**Appendix A: Hostage Negotiation Scenario**

In the large-difference condition, the kidnapped soldier scenario read as follows (text for the small-difference condition appears in parentheses):

You are a minister in the Israeli government and a member of the security cabinet. In early January, Israel was shocked by news of a terrorist attack in an army base in the north. During the ensuing shootout three Israeli soldiers were wounded and one terrorist killed. The terrorists withdrew from the base taking with them one of the wounded soldiers. According to eye-witnesses, the kidnapped soldier, Sergeant Ronen Sade, was slightly injured. Despite IDF pursuit of the terrorists, they were able to cross the border and disappear into Lebanon. Reports of the kidnapping gave rise to intense public debate in Israel. Some argued that ground troops should be immediately sent into Lebanon. Others stressed that without knowing the soldier’s whereabouts a ground operation would be futile and needlessly risk lives. Many conjured the trauma caused by Gilad Shalit’s abduction and others mentioned the tragic fate of Ron Arad. Although no organization officially claimed responsibility for the kidnapping, Israeli intelligence services suspected an extremist organization close to Hezbollah.

Five days later the Swiss Embassy in Iran received a message from the kidnappers who identified themselves as the "Islamic Liberation Army". The message detailed the terrorists' demands in return for releasing the soldier. As a sign-of-life of Sadeh, the terrorists attached a video, in which, apart from a bandaged hand, he appeared to be in satisfactory health.

The kidnappers demanded the release of 400 (660) Palestinian prisoners held in Israel, of which 5 (20) were serious offenders "with blood on their hands." Following this message, numerous consultations were held by Israeli security forums, but no consensus was achieved. As a result Israel did not respond to the terrorists demands, but rather continued its efforts to enlist immediate international intervention.

In the absence of an Israeli response, the Islamic Liberation Army severed contact with the Swiss embassy and no further information regarding the soldier surfaced.

Today, three months later, the Swiss embassy in Iran has received a new message. In return for the soldier, the kidnappers are now demanding release of 700 Palestinian prisoners of which 25 have "with blood on their hands." If their demands are not accepted within three days they will cut all communication and “the blood of the soldier will be on the hands of Israel.” Again the message is accompanied with of sign-of-life video of the soldier, holding a newspaper with the current date.

You are asked to rate your attitude regarding acceptance of the offer.

In the control version of the scenario the paragraph entailing a previous rejected offer was omitted.

**Appendix B: Territorial Dispute Scenario**

The large-difference version of the scenario read as follows (text for the small-difference version in parentheses)

You are a senior government minister in Kibagho, a small country in Central Africa. Since gaining independence in 1974, Kibagho has been involved in a militarized territorial dispute with its neighboring state, Naphura. Although historically belonging to Naphora, the disputed territory was given to Kibago when both states gained independence from France. Despite its small size, the territory is important to both countries due to its abundance in natural resources. To disrupt Kibagho’s access to the resources, Naphora troops have been continuously shelling the area triggering military response from Kibagho. Each year about 300 soldiers from both sides are killed in the hostilities and both parties have incurred high economic costs as a result of the conflict.

In 2011 the French government had sent the experienced statesman Edmond Shantel to the region to negotiate a settlement, after which the French mediator had presented to your government Naphora's offer. According to the proposal Naphora had agreed to an immediate ceasefire and peace agreement if Kibagho returned 40% (80%) of the disputed territory to Naphora. In addition, Naphora had offered to grant Kibagho with preferred trade terms upon return of the territory, for the natural resources found on the disputed territory. France had undertaken to guarantee the agreement and favor Kibagho with substantial economic aid.

News of the proposal had triggered intense public debate in Kibagho. Some had doubted Naphora's intentions, stressing that the new border would pass near the capital of Kibagho, and that despite the promise of preferential trade conditions, Kibagho would depend on Nephora for vital natural resources. On the other hand, supporters of the proposal had emphasized France’s offer to guarantee the settlement and that French financial aid would help strengthen the economy and move the country forward.

Despite efforts by your government to seriously consider the offer, due to severe natural disasters in the region and governmental instability, the proposal had not been discussed and the French envoy left the region. Consequently, the violent conflict continued, and the number of casualties on both sides increased monthly.

Two weeks ago, one year after the departure of the French envoy, Naphora has renewed contacts with the French mediator and communicated a new settlement proposal. According to the current proposal Naphora will immediately stop hostilities and sign a peace agreement, if your government returns 85% of the disputed land. As before, Naphora will grant Kibagho favorable trade conditions and France will guarantee the settlement and provide significant financial assistance if your country accepts the settlement.

You are asked to rate your attitude regarding acceptance of the offer.

In the control version of the scenario the paragraph entailing a previous rejected offer was omitted.