

# Supplemental Data File

## Study 1

### Hypothesis 1a

#### Fate Attributions. ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 299)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	115.89	.000	.279
Counterfactual Cond.	0.55	.460	.002
Scenario	0.45	.502	.002
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	1.36	.245	.005
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.18	.670	.001
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.04	.838	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.95	.331	.003

#### Personal Control: ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 297)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	1.30	.256	.004
Counterfactual Cond.	0.78	.377	.003
Scenario	0.05	.826	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	0.26	.609	.001
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.15	.700	.000
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.22	.634	.001
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	1.41	.236	.005

#### Luck: ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 294)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	68.45	.000	.189
Counterfactual Cond.	0.19	.662	.001
Scenario	0.06	.810	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	0.50	.481	.002
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.08	.775	.000
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	1.51	.221	.005
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	3.29	.071	.011

### Hypothesis 2a

#### Counterfactual Thinking: Antecedents. ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 296)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	24.71	.000	.078
Counterfactual Cond.	66.32	.000	.183
Scenario	26.10	.000	.061
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	24.71	.000	.077
Culture $\times$ Scenario	3.04	.082	.010
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	1.17	.279	.004
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.08	.784	.000

## Hypothesis 2b

### Counterfactual Thinking: Consequences. ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 297)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	50.24	.000	.145
Counterfactual Cond.	3.39	.067	.011
Scenario	1.26	.264	.004
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	3.27	.072	.011
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.69	.406	.002
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.19	.663	.001
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.003	.956	.000

### Equifinality: ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 295)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	157.44	.000	.348
Counterfactual Cond.	3.98	.047	.013
Scenario	0.04	.834	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	0.46	.499	.002
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.001	.972	.000
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.13	.717	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.08	.772	.000

## Hypothesis 2c

### Counterfactual Potency. ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 296)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	58.10	.000	.164
Counterfactual Cond.	28.91	.000	.089
Scenario	8.70	.003	.029
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	22.94	.000	.072
Culture $\times$ Scenario	1.48	.224	.005
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.38	.540	.001
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	0.00	.987	.000

## Hypothesis 4

### Regret: ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 298)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	0.79	.374	.003
Counterfactual Cond.	30.25	.000	.092
Scenario	0.04	.845	.000
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	3.32	.069	.011
Culture $\times$ Scenario	1.59	.208	.005
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	2.99	.085	.010
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	2.23	.136	.007

## Exploratory Variables

### Blame: ANOVA Table

	$F(1, 295)$	$p$	$\eta_p^2$
Culture	3.23	.074	.011
Counterfactual Cond.	0.06	.808	.000
Scenario	1.49	.223	.005
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond	0.39	.534	.001
Culture $\times$ Scenario	0.66	.417	.002
Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	4.29	.039	.014
Culture $\times$ Counterfactual Cond $\times$ Scenario	5.24	.023	.017

Car Accident Condition	Control Condition $M (SD)$	Counterfactual Condition $M (SD)$
White Americans	5.06 (0.76)	5.52 (0.59)
UAE-based Arabs	4.95 (1.11)	5.02 (0.90)

Construction Accident Cond.	Control Condition $M (SD)$	Counterfactual Condition $M (SD)$
White Americans	5.61 (0.72)	5.06 (1.05)
UAE-based Arabs	5.16 (1.27)	5.29 (1.17)

White American participants were more likely to hold the other driver responsible in the counterfactual versus control condition ( $F(1, 295) = 6.11$ ,  $p = .014$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .020$ ) but marginally more likely to hold the construction company responsible in the control versus counterfactual condition ( $F(1, 295) = 2.92$ ,  $p = .089$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .010$ ). There were no differences among Arab participants ( $F(1, 295) = 0.93$ ,  $p = .337$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .003$  and  $F(1, 295) = 1.51$ ,  $p = .221$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .005$  for the control and counterfactual conditions respectively).



UAE-based Arabs		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. Antecedents																
2. Consequences	<i>r</i>	.146														
	<i>p</i>	.059														
	<i>N</i>	169														
3. Counterfactual Potency	<i>r</i>	.731	.689													
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000													
	<i>N</i>	169	169													
4. Fate Attributions	<i>r</i>	-.060	-.266	-.182												
	<i>p</i>	.436	.000	.018												
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169												
5. Personal Control Attributions	<i>r</i>	-.019	.121	.063	-.112											
	<i>p</i>	.806	.118	.420	.144											
	<i>N</i>	167	168	167	170											
6. Luck Attributions	<i>r</i>	.190	.224	.244	-.213	.166										
	<i>p</i>	.015	.004	.002	.006	.033										
	<i>N</i>	165	166	165	167	166										
7. Equifinality	<i>r</i>	-.074	-.433	-.284	.443	-.050	-.306									
	<i>p</i>	.343	.000	.000	.000	.527	.000									
	<i>N</i>	165	166	165	168	166	163									
8. Regret	<i>r</i>	.070	.030	.046	-.078	.230	.217	-.062								
	<i>p</i>	.369	.697	.550	.311	.003	.005	.423								
	<i>N</i>	168	169	168	171	169	166	167								
9. Blame	<i>r</i>	.051	.045	.098	.024	-.167	.088	-.173	.078							
	<i>p</i>	.512	.558	.208	.760	.032	.260	.026	.314							
	<i>N</i>	167	168	167	168	166	164	165	167							
10. Internal Control	<i>r</i>	-.068	.132	.015	-.174	.120	.021	-.069	-.089	.016						
	<i>p</i>	.382	.085	.843	.022	.118	.792	.371	.246	.840						
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168						
11. Divine Control	<i>r</i>	-.069	-.266	-.182	.460	-.140	-.164	.332	-.127	-.063	.026					
	<i>p</i>	.376	.000	.019	.000	.069	.035	.000	.098	.420	.736					
	<i>N</i>	168	169	168	171	169	166	167	170	167	173					
12. Fate Beliefs	<i>r</i>	.037	-.237	-.112	.394	-.128	-.171	.378	.029	-.014	-.081	.688				
	<i>p</i>	.636	.002	.145	.000	.096	.027	.000	.709	.860	.290	.000				
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168	174	173				
13. Luck	<i>r</i>	.144	.008	.131	-.008	.156	.345	-.109	.210	-.119	-.142	-.034	.136			
	<i>p</i>	.062	.917	.090	.920	.042	.000	.161	.006	.126	.062	.654	.073			
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168	174	173	174			
14. Helplessness	<i>r</i>	.121	-.143	-.018	-.063	-.044	.006	.092	.158	-.084	-.263	.127	.383	.421		
	<i>p</i>	.118	.063	.820	.408	.566	.942	.234	.039	.279	.000	.096	.000	.000		
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168	174	173	174	174		
15. Counterfactual Cond. (0=control, 1=counterfactual)	<i>r</i>	.181	-.193	.039	.025	.022	.013	.138	.202	.041	-.078	-.002	.027	.050	.028	
	<i>p</i>	.018	.012	.612	.747	.779	.863	.074	.008	.602	.309	.974	.720	.509	.713	
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168	174	173	174	174	174	
16. Scenario (0=Car Accident; 1 = Construction Accident)	<i>r</i>	.191	-.022	.104	.014	.010	-.027	.017	-.073	-.105	-.022	.101	.097	.021	.011	.023
	<i>p</i>	.013	.779	.179	.854	.899	.725	.822	.344	.177	.770	.186	.204	.780	.886	.763
	<i>N</i>	169	170	169	172	170	167	168	171	168	174	173	174	174	174	174

## Study 2

### Exploratory Variables

Surprise	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
White Americans	4.58 (0.99)	4.86 (1.02)
UAE-based Arabs	4.41 (0.94)	4.28 (1.10)

**Main Effect of Culture,  $F(1, 277) = 9.26, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .032$**

Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 277) = 0.38, p = .538, \eta_p^2 = .001$

Culture  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 277) = 2.82, p = .095, \eta_p^2 = .009$

Bivariate correlations among all variables, Study 2

White Americans		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.
1. Antecedents - Self																		
2. Consequences - Self	<i>r</i>	.096																
	<i>p</i>	.222																
	<i>N</i>	165																
3. Antecedents - Situation	<i>r</i>	.222	.004															
	<i>p</i>	.004	.959															
	<i>N</i>	164	166															
4. Consequences - Situation	<i>r</i>	.119	.331	.220														
	<i>p</i>	.128	.000	.005														
	<i>N</i>	164	166	165														
5. Counterfactual Potency - Self	<i>r</i>	.746	.712	.165	.284													
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.034	.000													
	<i>N</i>	165	165	164	164													
6. Counterfactual Potency - Situation	<i>r</i>	.222	.164	.853	.655	.260												
	<i>p</i>	.004	.036	.000	.000	.000												
	<i>N</i>	163	165	165	165	163												
7. Fate Attributions	<i>r</i>	-.010	.015	-.088	-.001	.013	-.050											
	<i>p</i>	.898	.849	.259	.985	.864	.526											
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165											
8. Personal Control Attributions	<i>r</i>	-.087	-.015	.050	.027	-.054	.061	.139										
	<i>p</i>	.270	.844	.522	.732	.493	.440	.074										
	<i>N</i>	164	166	165	165	164	164	166										
9. Luck Attributions	<i>r</i>	.065	.149	-.009	-.161	.135	-.105	.048	-.053									
	<i>p</i>	.407	.054	.904	.038	.083	.179	.538	.499									
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166									
10. Equifinality	<i>r</i>	-.099	-.530	-.013	-.281	-.394	-.127	.168	.126	-.143								
	<i>p</i>	.207	.000	.868	.000	.000	.104	.030	.105	.065								
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167								
11. Regret	<i>r</i>	.350	.037	.094	.020	.263	.071	.040	.090	-.011	-.023							
	<i>p</i>	.000	.631	.230	.793	.000	.364	.612	.250	.883	.771							
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167							
12. Surprise	<i>r</i>	.086	.203	.251	.197	.203	.262	-.087	-.228	.117	-.218	.072						
	<i>p</i>	.271	.008	.001	.011	.009	.000	.263	.003	.132	.005	.358						
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167						
13. Internal Control	<i>r</i>	.094	.170	-.101	.086	.192	-.041	-.016	-.052	.072	-.098	.028	-.005					
	<i>p</i>	.228	.028	.196	.269	.014	.599	.833	.503	.356	.206	.719	.947					
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167	167					
14. Divine Control	<i>r</i>	-.036	-.199	-.089	-.081	-.157	-.081	.330	-.047	-.041	.225	-.028	-.165	-.142				
	<i>p</i>	.651	.010	.258	.298	.044	.303	.000	.549	.596	.004	.718	.034	.068				
	<i>N</i>	164	166	165	165	164	164	166	165	166	166	166	166	166				
15. Fate Beliefs	<i>r</i>	-.059	-.129	-.194	-.032	-.114	-.121	.545	-.081	.147	.221	-.036	-.182	-.114	.577			
	<i>p</i>	.453	.096	.012	.686	.146	.121	.000	.297	.057	.004	.645	.019	.142	.000			
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167	167	167	166			
16. Luck	<i>r</i>	-.020	.080	-.084	.057	.059	-.015	.253	.102	.220	-.018	.006	.021	-.072	-.029	.206		
	<i>p</i>	.799	.302	.280	.466	.455	.844	.000	.191	.004	.819	.936	.790	.353	.715	.008		
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167	167	167	166	167		
17. Helplessness	<i>r</i>	-.087	-.139	.001	-.048	-.152	-.005	.038	.170	.002	.147	.000	-.153	-.435	.188	.291	.297	
	<i>p</i>	.267	.073	.994	.537	.052	.948	.622	.029	.981	.058	.999	.049	.000	.015	.000	.000	
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167	167	167	166	167	167	
18. Counterfactual Condition (0=control, 1=counterfactual)	<i>r</i>	.378	-.106	.158	.081	.177	.139	.068	-.020	.041	-.014	.246	.139	-.001	.012	.076	.028	.072
	<i>p</i>	.000	.173	.041	.301	.023	.074	.380	.799	.603	.854	.001	.072	.986	.881	.330	.724	.357
	<i>N</i>	165	167	166	166	165	165	167	166	167	167	167	167	167	166	167	167	167





## Pretest for Study 3

### Outcome Severity with UAE-based Arab Participants

Significant Impact	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
Mild	3.51 (1.37)	3.43 (1.26)
Severe	4.17 (1.07)	4.16 (1.15)

**Main Effect of Severity,  $F(1, 188) = 15.69, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .077$**

Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 188) = 0.07, p = .795, \eta_p^2 = .000$

Severity  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 188) = 0.05, p = .826, \eta_p^2 = .000$

Changed Direction	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
Mild	3.20 (1.19)	3.21 (1.38)
Severe	3.63 (1.12)	3.58 (1.07)

**Main Effect of Severity,  $F(1, 189) = 5.27, p = .023, \eta_p^2 = .027$**

Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 189) = 0.01, p = .909, \eta_p^2 = .000$

Severity  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 189) = 0.03, p = .869, \eta_p^2 = .000$

## Study 3

### Exploratory Variables

Take normal route in future	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
White Americans	4.54 (1.09)	5.10 (1.05)
UAE-based Arabs	4.64 (0.98)	4.76 (0.94)

Main Effect of Culture,  $F(1, 312) = 1.13, p = .288, \eta_p^2 = .004$

**Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 312) = 8.63, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .027$**

Culture  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 312) = 3.81, p = .052, \eta_p^2 = .012$

Impact	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
White Americans	3.06 (1.10)	3.55 (1.06)
UAE-based Arabs	3.23 (1.17)	3.33 (1.11)

Main Effect of Culture,  $F(1, 312) = 0.04, p = .852, \eta_p^2 = .000$

**Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 312) = 5.43, p = .020, \eta_p^2 = .017$**

Culture  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 312) = 2.34, p = .128, \eta_p^2 = .007$





## Study 4

### Exploratory Variables

Take normal route in future	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
White Americans	4.48 (1.15)	4.76 (0.99)
UAE-based Arabs	4.50 (1.07)	4.41 (1.13)

Main Effect of Culture,  $F(1, 342) = 1.95, p = .164, \eta_p^2 = .006$

Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 342) = 0.69, p = .406, \eta_p^2 = .002$

Culture  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 342) = 2.49, p = .116, \eta_p^2 = .007$

Impact	Control Condition <i>M (SD)</i>	Counterfactual Condition <i>M (SD)</i>
White Americans	2.71 (1.05)	3.01 (1.07)
UAE-based Arabs	2.81 (1.13)	3.42 (1.11)

**Main Effect of Culture,  $F(1, 343) = 4.84, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .014$**

**Main Effect of CF Condition,  $F(1, 343) = 15.38, p = .000, \eta_p^2 = .043$**

Culture  $\times$  CF Condition,  $F(1, 343) = 1.77, p = .184, \eta_p^2 = .005$





## Study 5

### Supplemental Analyses

#### Predicting Counterfactuals and Regret from Religiosity and Arab identification

	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	Model
<b>Predicting CF Antecedents</b>				$F(2, 147) = 0.61, p = .542, R^2 = .008$
Religiosity	-.10	-1.03	.306	
Arab identification	.01	0.12	.907	
<b>Predicting CF Consequents</b>				$F(2, 147) = 1.12, p = .328, R^2 = .015$
Religiosity	-.08	-0.90	.367	
Arab identification	-.06	-0.63	.532	
<b>Predicting CF Potency</b>				$F(2, 147) = 1.79, p = .171, R^2 = .024$
Religiosity	-.12	-1.25	.213	
Arab identification	-.06	-0.66	.512	
<b>Predicting Regret</b>				$F(2, 147) = 0.12, p = .886, R^2 = .002$
Religiosity	-.04	-0.40	.691	
Arab identification	-.01	-0.07	.948	

#### Are Arab Muslim participants different from non-Arab Muslim participants?

We explored whether there were meaningful differences between Arab and non-Arab Muslims in counterfactual thinking or reports of regret. There were 180 Muslim participants, 129 of whom were Arab. The other group is a heterogeneous group of 51 Muslim participants with varying ethnicities (3 Black African, 7 East Asian, 25 South Asian, 8 Mixed/Multi-racial, 8 Other). All participants live in the UAE.

#### Comparing Arab and non-Arab Muslims on all DVs

	Non-Arab Muslims in the UAE	Arab Muslims in the UAE	Main Effect of Ethnicity
	$M$ $SD$	$M$ $SD$	
Counterfactual Antecedents	4.00 1.17	3.82 1.46	$F(1, 178) = 0.52,$ $p = .470, \eta_p^2 = .003$
Counterfactual Consequences	3.74 1.35	3.77 1.43	$F(1, 178) = 0.01,$ $p = .931, \eta_p^2 = .000$
Counterfactual Potency	15.08 7.33	14.52 8.13	$F(1, 178) = 0.15,$ $p = .699, \eta_p^2 = .001$
Regret	3.77 1.14	3.44 1.54	$F(1, 178) = 1.52,$ $p = .219, \eta_p^2 = .008$
Divine Control	4.90 1.12	4.98 1.03	$F(1, 178) = 0.20,$ $p = .656, \eta_p^2 = .001$
Fate	4.21 0.75	4.40 0.77	$F(1, 178) = 1.83,$ $p = .177, \eta_p^2 = .010$
Internal Control	4.47 0.65	4.47 0.65	$F(1, 178) = 0.002,$ $p = .967, \eta_p^2 = .000$
Religiosity (z scores)	0.16 0.91	0.22 0.88	$F(1, 178) = 0.15,$ $p = .696, \eta_p^2 = .001$



## Predicting Counterfactuals from Control Beliefs and Group Membership, Muslim Participants

Predicting CF Potency	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	Model
Step 1				$F(2, 177) = 0.29, p = .745, R^2 = .003$
Divine Control	-.05	-0.66	.509	
Ethnicity (0=non-Arab; 1 = Arab)	-.03	-0.37	.716	
Step 2				$F(1, 146) = 2.02, p = .157, \Delta R^2 = .011$
Divine Control X Ethnicity	-.53	-1.42	.157	
Step 1				$F(2, 177) = 2.44, p = .090, R^2 = .027$
Fate	-.16	-2.18	.031	
Ethnicity (0=non-Arab; 1 = Arab)	-.01	-0.17	.865	
Step 2				$F(1, 146) = 0.67, p = .415, \Delta R^2 = .004$
Fate X Ethnicity	-.38	-0.82	.415	
Step 1				$F(2, 177) = 0.12, p = .885, R^2 = .001$
Religiosity	-.02	-0.31	.760	
Ethnicity (0=non-Arab; 1 = Arab)	-.03	-0.38	.706	
Step 2				$F(1, 146) = 0.57, p = .450, \Delta R^2 = .003$
Religiosity X Ethnicity	-.12	-0.76	.450	

Overall, there are no clear differences between Arab and non-Arab Muslim participants.

### Are Muslim participants different from non-Muslim participants in the UAE?

We next explored whether there were meaningful differences between participants (of any ethnicity) who were Muslim or non-Muslim in counterfactual thinking or reports of regret. However, it is important to note that ethnicity and religion remain largely confounded. Of the thirty-one non-Muslim participants, only nine participants were Arab (2 Black African, 2 East Asian, 3 Hispanic, 13 South Asian, 1 White European, 1 Mixed/Multi-racial). Of the 180 Muslim participants, 129 were Arab (3 Black African, 7 East Asian, 25 South Asian, 8 Mixed/Multi-racial, 8 Other). In addition, eleven of thirty-one participants who were not Muslim reported being atheist, agnostic, or having no religion, thus again the comparison group is highly heterogeneous and any differences should be interpreted with caution.

### Comparing Muslim and non-Muslim participants on all DVs

	Non-Muslims in the UAE	Muslims in the UAE	Main Effect of Religion
	$M$ $SD$	$M$ $SD$	
Counterfactual Antecedents	4.16 1.44	3.86 1.41	$F(1, 209) = 1.24, p = .267, \eta_p^2 = .006$
Counterfactual Consequences	4.00 1.27	3.76 1.41	$F(1, 209) = 0.78, p = .378, \eta_p^2 = .004$
Counterfactual Potency	17.35 8.02	14.63 7.95	$F(1, 209) = 3.08, p = .081, \eta_p^2 = .015$
Regret	3.36 1.36	3.51 1.46	$F(1, 209) = 0.29, p = .593, \eta_p^2 = .001$
Divine Control	2.95 1.72	4.96 1.04	$F(1, 209) = 79.24, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .275$
Fate	3.59 1.10	4.36 0.77	$F(1, 209) = 22.31, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .096$
Internal Control	4.31 0.74	4.47 0.64	$F(1, 209) = 1.48, p = .226, \eta_p^2 = .007$
Religiosity (z scores)	-1.18 1.39	0.21 0.88	$F(1, 209) = 46.48, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .182$

Predicting Counterfactuals from Control Beliefs and Religion Category Participants

Predicting CF Potency	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	Model
Step 1				$F(2, 208) = 2.92, p = .056, R^2 = .027$
Divine Control	-.13	-.166	.099	
Religion (0=non-Muslim; 1 = Muslim)	-.05	-0.63	.529	
Step 2				$F(1, 207) = 1.54, p = .215, \Delta R^2 = .007$
Divine Control X Religion	.32	1.24	.215	
Step 1				$F(2, 208) = 5.77, p = .004, R^2 = .053$
Fate	-.21	-2.89	.004	
Religion (0=non-Muslim; 1 = Muslim)	-.06	-0.80	.425	
Step 2				$F(1, 207) = 0.29, p = .590, \Delta R^2 = .001$
Fate X Religion	.17	.539	.590	
Step 1				$F(2, 208) = 2.18, p = .116, R^2 = .021$
Religiosity	-.09	-1.13	.259	
Religion (0=non-Muslim; 1 = Muslim)	-.08	-1.11	.270	
Step 2				$F(2, 207) = 1.26, p = .245, \Delta R^2 = .006$
Religiosity X Religion	.15	1.17	.245	

Similar to findings reported in the main paper, fate beliefs predicted counterfactual potency, and they seem to do so similarly across groups, partly explaining the marginal difference between our largely Arab and South Asian Muslim group, and our highly heterogeneous and small group of non-Muslim participants. In other words, the process does not seem to be unique to Muslim participants within the UAE suggesting that the more an individual believes in fate, the less potent their counterfactual thoughts.