

Online Appendixes

Appendix A. Details on the Samples

Appendix B. Treatments for the three experiments

Appendix C. Sensitivity analyses

Appendix D. Additional results

Appendix A. Details on the Samples

Study 1. Dutch students

Study 1 relies on a convenience sample of undergraduate students in Communication Science at a large university in the Netherlands (BLINDED). Respondents were awarded 0.5 research credits for their cooperation, as part of their Bachelor degree. Students could find the survey online on the University “LAB” website, and their participation was purely opt-in and unrelated to any other classes they might take at the University. The questionnaire contained a “screener” (or “attention check”; Berinsky et al., 2014) set up as a long question with specific instructions to follow “hidden” in it. Respondents who failed to comply with those instructions (N=77) were assumed to have only skimmed the questions and were filtered out. The final sample is composed of 140 students. 80% of respondents are female (reflecting the composition of students at the university of BLINDED) and 39% are Dutch nationals. Overall, the sample is slightly skewed towards the left (M=4.2/10, SD=1.61).

Manipulation checks shows that the treatments were successful. Respondents were asked to evaluate if the messages they saw were “funny” and “an attack” (from 1 “Totally disagree” to 10 “Totally agree”). The negative treatments received, on average, a substantially higher score on the “attack” check; M(positive)=3.8, SD(positive)=2.3, N(positive)=49, M(negative)=7.1, SD(negative)=2.2, N(negative)=91, $t(138) = -8.41, p < .000$. At the same time, the treatments which contained a joke were evaluated, on average, as significantly funnier; M(no joke)=3.8, SD(no joke)=2.3, N(no joke)=42, M(joke)=5.2, SD(joke)=2.7, N(joke)=49, $t(89) = -2.67, p < .009$.

Study 2. MTurk USA (November 2018)

The sample of 803 respondents is composed of 54% of female respondents with a relatively high interest in politics (only 1.5% declared “no interest at all”), and leaning more towards the democratic party (M=5.7/10, SD=3.2 on “liking the Democratic party”, and M=3.9/10, SD=3.4 on “liking the Republican party”).

Manipulation checks shows that the treatments were successful. Respondents were asked to evaluate of the messages they saw were “negative” and “amusing” (from 1 “Totally disagree” to 7 “Totally agree”). The treatments based on attacks received, on average, a substantially

higher score on the “negativity” check; $M(\text{positive})=2.9$, $SD(\text{positive})=2.9$, $N(\text{positive})=201$, $M(\text{negative})=5.8$, $SD(\text{negative})=3.1$, $N(\text{negative})=402$, $t(601) = -10.88$, $p < .000$. At the same time, the treatments which contained a joke were evaluated, on average, as significantly more amusing; $M(\text{no joke})=2.9$, $SD(\text{no joke})=3.1$, $N(\text{no joke})=201$, $M(\text{joke})=5.2$, $SD(\text{joke})=3.2$, $N(\text{joke})=201$, $t(400) = -7.47$, $p < .000$.

Study 3. MTurk USA (May 2019)

As for sample 1 (Dutch students), the questionnaire contained a “screener” to filter out respondents that only skimmed the questionnaire; after exclusion of these respondents ($N=100$), the final sample contains 1,408 US respondents. The sample is composed by 53% of female respondents with a relatively high interest in politics (only 2.3% declared “no interest at all”), and leaning more towards the left: the average position of the left-right scale is 4.6 out of 10 ($SD=3.0$), and 55.0% declared a strong or leaning preference for the Democratic party (against 34.1 for the Republican party).

Manipulation checks shows that the treatments were successful. Respondents were asked to evaluate of the messages they saw were “negative” and “funny” (from 1 “Totally disagree” to 7 “Totally agree”). The treatments based on attacks received, on average, a substantially higher score on the “negativity” check; $M(\text{positive})=2.2$, $SD(\text{positive})=1.7$, $N(\text{positive})=200$, $M(\text{negative})=5.4$, $SD(\text{negative})=1.6$, $N(\text{negative})=1207$, $t(1405) = -26.31$, $p < .000$. At the same time, the treatments which contained a joke were evaluated, on average, as significantly more amusing; $M(\text{no joke})=2.1$, $SD(\text{no joke})=1.6$, $N(\text{no joke})=603$, $M(\text{joke})=3.9$, $SD(\text{joke})=2.1$, $N(\text{joke})=605$, $t(1206) = -17.59$, $p < .000$.

Appendix B. Treatments for the three experiments

We present below the treatments used in all three experiments, sequentially. S1T1 means “Study 1, Treatment 1”, and so forth. All treatment are mock statements, created for the needs of the studies. Participants were fully debriefed at the end of the studies and explicitly told that the materials they were exposed to were not real.

*** Experiment 1 (Dutch students)

T1. Positive message from Van Eijs (D66) (Positive, No joke)

Last Wednesday in Hilversum the televised debates between the main parties were held, in the build up to the national general elections next year. Multiple subjects were discussed in the long-awaited debate, in which the politicians held each other feet to the fire to win the votes of the electorate.

The televised debate is seen as one of the most important moments during the campaign, since it has proven to be determining for the eventual election results. Those who have followed the campaign, knows that D66 and VVD have crossed paths often. VVD member of parliament De Vries and D66 member of parliament Van Eijs were debating which course a future government should take. “D66 has always chosen a pragmatic, liberal course and has achieved many things. We will continue to do this in the upcoming term.”

The comment was one of the most important of the evening, one could hear the audience talk on about the statement by Van Eijs. What the result will be for D66, will become clear in the general elections of 2019.

T2. Negative message from Van Eijs (D66) attacking De Vries (VVD) in a civil way, including a joke (Negative civil + Joke)

Last Wednesday in Hilversum the televised debates between the main parties were held, in the build up to the national general elections next year. Multiple subjects were discussed in the long-awaited debate, in which the politicians held each other feet to the fire to win the votes of the electorate.

The televised debate is seen as one of the most important moments during the campaign, since it has proven to be determining for the eventual election results. Those who have followed the campaign, knows that D66 and VVD have crossed paths often. VVD member of parliament De Vries and D66 member of parliament Van Eijs were debating which course a future government should take. Van Eijs did not lose any time: “Please excuse me if I talk too fast, but I am scared that if I don’t another VVD-member will have resigned by the end of this sentence”.

The comment was one of the most important of the evening, one could hear the audience talk on about the statement by van Eijs. What the result will be for D66, will become clear in the general elections of 2019.

T3. Negative message from Van Eijs (D66) attacking De Vries (VVD) in an uncivil way, including a joke (Negative uncivil + Joke)

Last Wednesday in Hilversum the televised debates between the main parties were held, in the build up to the national general elections next year. Multiple subjects were discussed in the long-awaited debate, in which the politicians held each other feet to the fire to win the votes of the electorate.

The televised debate is seen as one of the most important moments during the campaign, since it has proven to be determining for the eventual election results. Those who have followed the campaign, knows that D66 and VVD have crossed paths often. VVD member of parliament De Vries and D66 member of parliament Van Eijs were debating which course a future government should take. Van Eijs did not lose any time: "It seems like Mrs. De Vries is the only VVD-member with a heart," the D66 member started, friendly enough. "But I wonder where she bought it"

The comment was one of the most important of the evening, one could hear the audience talk on about the statement by van Eijs. What the result will be for D66, will become clear in the general elections of 2019.

T4. Negative message from Van Eijs (D66) attacking De Vries (VVD) in a civil way (Negative civil, No Joke)

Last Wednesday in Hilversum the televised debates between the main parties were held, in the build up to the national general elections next year. Multiple subjects were discussed in the long-awaited debate, in which the politicians held each other feet to the fire to win the votes of the electorate.

The televised debate is seen as one of the most important moments during the campaign, since it has proven to be determining for the eventual election results. Those who have followed the campaign, knows that D66 and VVD have crossed paths often. VVD member of parliament De Vries and D66 member of parliament Van Eijs were debating which course a future government should take. "Recently, so many VVD-ministers have resigned that one can't take that party seriously anymore."

The comment was one of the most important of the evening, one could hear the audience talk on about the statement by van Eijs. What the result will be for D66, will become clear in the general elections of 2019.

T5. Negative message from Van Eijs (D66) attacking De Vries (VVD) in an uncivil way (Negative uncivil, No Joke)

Last Wednesday in Hilversum the televised debates between the main parties were held, in the build up to the national general elections next year. Multiple subjects were discussed in the long-awaited debate, in which the politicians held each other feet to the fire to win the votes of the electorate.

The televised debate is seen as one of the most important moments during the campaign, since it has proven to be determining for the eventual election results. Those who have followed the campaign, knows that D66 and VVD have crossed paths often. VVD member of parliament De Vries and D66 member of parliament Van Eijs were debating which course a future government should take. "VVD members are rarely short on money. But there is a thing you can't buy with that. A heart. And that is exactly what no VVD'er has."

The comment was one of the most important of the evening, one could hear the audience talk on about the statement by Van Eijs. What the result will be for D66, will become clear in the general elections of 2019.

*** Experiment 2 (US)

T1. Positive message from nondescript leading figure of the Democratic Party (**Positive, No joke**)

Title: Democrats defend their record on health care.

Below is an excerpt from a speech on health care by a leading figure from the Democratic party:

“In the past, many people were without health insurance and the poorest Americans lived much shorter lives than the rich. The Democrats are committed to fight inequality in health conditions and life expectancy. We Democrats have proven competent to tackle the problem. Trust us.”

T2. Satirical text (**Joke only**)

Title: Democrats sarcastically criticize Republicans for incompetence on health care.

Let me tell you something. Some are calling for the new Republican healthcare bill to be called Trumpcare. Experts say that's the first time the words 'Trump' and 'care' have ever been said together. I am not saying that the President is sloppy. Donald Trump was actually describing himself in an interview this week and said that his strongest suit is his temperament. Although sadly, even that suit is made in China. I'm kidding, I'm kidding. Of course, it can be hard to negotiate with President Trump, especially on tough issues such as health care, because it's hard to tell what he's thinking. It's even harder to tell if the President is thinking AT ALL.

T3. Negative message from nondescript leading figure of the Democratic Party attacking Republicans on healthcare (**Negative, No Joke**)

Title: Democrats criticize Republicans for incompetence on health care.

Below is an excerpt from a speech on health care by a leading figure from the Democratic party:

“Despite the Republicans' continued promises to end this, many people are still without health insurance and the poorest Americans have much shorter life expectancies than the rich. Even if they controlled both houses of the Congress and the Presidency for two years, Republicans are simply incapable of fighting inequalities in health conditions and life expectancy. The Republicans have proven incompetent to tackle the problem. Do not trust them.”

T4. Negative message from nondescript leading figure of the Democratic Party attacking Republicans on healthcare + Satirical text (**Negative + Joke**)

Title: Democrats sarcastically criticize Republicans for incompetence on health care.

Below is an excerpt from a speech on health care by a leading figure from the Democratic party:

“Despite the Republicans' continued promises, many people are still without health insurance and the poorest Americans have much shorter life expectancies than the rich. Even if they controlled both houses of the Congress and the Presidency for two years, Republicans are simply incapable of fighting inequalities. Let me tell you something. Some are calling the new Republican healthcare bill “Trumpcare”. Funny thing is, that's the first time the words 'Trump' and 'care' have ever been said together. I am not saying that the President is sloppy. Donald Trump described himself in an interview this week and said that his strongest suit is his temperament. Although sadly, even that suit is made in China. I'm kidding, I'm kidding. Of course, it can be hard to negotiate with President Trump, especially on tough issues such as health care, because it's hard to tell what he's thinking. It's even harder to tell if the President is thinking AT ALL. But enough joking. The Republicans have proven incompetent to tackle the problem of health care. Do not trust them.”

*** Experiment 3 (US)

T1. Positive message on healthcare reform from Pete Buttigieg (**Positive, No Joke**)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“I am advocating for a comprehensive reform to the healthcare system in the USA. I believe that we can deliver a new plan that improves the current situation, building on the achievements of Obamacare while correcting some of its problems. I will always defend pre-existing conditions, and make sure that all Americans, regardless of their income or situation, will receive a proper healthcare.”

T2. Policy attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform (**Negative policy, No Joke**)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare reform. McConnell’s plan will only benefit the rich, exclude patients with pre-existing conditions, and leave millions uninsured. The reality is that McConnell’s new healthcare plan is a bad plan.”

T3. Character attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform (**Negative character, No Joke**)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare reform. McConnell in particular lacks the leadership skills to steer such an important reform, and his obstructionist behavior in the Senate in recent times shows that he will not engage in bipartisan discussions. The reality is that Mitch McConnell will not be able to lead a successful healthcare reform.”

T4. Harsh character attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform (**Negative character harsh, No Joke**)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare reform. McConnell in particular has no backbone and lacks any courage to pass sweeping reforms that benefit all. He repeatedly lied to the American public about the protection of pre-existing conditions, which his plan will not include. The reality is that Mitch McConnell is an incompetent and a hypocrite; it would be naïve to trust him.”

T5. Policy attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform + Satirical text (**Negative policy + Joke**)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare reform. McConnell’s plan will only benefit the rich, exclude patients with pre-existing conditions, and leave millions uninsured.

Let me tell you something.

Some are calling McConnell’s plan “Trumpcare”. Funny thing is, that’s the first time the words ‘Trump’ and ‘care’ have ever been said in the same sentence... I’m kidding. I’m sure that it can be hard to negotiate with President Trump. Not because it’s hard to tell what he’s thinking, but simply because it’s hard to tell if he is thinking at all! Just look at his tweets! All his sentences seem as though they were written by a 4-year old... “Very stable genius”... Keep telling yourself that, Donald. And Mitch McConnell thinks that he can sit down with Trump and develop a new, comprehensive healthcare reform! That’s textbook delusional syndrome, if you ask me... Some might call it a severe pre-existing condition. Poor Mitch, not even his healthcare reform will be able to cover that.

But enough joking.

The reality is that McConnell’s new healthcare plan is a bad plan.”

T6. Character attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform + Satirical text (Negative character + Joke)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare reform. McConnell in particular lacks the leadership skills to steer such an important reform, and his obstructionist behavior in the Senate in recent times shows that he will not engage in bipartisan discussions.

Let me tell you something.

Some are calling McConnell’s plan “Trumpcare”. Funny thing is, that’s the first time the words ‘Trump’ and ‘care’ have ever been said in the same sentence... I’m kidding. I’m sure that it can be hard to negotiate with President Trump. Not because it’s hard to tell what he’s thinking, but simply because it’s hard to tell if he is thinking at all! Just look at his tweets! All his sentences seem as though they were written by a 4-year old... “Very stable genius”... Keep telling yourself that, Donald. And Mitch McConnell thinks that he can sit down with Trump and develop a new, comprehensive healthcare reform! That’s textbook delusional syndrome, if you ask me... Some might call it a severe pre-existing condition. Poor Mitch, not even his healthcare reform will be able to cover that.

But enough joking.

The reality is that Mitch McConnell will not be able to lead a successful healthcare reform.”

T7. Harsh character attack from Pete Buttigieg against Mitch McConnell on healthcare reform + Satirical text (Negative character harsh + Joke)

Pete Buttigieg, March 2019:

“The Republican Party, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, is trying, again, to reform the healthcare system in the USA. They have clearly not learned their lesson from their previous failures. Even controlling both houses of the Congress and the Presidency, Republicans are simply incapable of tackling a problem as complex as healthcare

reform. McConnell in particular has no backbone and lacks any courage to pass sweeping reforms that benefit all. He repeatedly lied to the American public about the protection of pre-existing conditions, which his plan will not include.

Let me tell you something.

Some are calling McConnell's plan "Trumpcare". Funny thing is, that's the first time the words 'Trump' and 'care' have ever been said in the same sentence... I'm kidding. I'm sure that It can be hard to negotiate with President Trump. Not because it's hard to tell what he's thinking, but simply because it's hard to tell if he is thinking at all! Just look at his tweets! All his sentences seem as though they were written by a 4-year old... "Very stable genius"... Keep telling yourself that, Donald. And Mitch McConnel thinks that he can sit down with Trump and develop a new, comprehensive healthcare reform! That's textbook delusional syndrome, if you ask me... Some might call it a severe pre-existing condition. Poor Mitch, not even his healthcare reform will be able to cover that.

But enough joking.

The reality is that Mitch McConnell is an incompetent and a hypocrite; it would be naïve to trust him."

Appendix C. Sensitivity analyses

Table C1. Sensitivity analysis for path model in Study 2

	Attacker	Target
Rho at which ACME = 0	0.22	-0.02
R2_M*R2_Y* at which ACME = 0	0.05	0.00
R2_M~R2_Y~ at which ACME = 0	0.04	0.00

Note: 95% confidence intervals, 1000 simulations.

Figure C1. Evolution of sensitivity parameter in Study 2





Table C2. Sensitivity analysis for path model in Study 3

	Attacker	Target
Rho at which ACME = 0	0.47	0.07
R2_M*R2_Y* at which ACME = 0	0.22	0.01
R2_M~R2_Y~ at which ACME = 0	0.14	0.00

Note: 95% confidence intervals, 1000 simulations.

Figure C2. Evolution of sensitivity parameter in Study 3

Appendix D. Additional results

Table D1a. Study 1 (attacker), factor analysis, Principal components

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Comp1	5.41	4.58	0.60	0.60
Comp2	0.83	0.16	0.09	0.69
Comp3	0.66	0.14	0.07	0.77
Comp4	0.52	0.08	0.06	0.82
Comp5	0.44	0.03	0.05	0.87
Comp6	0.41	0.08	0.05	0.92
Comp7	0.32	0.09	0.04	0.95
Comp8	0.23	0.05	0.03	0.98
Comp9	0.18	.	0.02	1.00

N=140

Table D1b. Study 1 (attacker), factor analysis, Eigenvectors

Variable	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6	Comp7	Comp8	Comp9
Warm	0.31	-0.51	0.16	0.54	0.16	0.34	0.29	0.33	-0.08
Competent	0.35	0.13	-0.53	0.05	-0.21	0.29	-0.30	-0.03	-0.60
Professional	0.37	-0.14	-0.40	0.20	0.04	0.01	-0.26	-0.33	0.68
Honest	0.25	0.77	0.30	0.30	-0.14	0.28	0.15	0.02	0.19
Inspiring	0.35	-0.13	0.53	0.13	0.03	-0.29	-0.20	-0.60	-0.30
Experienced	0.34	0.12	-0.29	0.09	-0.10	-0.69	0.51	0.14	-0.08
Shares my values	0.35	-0.11	0.29	-0.25	-0.42	-0.16	-0.43	0.55	0.16
Easy to like	0.34	-0.16	0.05	-0.63	-0.18	0.36	0.48	-0.24	0.08
Provides strong leadership	0.33	0.19	0.01	-0.31	0.83	-0.02	-0.14	0.21	-0.05

Table D1c. Study 1 (attacker), factor analysis, Component rotation matrix

Component	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6	Comp7	Comp8	Comp9
Comp1	0.35	0.25	0.35	0.34	0.33	0.34	0.31	0.35	0.37
Comp2	-0.11	0.77	0.13	-0.16	0.19	0.12	-0.51	-0.13	-0.14
Comp3	0.29	0.30	-0.53	0.05	0.01	-0.29	0.16	0.53	-0.40
Comp4	-0.25	0.30	0.05	-0.63	-0.31	0.09	0.54	0.13	0.20
Comp5	-0.42	-0.14	-0.21	-0.18	0.83	-0.10	0.16	0.03	0.04
Comp6	-0.16	0.28	0.29	0.36	-0.02	-0.69	0.34	-0.29	0.01
Comp7	-0.43	0.15	-0.30	0.48	-0.14	0.51	0.29	-0.20	-0.26
Comp8	0.55	0.02	-0.03	-0.24	0.21	0.14	0.33	-0.60	-0.33
Comp9	0.16	0.19	-0.60	0.08	-0.05	-0.08	-0.08	-0.30	0.68

Note: Quartimax rotation, normalized

Table D2a. Study 1 (target), factor analysis, Principal components

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Comp1	6.30	5.37	0.70	0.70
Comp2	0.93	0.55	0.10	0.80
Comp3	0.38	0.05	0.04	0.85
Comp4	0.33	0.01	0.04	0.88
Comp5	0.31	0.08	0.04	0.92
Comp6	0.23	0.04	0.03	0.94
Comp7	0.20	0.03	0.02	0.97
Comp8	0.17	0.02	0.02	0.98
Comp9	0.15	.	0.02	1.00

N=140

Table D2b. Study 1 (target), factor analysis, Eigenvectors

Variable	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6	Comp7	Comp8	Comp9
Warm	0.33	-0.32	-0.56	0.05	-0.08	-0.26	0.43	0.43	-0.16
Competent	0.32	0.36	-0.39	0.54	0.10	0.53	-0.05	-0.17	0.03
Professional	0.34	0.37	0.05	-0.14	0.33	-0.46	0.32	-0.52	-0.20
Honest	0.34	0.14	0.07	-0.64	-0.34	0.50	0.28	0.00	0.08
Inspiring	0.35	-0.33	0.03	-0.12	0.05	0.12	-0.52	-0.11	-0.68
Experienced	0.33	0.42	-0.05	-0.22	0.20	-0.24	-0.50	0.49	0.28
Shares my values	0.31	-0.44	0.38	0.07	0.62	0.22	0.18	0.10	0.30
Easy to like	0.34	-0.35	-0.12	0.06	-0.38	-0.24	-0.25	-0.44	0.53
Provides strong leadership	0.33	0.15	0.60	0.44	-0.44	-0.13	0.13	0.24	-0.15

Table D2c. Study 1 (target), factor analysis, Component rotation matrix

Component	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6	Comp7	Comp8	Comp9
Comp1	0.33	0.34	0.33	0.34	0.31	0.32	0.33	0.34	0.35
Comp2	-0.32	-0.35	0.15	0.14	-0.44	0.36	0.42	0.37	-0.33
Comp3	-0.56	-0.12	0.60	0.07	0.38	-0.39	-0.05	0.05	0.03
Comp4	0.05	0.06	0.44	-0.64	0.07	0.54	-0.22	-0.14	-0.12
Comp5	-0.08	-0.38	-0.44	-0.34	0.62	0.10	0.20	0.33	0.05
Comp6	-0.26	-0.24	-0.13	0.50	0.22	0.53	-0.24	-0.46	0.12
Comp7	0.43	-0.25	0.13	0.28	0.18	-0.05	-0.50	0.32	-0.52
Comp8	0.43	-0.44	0.24	0.00	0.10	-0.17	0.49	-0.52	-0.11
Comp9	-0.16	0.53	-0.15	0.08	0.30	0.03	0.28	-0.20	-0.68

Note: Quartimax rotation, normalized

Table D3a. Study 3 (attacker), factor analysis, Principal components

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Comp1	4.14	3.43	0.69	0.69
Comp2	0.71	0.11	0.12	0.81
Comp3	0.60	0.37	0.10	0.91
Comp4	0.23	0.06	0.04	0.95
Comp5	0.17	0.03	0.03	0.98
Comp6	0.15	.	0.02	1.00

N=1391

Table D3b. Study 3 (attacker), factor analysis, Eigenvectors

Variable	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6
Competent	0.45	-0.05	-0.25	-0.38	0.77	-0.01
Likeable	0.45	-0.01	0.10	-0.68	-0.57	-0.08
Funny	0.34	-0.45	0.78	0.22	0.14	0.05
Disagreeable (r)	0.31	0.88	0.30	0.18	0.07	-0.01
Knowledgeable	0.44	-0.13	-0.33	0.45	-0.16	-0.67
Qualified	0.44	-0.08	-0.34	0.32	-0.20	0.73

Table D3c. Study 3 (attacker), factor analysis, Component rotation matrix

Component	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6
Comp1	0.44	0.31	0.34	0.45	0.45	0.44
Comp2	-0.13	0.88	-0.45	-0.01	-0.05	-0.08
Comp3	-0.33	0.30	0.78	0.10	-0.25	-0.34
Comp4	0.45	0.18	0.22	-0.68	-0.38	0.32
Comp5	-0.16	0.07	0.14	-0.57	0.77	-0.20
Comp6	-0.67	-0.01	0.05	-0.08	-0.01	0.73

Note: Quartimax rotation, normalized

Table D4a. Study 3 (target), factor analysis, Principal components

Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Comp1	3.79	2.89	0.63	0.63
Comp2	0.90	0.22	0.15	0.78
Comp3	0.68	0.44	0.11	0.90
Comp4	0.25	0.04	0.04	0.94
Comp5	0.21	0.04	0.04	0.97
Comp6	0.17	.	0.03	1.00

N=1397

Table D4b. Study 3 (target), factor analysis, Eigenvectors

Variable	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6
Competent	0.46	-0.23	0.08	-0.37	0.76	0.11
Likeable	0.45	0.25	-0.19	-0.62	-0.51	0.24
Funny	0.35	0.41	-0.69	0.42	0.21	-0.10
Disagreeable (r)	0.28	0.65	0.67	0.21	0.06	0.00
Knowledgeable	0.43	-0.44	0.11	0.50	-0.23	0.55
Qualified	0.45	-0.32	0.12	0.05	-0.24	-0.79

Table D4c. Study 3 (target), factor analysis, Component rotation matrix

Component	Comp1	Comp2	Comp3	Comp4	Comp5	Comp6
Comp1	0.43	0.28	0.35	0.45	0.46	0.45
Comp2	-0.44	0.65	0.41	0.25	-0.23	-0.32
Comp3	0.11	0.67	-0.69	-0.19	0.08	0.12
Comp4	0.50	0.21	0.42	-0.62	-0.37	0.05
Comp5	-0.23	0.06	0.21	-0.51	0.76	-0.24
Comp6	0.55	0.00	-0.10	0.24	0.11	-0.79

Note: Quartimax rotation, normalized