Table 1. Study Characteristics and Mortality Salience (MS) Effect Sizes for Terror Management Studies involving Political Dependent Variables

Study (first author/date)	Total N	Mean Age	Location	Control Group	Second IV	Delay Tasks	DV	Hypothesis	Effect Size, *r* (95% CI)
Anson11-study2	103		US	TV	NONE	1	Implicit Association Test for politics (Mitchell et al., 2003)	WD	**.24 (.03, .43)**
Castano11-study3[s]	31		US	TV[s]	NONE (liberals only)	1	Support for 3 conservative policies	WD	**.37 (.02, .64)**
Castano11-study4	8		US	DP	Liberal	1	Rating of pro-evolution essay	WD	.43 (–.43, .88)
					Conservative				–.29 (–.53, .83)
Cohen04	190	21.8	US	exam	NONE	2	Voting for charismatic leader	N	**.34 (.20, .46)**
Cohen05	184	21.0	US	TV	NONE	2	Voting for G.W. Bush	CS	**.51 (.30, .67)**
Cuillier09	58	38.0	US	DP	NONE	1	Support for G.W. Bush	CS	.15 (–.11, .55)
Francis10[s]	46	21.4	US	DP[s]	Ethnicity: CAUCASIAN	1	Support for Obama (inverse)	CS	.28 (–.05, .55)
					NON				–.51 (–.82, .05)
Gailliot06-study5	88			No task	Self-Control: LOW	2	Voting for G.W. Bush	CS	**.53 (.01, .83)**
					HIGH				–.13 (–.61, .43)
Hirshberger09-study1	80	24.0	Israel	pain	Iranian leaders: Support violence	1	Support for Israeli violence against Iran	CS	**.46 (.16, .68)**
					NOT				**–.35 (–.60, –.03)**
Hirshberger09-study2	308	24.0	Israel	pain	Personal vulnerability: LOW	1	Support for Israeli violence against Iran	CS	**.17 (.07, .32)**
					HIGH				**–.16 (–.31, –.01)**
Hoyt09-study1	68		US	exam	Female	2	Voting for female candidate	N	**.37 (.01, .64)**
					Male				–.10 (–.42, .25)
Kosloff10a	146		US	pain	Liberal	2	Rating of like charismatic politician	WD	**.42 (.08, .64)**
					Conservative				.25 (–.06, .52)
Landau04a-study1	97		US	TV	NONE	2	Support for G.W. Bush	CS	**.74 (.63, .82)**
Landau04a-study3	74		US	exam	NONE	2	Support for G.W. Bush	CS	**.74 (.62, .83)**
Landau04a-study4	157		US	pain	NONE	2	Support for G.W. Bush	CS	**.68 (.53, .78)**
Lavine05	145		US	No task	Authoritarianism (RWA): HIGH	1	Preference for attitude-congruent capital punishment article	WD	**.30 (.01, .55)**
					LOW				.15 (–.44, .18)
Moty110	136	23.0	US	DP	Authoritarianism (RWA): HIGH	1	Support for use of military force when human violence was compared to animals (inverse)	WD	**.62 (.26, .82)**
					LOW				.00 (–.45, .45)
Nail09-study2	58	22.0	Canada	TV	Preference for consistency (PC): LOW	1	Psychological conservatism (pro-capital punishment and anti-abortion survey conviction)	CS	**.73 (.13, .94)**
					HIGH				.00 (–81, .81)
Nail09-study3	35	24.3	Canada	TV	Preference for consistency (PC): LOW	1	Anti-gay sentiment (non-support for gay partner benefits in vignette)	CS	.74 (–.18, .97)
					HIGH				.00 (–81, .81)
Nikkah08-study 1[s]	25		US	TV[s]	NONE (liberals only)	4	Authoritarianism via RWA scale (INVERSE)	WD	**.45 (.01, .74)**

Table 1. (cont.)

Study (first author/date)	Total N	Mean Age	Location	Control Group	Second IV	Delay Tasks	DV	Hypothesis	Effect Size, *r* (95% CI)
Nikkah08-study2[s]	37		US	TV[s]	NONE (liberals only)	15	Support for 8 conservative policies (INVERSE)	WD	**.34 (.01, .61)**
Ogilvie08-study1	234		US	Undesired self	NONE	2	Support for G.W. Bush	CS	.16 (–.02, .33)
Pyszczynski-study1	40	22.0	Iran	DP	NONE	1	Ratings of pro-martyrdom target	N	**.87 (.76, .93)**
Rothschild09-study1	151	22.6	US	pain	Religious Fundamentalism (RF): HIGH	1	Support for military force when compassionate Biblical values primed (inverse)	WD	**.43 (.04, .71)**
					LOW				–.32 (–.64, .09)
Rothschild09-study2	121	22.1	US	pain	Religious Fundamentalism (RF): HIGH	1	Support for military force when compassionate Biblical values primed (inverse)	WD	**.56 (.15, .80)**
					LOW				–.34 (–.68, .12)
Rothschild09-study3	120	21.7	Iran	DP	Compassionate values primed: SECULAR	2	Anti-Western attitudes (e.g., support for violence against US)	N	**.66 (.48, .78)**
					KORAN-BASED				**–.37 (–.57, –.12)**
Simon96-study2	61		US	TV	NONE	1	Rating of essay on U.S. flag burning that supported worldview	WD	**.60 (.40, .74)**
Vail09	91	18.3	US	uncertainty	Prime: NONE	2	Support for McCain (vs. Obama)	CS	**.83 (.64, .92)**
					COMPASSION QUOTATIONS				**–.84 (–.93, –.66)**
Vail11	72		US	fail exam	View of whether new health care law supported autonomy: YES	2	Support for health care reforms (9 items)	N	.57 (–.01, .86)
					NO				**–.63 (–.88, –.09)**
Weise08-study1	40	18.6	US	DP	Attachment Security (RSQ): LOW	2	Support for G.W. Bush (vs. J. Kerry)	CS	.81 (–.01, .98)
					HIGH				**–.35 (–.90, –.65)**
Weise08-study2	160	22.2	US	DP	Relationship Prime: SECURE	1	Support for extreme military force (inverse)	CS	**.26 (.04, .45)**
					NEUTRAL				–.10 (–.13, .31)

Note. All studies above used two open-ended questions about death (Rosenblatt et al., 1989) as the mortality salience (MS) manipulation except for four studies indicated with an [S] that used the Death Anxiety Scale (Templer, 1970); abbreviations are listed in alphabetical order under the relevant column title; Blank spaces mean that the information was not available in the original study; Heading Abbreviations: CI = confidence intervals; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; Control Group Abbreviations: [s] = Death Anxiety Scale (Templer, 1970) used as MS prime with parallel scale on DP (dental pain) or TV used as the control; DP = two essay questions about dental pain; TV = two essay questions about watching television; Second IV Abbreviations: PC = preference for consistency (Cialdini, Trost, & Newsom, 1995); RF = Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992); RSQ = Relationship Scales Questionnaire (a measure of attachment style; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994); RWA = Right-wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992); Delay Tasks: number of delay tasks between MS manipulation and measurement of the political dependent variable; Hypothesis: CS = conservative shift; WD = worldview defense; N = neither. Effect sizes in bold are significant at $p < .05$.