

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Materials A. Latent Class Analysis of Issue Preferences ($N = 1208$).

#	Issues	Frequencies			
		Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
1	Banning of alcoholic beverages				
	Negative	0.0081	0.0081	0.0000	0.0265
	Neutral	0.0000	0.0106	0.4158	0.2327
	Positive	0.9919	0.9814	0.5842	0.7408
2	Closing of night clubs and bars				
	Negative	0.0047	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	Neutral	0.0028	0.0813	0.6352	0.2998
	Positive	0.9925	0.9187	0.3648	0.7002
3	Rejection of LGBT rights				
	Negative	0.0413	0.0153	0.0169	0.0209
	Neutral	0.0082	0.0383	0.3712	0.2805
	Positive	0.9505	0.9464	0.6119	0.6985
4	The President should be Muslim				
	Negative	0.0000	0.0127	0.0074	0.0028
	Neutral	0.0254	0.7439	0.6823	0.2472
	Positive	0.9746	0.2434	0.3103	0.7500
5	The constitution should be based on Islam				
	Negative	0.0000	0.0363	0.0398	0.0303
	Neutral	0.0694	0.9637	0.8678	0.4160
	Positive	0.9306	0.0000	0.0923	0.5537
6	Religion as a source of public policy				
	Negative	0.0000	0.0108	0.0225	0.0091
	Neutral	0.0869	0.8664	0.8696	0.3497
	Positive	0.9131	0.1228	0.1079	0.6412
7	Death penalty for blasphemers				
	Negative	0.0505	0.0459	0.2972	0.0805
	Neutral	0.2135	0.8348	0.6829	0.4670
	Positive	0.7361	0.1194	0.0198	0.4526

8	Affordable basic needs for citizens				
	Negative	0.0000	0.0000	0.0149	0.0000
	Neutral	0.0292	0.1005	0.9071	0.3823
	Positive	0.9708	0.8995	0.0781	0.6177
9	Increase of labor minimum wage				
	Negative	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	Neutral	0.0000	0.0000	0.7010	0.4321
	Positive	1.0000	1.0000	0.2990	0.5679
10	Gap control for rich and poor				
	Negative	0.0272	0.0255	0.0048	0.0333
	Neutral	0.1673	0.3704	0.9175	0.5787
	Positive	0.8054	0.6041	0.0778	0.3881
11	Limiting foreign investment in the nation				
	Negative	0.0027	0.0494	0.0123	0.0084
	Neutral	0.0572	0.1649	0.8737	0.3807
	Positive	0.9402	0.7857	0.1140	0.6109
12	Increase of electricity, gas, and fuel subsidy				
	Negative	0.0057	0.0000	0.0075	0.0080
	Neutral	0.0420	0.0815	0.8351	0.3220
	Positive	0.9523	0.9185	0.1575	0.6701

Supplementary Materials B. Lo, Mendell, and Rubin (LMR) Test

Results

Class K (k/k-1)	LR	LMR LR	df	p-value
2	729.2296	696.5142	25	0.00000
3	328.0868	313.3679	25	0.00000
4	259.148	247.5219	25	0.00000
5	261.2134	249.4946	25	0.00000
6	132.7572	126.8014	25	0.00000
7	93.89754	89.68503	25	0.00000
8	108.4902	103.6231	25	0.00000
9	87.48317	83.55843	25	0.00000
10	99.47806	95.01519	25	0.00000
11	63.16014	60.3266	25	0.00009
12	80.35866	76.75354	25	0.00000
13	56.54965	54.01267	25	0.00066
14	56.14451	53.6257	25	0.00074
15	72.56516	69.30968	25	0.00000
16	65.30225	62.37261	25	0.00005
17	43.39438	41.44759	25	0.02059
18	34.83739	33.27449	25	0.12435

19	44.10297	42.12438	25	0.01743
20	66.06295	63.09918	25	0.00004

Supplementary Materials C. Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses for psychological determinants across six classes

Between	95% CI [LLCI to ULCI]					
	RWA			SDO		NFCC
	Submission	Aggression	Conventional	SDO-D	SDO-E	
1 vs. 2	[-1.8098 to 0.4298]	[-3.2522 to -0.9478] ***	[-2.7221 to -1.0179] ***	[-3.1327 to -0.8273] ***	[-3.0257 to -1.1743] ***	[-5.7754 to -2.1846] ***
1 vs. 3	[-3.6855 to -1.3745] ***	[-3.1989 to -0.8211] ***	[-1.2392 to 0.5192]	[-1.1915 to 1.4515]	[-1.4313 to 0.6913]	[-5.1625 to -1.4575] ***
1 vs. 4	[-3.5348 to -1.6852] ***	[-3.8116 to -1.9084] ***	[-1.0537 to 0.3537]	[-2.7411 to -0.7189] ***	[-2.5720 to -0.9480] ***	[-3.7827 to -0.8173] ***
1 vs. 5	[-1.9988 to 0.9188]	[-3.0310 to -0.0290] *	[-1.9100 to 0.3100]	[-3.8188 to -0.4012] **	[-3.3224 to -0.5776] ***	[-5.3588 to -0.6812] **
1 vs. 6	[-1.1680 to 0.4280]	[-1.6911 to -0.0489] *	[-1.4173 to -0.2027] **	[-2.3723 to -0.5277] ***	[-1.5907 to -0.1093] *	[-3.3995 to -0.8405] ***
2 vs. 3	[-3.2922 to -0.3878] **	[-1.4042 to 1.5842]	[0.4050 to 2.6150] **	[0.5404 to 3.6796] **	[0.4694 to 2.9906] **	[-1.6582 to 2.9982]
2 vs. 4	[-3.1963 to -0.6437] ***	[-2.0733 to 0.5533]	[0.5488 to 2.4912] ***	[-1.0690 to 1.5690]	[-0.7193 to 1.3993]	[-0.3663 to 3.7263]
2 vs. 5	[-1.5535 to 1.8535]	[-1.1828 to 2.3228]	[-0.2262 to 2.3662]	[-2.0372 to 1.7772]	[-1.3817 to 1.6817]	[-1.7711 to 3.6911]
2 vs. 6	[-0.8677 to 1.5077]	[0.0079 to 2.4521] *	[0.1562 to 1.9638] *	[-0.7223 to 1.7823]	[0.2443 to 2.2557] **	[-0.0442 to 3.7642]
3 vs. 4	[-1.3877 to 1.2277]	[-2.1956 to 0.4956]	[-0.9851 to 1.0051]	[-3.3288 to -0.3912] **	[-2.5696 to -0.2104] *	[-1.0866 to 3.1066]
3 vs. 5	[0.2629 to 3.7171] *	[-1.2971 to 2.2571]	[-1.7542 to 0.8742]	[-4.2537 to -0.2263] *	[-3.1973 to 0.0373]	[-2.4790 to 3.0590]
3 vs. 6	[0.9386 to 3.3814] ***	[-0.1167 to 2.3967]	[-1.3794 to 0.4794]	[-2.9892 to -0.1708] *	[-1.6117 to 0.6517]	[-0.7682 to 3.1482]
4 vs. 5	[0.4879 to 3.6521] **	[-0.2979 to 2.9579]	[-1.6539 to 0.7539]	[-2.2052 to 1.4452]	[-1.6558 to 1.2758]	[-3.2565 to 1.8165]

4 vs. 6	[1.2341 to 3.2459] ***	[0.9550 to 3.0250] ***	[-1.2255 to 0.3055]	[-0.8433 to 1.4033]	[0.0079 to 1.8121] *	[-1.4328 to 1.7928]
5 vs. 6	[-1.3415 to 1.6815]	[-0.8952 to 2.2152]	[-1.1602 to 1.1402]	[-1.1175 to 2.4375]	[-0.3276 to 2.5276]	[-1.5233 to 3.3233]

*Note: *) $p < .05$, **) $p < .01$, ***) $p < .001$; 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval; LLCI = Lower Level of*

Confidence Interval; ULCI = Upper Level of Confidence Interval

Supplementary Materials D. Latent Profile Analysis

Model	Log-Likelihood	df	BIC	ICL	BLRT <i>p-value</i>
Model 2	-17140.1791579591	169	-35479.7042288839	-35758.2006100219	0.001
Model 3	-16734.1905791412	248	-35228.3680601491	-35545.8671786691	0.001
Model 4	-16099.4530127617	327	-34519.5339162911	-34824.6319422253	0.001
Model 5	-15781.4320806304	406	-34444.1330409296	-34717.8000085325	0.001
Model 6	-15512.799175452	485	-34467.5082194739	-34722.4294370567	0.001
Model 7	-15177.5834851075	564	-34357.717827686	-34719.1182657992	0.001
Model 8	-15017.1586540249	643	-34597.5091544218	-35029.0310466561	0.001
Model 9	-14821.7862028234	722	-34767.40524092	-35182.0980101375	0.001

Note: *df* = degree of freedom, *BIC* = Bayesian Information Criterion, *ILC* = Integrated complete-data Likelihood Criterion, *BLRT* = bootstrapped likelihood ratio test

Model 7 was the more acceptable model as it scored as lowest in Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) as well as the second lowest in Integrated complete-data Likelihood Criterion (ILC). The lowest ILC score was found for Model 5. We prioritized BIC than ILC since the ILC score difference was quite small for Model 5 and Model 7.