 | -.45 | .37 |
| Group Empathy | .13\*\*\* | .03 | .12\*\*\* | .03 | .94\* | .43 | 1.13\* | .55 |
| Party ID (Democrat-Republican) |  |  | -.03 | .03 |  |  | .06 | .41 |
| Ideology (Liberal-Conservative) |  |  | -.08\* | .04 |  |  | -.65 | .56 |
| Female | -.04\*\* | .01 | -.05\*\*\* | .02 | -.32 | .20 | -.14 | .24 |
| Minority Race/Ethnicity | -.02† | .01 | -.03† | .02 | -.46\* | .21 | -.58\* | .26 |
| Age | .07\*\* | .03 | .07\* | .04 | 3.01\*\*\* | .46 | 3.46\*\*\* | .63 |
| Education | .09\*\* | .03 | .07\* | .03 | 1.53\*\*\* | .35 | 1.14\*\* | .41 |
| Income | .04 | .04 | .05 | .05 | 1.50\*\* | .48 | .24 | .63 |
| Church Attendance | .02 | .02 | .07\* | .03 | -.07 | .32 | -.11 | .52 |
| Religiosity |  |  | -.04 | .03 |  |  | -.42 | .46 |
| Catholic |  |  | .02 | .02 |  |  | .52\* | .26 |
| Married |  |  | -.01 | .02 |  |  | .29 | .28 |
| Knows someone who had abortion |  |  | .06\*\*\* | .02 |  |  | .42† | .24 |
| Has children under 18 |  |  | .0002 | .02 |  |  | .24 | .34 |
| Fully Employed |  |  | -.02 | .02 |  |  | .17 | .28 |
| Constant | -.04 | .02 | .05 | .04 | -1.69\*\*\* | .45 | -1.03 | .69 |
| *N* | 852 |  | 692 |  | 852 |  | 692 |  |

*Note.* Coefficients for campaign participation estimated via OLS regression and for voter turnout via binary logistic regression. Data are weighted. All variables in the models are linearized to run from 0 to 1. †p ≤ .10, \*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, and \*\*\*p ≤ .001, two-tailed.

*Source:* 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Table A3.** The Main and Interactive Effects of Support for Abortion Rights and Group Empathy on Voter Mobilization – Robustness Checks with the 2020 ANES Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Campaign Participation | | | | | Voter Turnout | | | |
|  | Main Model | | | Interaction Model | | Main Model | | Interaction Model | |
|  | β | S.E. | | β | S.E. | β | S.E. | β | S.E. |
| Group Empathy\*Support for Abortion Rights |  | |  | .20\*\*\* | .04 |  |  | 3.09\*\*\* | .68 |
| Support for Abortion Rights | -.02† | | .01 | -.13 | .02 | -.17 | .19 | -1.90 | .42 |
| Group Empathy | .11\*\*\* | | .01 | -.03 | .03 | 1.12\*\*\* | .27 | -1.01 | .52 |
| Party ID (Democrat-Republican) | -.01 | | .01 | -.01 | .01 | -.41\* | .21 | -.43\* | .21 |
| Ideology (Liberal-Conservative) | -.06\*\*\* | | .02 | -.05\*\*\* | .02 | .29 | .30 | .44 | .30 |
| Female | -.02\*\*\* | | .01 | -.02\*\*\* | .01 | .07 | .11 | .06 | .11 |
| Minority Race/Ethnicity |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Blacks* | -.03\*\* | | .01 | -.03\*\* | .01 | -.04 | .20 | -.02 | .20 |
| *Latinos* | -.04\*\*\* | | .01 | -.03\*\*\* | .01 | -.61\*\*\* | .16 | -.60\*\*\* | .16 |
| *Asians/Native Hawaiian* | -.05\*\*\* | | .01 | -.04\*\*\* | .01 | -.45 | .29 | -.44 | .29 |
| *Native Americans* | -.05\*\* | | .02 | -.05\*\* | .02 | -.95\*\* | .35 | -.99\*\* | .33 |
| *Multiple Races* | -.02 | | .02 | -.02 | .02 | -.58\* | .29 | -.58\* | .29 |
| Age | .08\*\*\* | | .01 | .08\*\*\* | .01 | 1.70\*\*\* | .21 | 1.76\*\*\* | .21 |
| Education | .06\*\*\* | | .01 | .06\*\*\* | .01 | 1.80\*\*\* | .24 | 1.78\*\*\* | .23 |
| Income | .05\*\*\* | | .01 | .05\*\*\* | .01 | 1.69\*\*\* | .20 | 1.71\*\*\* | .19 |
| Church Attendance | .01 | | .01 | .01 | .01 | .52\*\* | .18 | .56\*\* | .18 |
| Constant | .04\* | | .02 | .11\*\*\* | .02 | -1.72\*\*\* | .34 | -.65† | .40 |
| *N* | 6,288 | |  | 6,288 |  | 6,287 |  | 6,287 |  |

*Note.* Coefficients for campaign participation estimated via OLS regression and for voter turnout via binary logistic regression. Data are weighted. Whites are the baseline comparison category for race/ethnicity. All variables in the models are linearized to run from 0 to 1. †p ≤ .10, \*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, and \*\*\*p ≤ .001, two-tailed.

*Source:* 2020 American National Election Study

**Table A4.** TheCorrelation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Oppose *Dobbs* | Group Empathy | PID | Ideology | Female | Minority | Age | Education | Income | Church Attend. |
| Oppose *Dobbs* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Group Empathy | .125 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Party ID | -.445 | -.204 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideology | -.536 | -.242 | .651 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | .062 | .115 | .009 | .031 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minority | .083 | -.115 | -.268 | -.168 | .009 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Age | -.046 | -.073 | .172 | .234 | .061 | -.207 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Education | .032 | .214 | -.075 | -.082 | .020 | -.224 | .018 | 1 |  |  |
| Income | .024 | .114 | .030 | -.018 | -.094 | -.212 | .026 | .472 | 1 |  |
| Church Attend. | -.439 | .075 | .236 | .339 | .046 | -.003 | -.032 | .083 | .045 | 1 |

*Note.* Data are weighted.

Source: 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Table A5.** The Main Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* on Voter Mobilization – Sensitivity Analyses with Binary and Parsimonious Models (with Group Empathy Excluded)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Campaign Participation | | | | Voter Turnout | | | |
|  | Binary  Model | | Parsimonious Model | | Binary  Model | | Parsimonious Model | |
|  | β | S.E. | β | S.E. | β | S.E. | β | S.E. |
| Oppose Overturning *Roe v. Wade* | -.006 | .02 | -.02 | .02 | .08 | .19 | -.08 | .38 |
| Group Empathy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Party ID (Democrat-Republican) |  |  | -.04† | .03 |  |  | .13 | .38 |
| Ideology (Liberal-Conservative) |  |  | -.10\*\*\* | .04 |  |  | -.96† | .56 |
| Female |  |  | -.02† | .01 |  |  | -.18 | .22 |
| Minority Race/Ethnicity |  |  | -.05\*\* | .02 |  |  | -.47\* | .24 |
| Age |  |  | .09\*\* | .03 |  |  | 3.03\*\*\* | .50 |
| Education |  |  | .08\*\* | .03 |  |  | 1.28\*\*\* | .39 |
| Income |  |  | .05 | .04 |  |  | 1.23\* | .51 |
| Church Attendance |  |  | .04† | .02 |  |  | .12 | .36 |
| Constant |  |  | .11\*\*\* | .03 |  |  | -.42 | .58 |
| *N* | 1,000 |  | 775 |  | 1,000 |  | 775 |  |

*Note.* Coefficients for campaign participation estimated via OLS regression and for voter turnout via binary logistic regression. Data are weighted. All variables in the models are linearized to run from 0 to 1. †p ≤ .10, \*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, and \*\*\*p ≤ .001, two-tailed.

*Source:* 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Table A6.** The Main and Interactive Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* and Group Empathy on Vote Choice

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Main Model | | Interaction Model | |
|  | β | S.E. | β | S.E. |
| Group Empathy  \*Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* |  |  | -.10 | .07 |
| Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* | .21\*\*\* | .03 | .27\*\*\* | .05 |
| Group Empathy | .11\* | .04 | .15\*\*\* | .05 |
| Party ID (Democrat-Republican) | -.66\*\*\* | .04 | -.67\*\*\* | .04 |
| Ideology (Liberal-Conservative) | -.16\*\*\* | .05 | -.17\*\*\* | .05 |
| Female | -.04\* | .02 | -.04\* | .02 |
| Minority Race/Ethnicity | .07\*\*\* | .02 | .07\*\*\* | .02 |
| Age | -.12\*\*\* | .04 | -.12\*\* | .04 |
| Education | .01 | .03 | .004 | .03 |
| Income | -.01 | .04 | -.01 | .04 |
| Church Attendance | .07\* | .03 | .06\* | .03 |
| *Constant* | .77\*\*\* | .06 | .75\*\*\* | .06 |
| *N* | 649 |  | 649 |  |

*Note.* Coefficients estimated via OLS regression. Data are weighted. All variables in the models are linearized to run from 0 to 1. †p ≤ .10, \*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, and \*\*\*p ≤ .001, two-tailed. The dependent variable “Vote Choice” is based on the survey question that asked those respondents who had confirmed voting in the 2022 midterms whether they voted (on a 5-point scale) “entirely for Democrats, mostly for Democrats, about equally for Democrats and Republicans, mostly for Republicans, or entirely for Republicans?” (recoded to range from “0” for “entirely Republicans” to “1” for “entirely Democrats”).

*Source:* 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Figure A1.** The Two-Way Interactive Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* and Gender on Campaign Participation

****

*Note.* Lines represent the marginal effects of opposition to overturning *Roe v. Wade* on one’s campaign participation (OLS regression) among males vs. females, with controls for group empathy, party identification, ideology, race/ethnicity, education, income, and church attendance. The shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

Source: 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Figure A2.** The Interactive Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* and Group Empathy on Voter Turnout – Sensitivity Analyses



*Note.* Lines represent the marginal effects of opposition to overturning *Roe v. Wade* on one’s probability to vote under three different levels of group empathy (minimum, mean, and maximum), based on the parsimonious logistic regression model in Table A2. The shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

Source: 2023 Group Empathy Study

**Figure A3.** The Interactive Effects of Support for Abortion Rights and Group Empathy on Campaign Participation – The 2020 Presidential Elections

****

*Note.* Lines represent the marginal effects of support for abortion rights on campaign participation under three different levels of group empathy (minimum, mean, and maximum), based on the OLS regression interaction model in Table A3. The shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

*Source:* 2020 American National Election Study

**Figure A4.** The Interactive Effects of Support for Abortion Rights and Group Empathy on Voter Turnout – The 2020 Presidential Elections

****

*Note.* Lines represent the marginal effects of support for abortion rights on one’s probability to vote under three different levels of group empathy (minimum, mean, and maximum), based on the logistic regression interaction model in Table A3. The shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

*Source:* 2020 American National Election Study

**Figure A5.** The Interactive Effects of Opposition to Overturning *Roe v. Wade* and Group Empathy on Vote Choice



*Note.* Lines represent the marginal effects of opposition to overturning *Roe v. Wade* on one’s vote choice under three different levels of group empathy (minimum, mean, and maximum), based on the interaction model in Table A5. The shaded areas represent 90% confidence intervals. The dependent variable “Vote Choice” is based on the survey question that asked those respondents who had confirmed voting in the 2022 midterms whether they voted (on a 5-point scale) “entirely for Democrats, mostly for Democrats, about equally for Democrats and Republicans, mostly for Republicans, or entirely for Republicans?” (recoded to range from “0” for “entirely Republicans” to “1” for “entirely Democrats”).

Source: 2023 Group Empathy Study