**Supplemental Materials**

**Additional Pre-Registered Analyses**

**Attitude Importance.** To test whether any differences in moral conviction reflect actual moralization of the attitude rather than a general “strengthening” of the attitude, we re-ran the analysis testing our main hypothesis also controlling for attitude importance. Specifically, we conducted a 2(Wave: baseline moral conviction, post-manipulation moral conviction) by 4(Emotion condition: disgust, anger, neutral writing prompt control, and no writing prompt control) mixed analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the participants' reported level of moral conviction as a within-subjects factor and baseline attitude importance as a continuous control variable (mean-centered). Results indicated that the main effect of time remained significant, *F*(1, 701) = 12.17, *p* < .001, η2p= .005, η2G = .02, and that the hypothesized interaction between moral conviction and experimental emotion manipulation condition remained not significant when controlling for attitude importance, *F*(3, 701) = 0.69, *p* = .56, η2p= .003, η2G = .001.

**Political Orientation.** To test whether the possible moralization effects of disgust were stronger for political conservatives compared to liberals, we re-ran the analyses testing our main hypothesis to see if they were moderated by political orientation. Specifically, we conducted a 2(Wave: baseline moral conviction, post-manipulation moral conviction) by 4(Emotion condition: disgust, anger, neutral writing prompt control, and no writing prompt control) by political orientation (continuous variable, midpoint centered) mixed analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the participants' reported level of moral conviction as a within-subjects factor. Results indicated that the main effect of time remained significant, *F*(1, 698) = 12.38, *p* < .001, η2p= .02, η2G = .003, and that the hypothesized interaction between moral conviction and experimental emotion manipulation condition remained not significant when controlling for political orientation, *F*(3, 698) = 0.86, *p* = .46, η2p= .004, η2G = .001. Furthermore, political orientation did not moderate the effect of time, *F*(1, 698) = 2.09, *p* = .15, η2p= .003, η2G = .001, experimental emotion manipulation condition, *F*(3, 698) = 1.81, *p* = .14, η2p= .008, η2G = .001, nor the hypothesized interaction between moral conviction and experimental emotion manipulation condition, *F*(3, 698) = 1.05, *p* = .37, η2p= .004, η2G = .001.

**Disgust Sensitivity**. To test whether the possible moralization effects of disgust were stronger for people high in disgust sensitivity compared to low, we re-ran the analyses testing our main hypothesis to see if they were moderated by disgust sensitivity. Specifically, we conducted a 2(Wave: baseline moral conviction, post-manipulation moral conviction) by 4(Emotion condition: disgust, anger, neutral writing prompt control, and no writing prompt control) by disgust sensitivity (continuous variable, mean centered) mixed analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the participants' reported level of moral conviction as a within-subjects factor. Results indicated that the main effect of time remained significant, *F*(1, 698) =11.79, *p* < .001, η2p= .02, η2G = .003, and that the hypothesized interaction between moral conviction and experimental emotion manipulation condition remained not significant when controlling for disgust sensitivity, *F*(3, 698) = 1.02, *p* = .39, η2p= .004, η2G = .001. Furthermore, disgust sensitivity did not moderate the effect of time, *F*(1, 698) = 2.22, *p* = .14, η2p= .003, η2G = .001, experimental emotion manipulation condition, *F*(3, 698) = 0.70, *p* = .55, η2p= .003, η2G = .001, or the hypothesized interaction between moral conviction and experimental emotion manipulation condition, *F*(3, 698) = 0.57, *p* = .63, η2p= .002, η2G < .001.

**Coding of Suspicious Responses at Wave 1**

During data collection for wave 1, we noticed that some participants appeared to be providing suspicious or nonsensical responses to our open-ended question about “what they had heard” about the water crisis. To deal with this issue, we decided to systematically code the participants’ answers for those that should be dropped. To do this, the second author first looked through the responses and created a coding scheme for different categories of suspicious responses. The response categories are given below along with example responses for that category:

1. **Incoherent responses**: “I heard the good newses”, “Types: Water Wise, Activist Errors, Shallow Answers, Clearing the Water”
2. **Responses cut and pasted from an online source:** Wikipedia, “water 4 kid’s”, “Aluminum Water Bottles”, news articles, “Protecting Our Oceans, Waves, and Beaches Since 1984.”
3. **Short non sequitur responses**: “Good”, “nice”, “very good”, “news”, “good memory”, “great”, “nice person”, “save water”, “yes”, “no”
4. **Other**

Once these categories were created, the first and third authors independently coded the open-ended data. The agreement between the coders was adequate (Kappa = .794). All disagreements were resolved through discussion between the three authors. Ultimately, 91 participants (~8%) were coded to be dropped from the sample due to suspicious responding.

**Table S1**

*Results of the Exploratory Cross-lagged Path Model*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Path Estimates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | W2 Moral Conviction | | |  | W2 Disgust | | |  | W2 Anger | | |  | W2 Sadness | | |  | W2 Harm | | |
| Wave 1 Predictor | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |
| W1 MC | 0.60 | 0.03 | < .001 |  | 0.19 | 0.05 | < .001 |  | 0.28 | 0.05 | < .001 |  | 0.22 | 0.05 | < .001 |  | 0.09 | 0.03 | < .001 |
| W1 Disgust | 0.04 | 0.03 | .22 |  | 0.55 | 0.02 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Anger | 0.04 | 0.03 | .12 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.53 | 0.02 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Sadness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.54 | 0.03 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Harm | 0.15 | 0.04 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.58 | 0.03 | < .001 |
|  | Covariance and Variance Estimates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | W1 Moral Conviction | | |  | W1 Disgust | | |  | W1 Anger | | |  | W1 Sadness | | |  | W1 Harm | | |
| Wave 1 Predictor | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |
| W1 MC | 0.95 | 0.05 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Disgust | 0.64 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 2.94 | 0.16 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Anger | 0.81 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 2.39 | 0.15 | < .001 |  | 3.23 | 0.17 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Sadness | 0.66 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 2.31 | 0.14 | < .001 |  | 2.36 | 0.15 | < .001 |  | 3.19 | 0.17 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |
| W1 Harm | 0.29 | 0.03 | < .001 |  | 0.44 | 0.05 | < .001 |  | 0.62 | 0.06 | < .001 |  | 0.52 | 0.05 | < .001 |  | 0.57 | 0.03 | < .001 |
|  | Covariance and Residual Variance Estimates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | W2 Moral Conviction | | |  | W2 Disgust | | |  | W2 Anger | | |  | W2 Sadness | | |  | W2 Harm | | |
| Wave 2 Outcome | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |
| W2 MC | 0.57 | 0.03 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W2 Disgust | 0.17 | 0.04 | < .001 |  | 1.55 | 0.08 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W2 Anger | 0.22 | 0.04 | < .001 |  | 1.05 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 1.52 | 0.08 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W2 Sadness | 0.14 | 0.04 | < .001 |  | 0.98 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 0.85 | 0.07 | < .001 |  | 1.71 | 0.09 | < .001 |  |  |  |  |
| W2 Harm | 0.09 | 0.02 | < .001 |  | 0.16 | 0.03 | < .001 |  | 0.22 | 0.03 | < .001 |  | 0.17 | 0.03 | < .001 |  | 0.36 | 0.02 | < .001 |
|  | Intercepts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | W2 Moral Conviction | | |  | W2 Disgust | | |  | W2 Anger | | |  | W2 Sadness | | |  | W2 Harm | | |
|  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |  | *B* | *SE* | *p* |
| Intercept | 3.81 | 0.04 | < .001 |  | 1.15 | 0.19 | < .001 |  | 1.38 | 0.19 | < .001 |  | 1.12 | 0.20 | < .001 |  | 1.52 | 0.14 | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Note.* MC = Moral Conviction. All *B*s and *SE*s are unstandardized estimates.