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*Appendix 1*

Table S1: **Demographic Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2010 National Census** | **2016****Sample** |
| **Targets**  |  | **Full****population** | **Age 18 or above** |
|  Gender   | Male   | 51.2% | 50.5% | 52.6% |
| Geography  | Northern  | 12.4% | N/A | 13.1% |
|  | North-eastern | 8.2% | N/A | 9.7% |
|  | Eastern  | 29.5% | N/A | 28.0% |
|  | Central & Southern  | 28.2% | N/A | 25.9% |
|  | South-western  | 14.5% | N/A | 15.9% |
|   | North-western   | 7.3% | N/A | 7.3% |
| Age  | ≤19  | 24.1% | 4.0% | 2.0% |
|  | 20-29 | 17.1% | 21.7% | 25.6% |
|  | 30-39  | 16.1% | 20.4% | 24.1% |
|  | 40-49  | 17.3% | 21.9% | 18.2% |
|  | ≥50  | 25.3% | 32.0% | 30.0% |
|  | Average | 35.6 | 42.7 | 39.8 |
| Income  | Average disposable household income  | ¥68,095 | N/A | ¥60,000-¥69,000 |
| Ethnicity | Han | 91.6% | 92.3% | 94.9% |

*Sources:*

China National Census 2010 and *China Statistical Yearbook 2016*.

*Notes:*

¥60,000-¥69,000 is the average disposable household income category reported by respondents. Percentages may not sum to 100% owing to rounding.

*Appendix 2*

Figure S1: **Public Support for Increased Military Spending by Randomized Variable**
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*Appendix 3*

Table S2: **Ordered Logit – Support for Military Spending, War Avoidance, and Isolationism**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Military spending** | **War avoidance** | **Isolationism** |
| National pride | 0.508\*\*\* | 0.315\*\*\* | -0.079 |
|  | (0.060) | (0.059) | (0.057) |
| Age | 0.010\* | 0.009\* | 0.018\*\*\* |
|  | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) |
| Male | 0.492\*\*\* | -0.051 | -0.116 |
|  | (0.096) | (0.094) | (0.093) |
| Income | 0.030\*\* | 0.021\* | 0.013 |
|  | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.009)  |
| Bachelor’s degree/aboveα | 0.119 | -0.195\* | 0.142 |
|  | (0.098) | (0.097) | (0.096) |
| N | 1,471 | 1,471 | 1,470 |
| *Notes*:  Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05; constant cuts omitted. α Bivariate regression for war avoidance shows “Bachelor’s degree or above” is statistically insignificant, although it is significant in the multivariate regression here. |

Table S3: **Ordered Logit – Support for Military Spending**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| National pride | 0.473\*\*\* | 0.497\*\*\* | 0.499\*\*\* | 0.502\*\*\* | 0.508\*\*\* |
|  | (0.059) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) |
| Age |  | 0.016\*\*\* | 0.012\*\* | 0.009\* | 0.010\* |
|  |  | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) |
| Male |  |  | 0.519\*\*\* | 0.497\*\*\* | 0.492\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.095) | (0.096) | (0.096) |
| Income |  |  |  | 0.032\*\*\* | 0.030\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.009) | (0.009) |
| Bachelor’s degree/above |  |  |  |  | 0.119 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.098) |
| N | 1,482 | 1,476 | 1,475 | 1,473 | 1,471 |
| *Notes:* Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, Ϯ p < 0.1; constant cuts omitted. |

Table S4: **Ordered Logit – Preference for War Avoidance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| National pride | 0.309\*\*\* | 0.328\*\*\* | 0.325\*\*\* | 0.324\*\*\* | 0.315\*\*\* |
|  | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) |
| Age |  | 0.010\*\* | 0.010\*\* | 0.009\* | 0.009\* |
|  |  | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) |
| Male |  |  | -0.038 | -0.056 | -0.051 |
|  |  |  | (0.094) | (0.094) | (0.094) |
| Income |  |  |  | 0.016 Ϯ | 0.021\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.009) | (0.009) |
| Bachelor’s degree/above |  |  |  |  | -0.195\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.097) |
| N | 1,482 | 1,476 | 1,475 | 1,473 | 1,471 |
| *Notes:* Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, Ϯ p < 0.1; constant cuts omitted. |

Table S5: **Ordered Logit – Preference for Isolationism**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| National pride | -0.100Ϯ | -0.071 | -0.075 | -0.070 | -0.079 |
|  | (0.056) | (0.057) | (0.057) | (0.057) | (0.057) |
| Age |  | 0.018\*\*\* | 0.019\*\*\* | 0.017\*\*\* | 0.018\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (0.004) |
| Male |  |  | -0.112 | -0.117 | -0.116 |
|  |  |  | (0.093) | (0.093) | (0.093) |
| Income |  |  |  | 0.016Ϯ | 0.013 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.009) | (0.009) |
| Bachelor’s degree/above |  |  |  |  | 0.142 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.096) |
| N | 1,481 | 1,475 | 1,474 | 1,472 | 1,470 |
| *Notes:* Standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, Ϯ p < 0.1; constant cuts omitted. |

*Appendix 4*

Table S6: **Difference in Means – Support for Military Spending, War Avoidance and Isolationism**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Military spending** | **War avoidance** | **Isolationism** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |
| Male | 4.91 | 5.15 | 4.48 |
| Female | 4.54 | 5.23 | 4.53 |
| *Difference in means* | 0.37\*\*\* | -0.08 | -0.06 |
| **Ageα** |  |  |  |
| 28 and older | 4.80 | 5.21 | 4.66 |
| Younger than 28 | 4.54 | 5.11 | 4.03 |
| *Difference in means* | 0.26\*\* | 0.10 | 0.64\*\*\* |
| **Education** |  |  |  |
| Bachelor’s degree/above | 4.80 | 5.12 | 4.60 |
| Otherwise | 4.68 | 5.23 | 4.43 |
| *Difference in means* | 0.13Ϯ | -0.11 | 0.17Ϯ |
| **Incomeβ** |  |  |  |
| High income | 4.86 | 5.26 | 4.61 |
| Otherwise | 4.61 | 5.11 | 4.41 |
| *Difference in means* | 0.26\*\*\* | 0.15Ϯ | 0.19\* |
| **National prideγ** |  |  |  |
| Strong pride | 4.85 | 5.27 | 4.48 |
| Otherwise | 4.21 | 4.79 | 4.63 |
| *Difference in Means* | 0.63\*\*\* | 0.49\*\*\* | -0.15 |
| **Increasing military strength as top priority** |  |  |  |
| Yes  | 5.38 | 5.13 | 4.20 |
| No | 4.58 | 5.21 | 4.56 |
| *Difference in means* | 0.80\*\*\* | -0.08 | -0.36\*\* |
| *Notes:* \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, Ϯ p < 0.1. Reported differences may differ slightly owing to rounding. |
| α Since there is no standard cut-off for age, we use 28 as it is the maximum age for membership in the Communist Youth League of China. β We use the median income category as the cut-off point. **γ** National pride measured with the question “Are you proud to be a Chinese citizen?” on a four-point scale (from “Not proud at all” to “Very proud”). We use three points as the cut-off. |

*Appendix 5*

Table S7: **Subgroup Means – Respondents for whom Increasing Military Capability Was Top Priority vs Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Increasing military strength as top priority****(group mean)** | **Other policy options as top priority****(group mean)** |
| Age | 39.70 | 40.01 |
| Male | 57.21% | 52.76% |
| Bachelor’s degree/above | 42.11% | 43.83% |
| Incomeα | 10.76 | 11.29 |
| National prideβ | 2.37 | 2.07 |
| *Notes:* α Numbers refer to the annual income category that respondents reported in the survey.β Difference is statistically significant (*p* < 0.001, *n* = 1,313). |

Table S8: **Ordered Logit – Increasing Military Capability as Top Priority**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| National pride | 0.479\*\*\* | 0.479\*\*\* | 0.484\*\*\* | 0.482\*\*\* | 0.503\*\*\* |
|  | (0.100) | (0.100) | (0.100) | (0.100) | (0.101) |
| Age |  | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.002 |
|  |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) |
| Male |  |  | 0.215 | 0.229 | 0.222 |
|  |  |  | (0.150) | (0.150) | (0.151) |
| Income |  |  |  | -0.017 | -0.017 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.014) | (0.014) |
| Bachelor’s degree/above |  |  |  |  | 0.001 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.156) |
| N | 1,313 | 1,309 | 1,309 | 1,308 | 1,307 |
| *Note*:  Standard errors in parentheses. Constant cuts omitted. \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, Ϯ p < 0.1.  |