## Appendix

1.	Conditions and Vignettes	2
2.	Manipulation Checks	5
3.	Sample Demographics, Randomization Checks, and Measurement Details	8
4.	Factor Analysis of Emotions	9
5.	Comparison of Five Factor Model versus Two Factor Model MFQ	10
6.	Justification of Including Control Variables in Analysis	13
7.	Questionnaire	14
8.	Table 1 with Full Models	25
9.	Robustness Check with Full Individualizing and Binding Indices	27

## A1. Conditions and Vignettes

Number Treatment	Nature Campaign Message	Partisanship Actors
1	Civil	No partisan labels
2	Civil	Republican vs Democrat
3	Civil	Democrat vs Republican
4	Neutral	No partisan labels
5	Neutral	Republican vs Democrat
6	Neutral	Democrat vs Republican
7	Uncivil	No partisan labels
8	Uncivil	Republican vs Democrat
9	Uncivil	Democrat vs Republican

## Table A1.1: Overview of Conditions

## 2. Vignettes

## Vignette 1: Civil, No partisan labels

David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller listened closely. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Thanks for having me today. I want to begin by thanking my colleague for his 15 years of service to our state and for his thoughtful comments on this stage. I am deeply honored to be up here with him. I think my opponent and I share many of the same goals for this state. But today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime and create jobs."

## Vignette 2: Civil, Republican vs Democrat

Republican David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Democrat Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller listened closely. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Thanks for having me today. I want to begin by thanking my colleague for his 15 years of service to our state and for his thoughtful comments on this stage. I am deeply honored to be up here with him. I think my opponent and I share many of the same goals for this state. But today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime and create jobs."

## Vignette 3: Civil, Democrat vs Republican

Democrat David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Republican Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior. During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller listened closely. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Thanks for having me today. I want to begin by thanking my colleague for his 15 years of service to our state and for his thoughtful comments on this stage. I am deeply honored to be up here with him. I think my opponent and I share many of the same goals for this state. But today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime and create jobs."

## Vignette 4: Neutral, No partisan labels

David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Today, I want talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

#### Vignette 5: Neutral, Republican vs Democrat

Republican David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Democrat Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Today, I want talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

#### Vignette 6: Neutral, Democrat vs Republican

Democrat David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Republican Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Today, I want talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

#### Vignette 7: Uncivil, No partisan labels

David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinso n faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller appeared irritated and even rolled his eyes at times. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "My opponent doesn't share our values and is clearly a fool. He has accomplished absolutely nothing in office. Today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

#### Vignette 8: Uncivil, Republican vs Democrat

Republican David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Democrat Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller appeared irritated and even rolled his eyes at times. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "My opponent doesn't share our values and is clearly a fool. He has accomplished absolutely nothing in office. Today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

## Vignette 9: Uncivil, Democrat vs Republican

Democrat David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Republican Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller appeared irritated and even rolled his eyes at times. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "My opponent doesn't share our values and is clearly a fool. He has accomplished absolutely nothing in office. Today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime, and create jobs."

#### A2. Manipulation Checks

To test whether our civility manipulation worked, we asked respondents to, "Please indicate to what extent the following words describe Miller's behavior at the debate [civil/uncivil]" on a scale ranging from 0 ("Not at all") to 100 ("Extremely"). Respondents were randomly assigned to a "civil" or "uncivil" condition and the that latter was recoded to run in the same direction as the former.

	Sum of	Degrees of	Mean Square	F	Р
	Squares	Freedom			
Model	659637.75	2	329818.88	387.08	.000
Treatments	659637.75	2	329818.88	387.08	.000
Residual	1416148.4	1.662	852.07483		
Total	20757586.1	1.664	1247.4676		

#### Table A2.1 Anova results

*Note:* N=1664





As the one-way Anova test indicates and Table A2.1 shows, respondents found the civil and neutral treatments to be significantly more civil than the uncivil treatments (76, 68, and 33, respectively). They also found the civil treatment to be significantly more civil than the neutral treatment.

Unfortunately, we did not include a specific manipulation check for our partisan manipulation in the survey. The affective polarization literature, however, would predict respondents to express significantly more positive emotion about a candidate who is a copartisan and significantly more negative emotion about a candidate from the opposing party, even when we control for the civility conditions. We do not find that to be the case as Table A2.2 indicates below.

VARIABLES	Positive Emotion	Negative Emotion
Copartisan	3.62*	
	(1.42)	
Outpartisan		1.22
		(1.38)
Neutral treatment	-9.18***	3.04#
	(1.81)	(1.74)
Uncivil treatment	-30.43***	27.21***
	(1.56)	(1.50)
Constant	55.29***	20.79***
	(1.33)	(1.28)
Observations	1,665	1,665
Adjusted R-squared	0.21	0.21

 Table A2.2: Evaluation of Copartisan and Outpartisan Candidate on Positive and Negative Emotion Scales

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. The civil treatment is omitted. Both emotion scales range from 0-100. \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, # p<0.10 N=1516

Respondents rated a copartisan on average 3.6 points higher on the positive emotion scale, controlling for the civility treatment condition. Recall, however, that the positive emotion scale runs from 0 to 100 so this is hardly a substantive effect. Perhaps more importantly, respondents did not rate an outpartisan any more negatively than a copartisan. The 1.22 coefficient is not statistically significant from zero. We believe the manipulation effect is so weak because we mentioned the partisanship of the candidate only in the paragraph introducing the candidates and not in the paragraph that actually describes the candidates' behavior. For example, here is vignette 3 which was a partisan/civil treatment:

"Democrat David Miller is running for reelection to the US Senate after having served one term. His opponent is Republican Peter Robinson, who is currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. Yesterday, Miller and Robinson faced one another for the first time in a televised political debate. Please read the following short excerpt about the debate carefully, paying particularly close attention to David Miller's behavior.

During Robinson's opening remarks, Miller listened closely. When it was his turn to speak, Miller stepped up to the podium and said, "Thanks for having me today. I want to begin by thanking my colleague for his 15 years of service to our state and for his thoughtful comments on this stage. I am deeply honored to be up here with him. I think my opponent and I share many of the same goals for this state. But today, I want to talk about my innovative and comprehensive plan that will improve school performance, reduce crime and create jobs."

We should have stated each candidate's party again in the second paragraph by saying, "When it was his turn to speak, Democrat David Miller stepped up to the podium and said..." Although we fail to find a partisan effect, it does not diminish the value of the experiment as this was not our main interest and it actually increases the statistical power of our subsequent analyses as the number of

conditions compared reduces. We hope other researchers, however, learn from our mistake and use a stronger partisan prompt in their vignettes.

## A3. Sample Demographics, Randomization Checks, and Measurement Details

Variable	
% Male	48.71
% White	68.41
% African	12.73
% Hispanic	11.77
Mean Age (st.dev)	44.42 (.394)
% No college graduate	56.64
% More than \$50.000	57.46
% Republican	38.14
% Democrat	44.80
Note: N=1516.	

## Table A3.1: Sample Demographics

## Table A3.2: Randomization Check

Variable	Chi Square (p.value)
Male (0-1)	7.5144 (0.482)
White (0-1)	5.6262 (0.689)
African(0-1)	3.8507 (0.870)
Hispanic(0-1)	3.5745 (0.893)
Age (Anova)	2.35 (0.016)
No college graduate (0-1)	3.9559 (0.861)
Income more than \$50.000 (0-1)	29.9055 (0.673)
Democrat (0-1)	6.7240 (0.567)
Republican(0-1)	6.0483 (0.642)

Note: To further assess balance, we estimated a multinomial logistic regression model using the variables in the table to predict treatment assignment. The chi-square from this model is 64.23 (0.7310) indicating that the variables do not jointly predict treatment assignment. N=1516.

## A4: Factor analysis of Emotions

## **Table 4.1: Factor Analysis of Emotions**

Factor	Variance	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor	13.30171	0.83189	0.6136	0.6136
Factor	22.46982	•	0.459	1.0726

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Uniqueness
Anger	-0.1667	0.855	0.2412
Worry	-0.077	0.7488	0.4333
Disgust	-0.2572	0.8296	0.2457
Contempt	0.0972	0.6586	0.5568
Optimism	0.873	-0.0894	0.2299
Warm-hearted	0.9035	-0.0848	0.1765
Uplifted	0.8996	-0.1045	0.1798
Hopeful	0.897	-0.1731	0.1654

Note: N=1516. Principal factors analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. Results are similar using orthogonal oblimin rotation (contempt still loads positively on both factors (.08 on Factor 1, .66 on Factor 2).

#### A5. Comparison Five Factor Model versus Two Factor Model MFQ

Using an approach employed by several recent studies (e.g. Yilmaz et al. 2016; Nillson and Erlandsson 2015; Davies et al. 2014), we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis comparing the five-factor model with the two-factor model for the full 30-item MFQ, as well as separate model tests for the judgment and relevance subscales. The Moral Foundation Questionnaire consists of one part explicitly asking respondents to evaluate the moral relevance of several foundation-related concerns (relevance items) and a second part that was later added that assesses levels of agreement with more specific and contextualized moral judgment statements (judgment items) (Graham et al. 2011). These subsets of items each form relevance subscales and judgment subscales that later were combined by Graham et al. (2011) into five scales measuring the five moral foundations. They decided to use two sets of questions instead of one set to minimize the impact of variance based on response set and to supplement the abstract relevance items (Graham et al. 2011).

We assessed model fit of the two-factor and five-factor model using the Chi-Square Model Fit index, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). We also used  $\chi^2/df$  as an additional model fit index because the Chi-Square test of absolute model fit is sensitive to sample size. Table 1 displays these values for the two-factor and five-factor models. A RMSEA value below .06 is considered a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Steiger, 2007), while SRMR values less than .08 are indicative of an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The CFI is one of the most widely reported fit indices, with Hu and Bentler (1999) recognizing values equal to, or greater than, .95 on this index as a good fit.

Relevance items									
Model	χ2	df	$\chi^2/df$	AIC	CF	RMS	90%	SRM	
					Ι	EA	CI	R	
Five-factor model	782.103	70	11.17	70002.030	.925	.082	[.08,	.056	
			2				.09]		
Two-factor model	232.981	47	4.958	69498.907	.980	.051	[.05,	.022	
							.06]		
		J	ludgmen	t items					
Model	χ2	df	$\chi^2/df$	AIC	CF	RMS	90%	SRM	
					Ι	EA	CI	R	
Five-factor model	745.868	75	9.945		.862	.077	[.07,	.060	
				77235.081			.08]		
Two-factor model	362.383	65	5 5 7 5	76877 596	938	057	[05	.041	
	00=.000	00	0.010	10011.070	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Ŀ.º.,		

Table A5.1: Fit Indices Moral Foundation Questionnaire

Note: N=1516. Method: Confirmatory Factor Analysis using Maximum Likelihood. We allowed the error terms of items within the same factor to covary. Five factor model measured with relevance items constitutes of Care (emotionally, weak, and cruel), Fairness (treated, unfairly, and rights), Ingroup (lovecountry, betray, and history),

Authority (respect, traditions, and chaos) and Sanctity (decency, disgusting, and god). The two-factor model measured with relevance items consists of Individualizing (emotionally, weak, cruel, treated, unfairly, and rights) and Binding (lovecountry, betray, history, respect, traditions, chaos, decency, disgusting, and god). Five factor model measured with judgment items consists of Care (compassion, animal, and kill), Fairness (fairly, justice, and rich), Ingroup (family, team, and loyalty), Authority (kidrespect, sexroles, and soldier), Sanctity (harmlessdg, unnatural, and chastity). Two factor model measured with judgment items consist of Individualizing compassion, animal, kill, fairly, justice, and rich) and Binding (family, loyalty, team, kidrespect, soldier, sexroles, harmlessdg, unnatural, and chastity).

As Table 1 indicates, we find that for our data the two-factor model outperforms the five-factor model. Apart from the Comparative Fit Index for the judgment items, we seem to be justified in using the two-factor model. There are more studies where the Comparative Fit Index criterion is not fulfilled, including work of Graham et al (2011, see Table 10) and that do not support the five-factor model (e.g. Iurino and Saucier 2020).

The confirmatory factor analysis with the full MFQ we ran was complicated by a strong format effect that generated heightened correlations between items of the same subsets (judgment items, relevance items). As Table 2 shows below, relevance items for both the individualizing and binding foundations have a higher internal consistency than the judgment items. Thus, we use the relevance item subscales in our analysis, but confirm our findings by using the combined indices (relevance plus judgment) as a robustness check (see p. 27 in the appendix).

Relevance items					
Two factor-model Individualizing Foundation .8754					
Binding Foundation .8499					
	Judgment items				
Two factor-model Individualizing .6802					
Binding .7817					

Table 2: Internal Consistency Subscales Two-Factor Model

Note: N=1516. Cronbach alpha

## References

Davies, C. L., Sibley, C. G., Liu, J. H. (2014). Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire Independent Scale Validation in a New Zealand Sample. *Social Psychology*, 45, 431-436.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A, Haidt, J., Iyer, R. Koleva, S. and Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the Moral Domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366–385.

Hu, L. and Benter, P. M. (1999). Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analyses: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modelling*, 6, 1-55.

Iurino, K. and Saucier, G. (2020). Testing measurement invariance of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire across 27 countries. *Assessment*, 27 (2), 365-372 Nilsson, A. and Erlandsson, A. (2015). The Moral Foundations taxonomy: Structural validity and relation to political ideology in Sweden. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 76, 28-32.

Steiger, J. H. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modelling. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 893-898.

Van Leeuwen, F. and Park, J. H. (2009). Perceptions of social dangers, moral foundations, and political orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(3), 169-173.

Yilmaz, O., Harma, M., Bahçekapili, H. G. and Cesur, S. (2016). Validation of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire in Turkey and its relation to cultural schemas of individualism and collectivism *Personality and Individual Differences*, 99, 149-154.

Weber, C. R. and Frederico, C. M. (2013). Moral Foundations and Heterogeneity in Ideological Preferences. *Political Psychology*, 34(1) 107-126.

#### A6. Justification of Including Control Variables in Analysis

On average, there is no need to include control variables in models estimating the effects of treatments on subjects who are randomly assigned to treatment groups. However, this is on average which means that if we were to randomly assign an infinite number of respondents to these treatment groups the distribution of characteristics in each condition would be perfectly equal. However, any particular study represents only one such attempt and is therefore subject to the vagaries of chance. The smaller the number of subjects and the larger the number of conditions the more likely it is that the groups exposed to different conditions. Therefore, it is a safe strategy to include relevant characteristics in the model. We also ran the models without controls and found little difference.

## A7. Questionnaire

## Demographics

Q25.1 What is the highest level of school you have completed?

- Grade 8 or lower (1)
- Some high school, no diploma (2)
- High school diploma or equivalent (3)
- Some college, no degree (4)
- Associate degree (5)
- Bachelor's degree (6)
- Master's degree (7)
- Professional degree (8)
- Doctoral degree (9)

Q25.2 In what year were you born?

Q25.3 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
- o Female (2)
- Other, please specify (3)

Q25.4 Please indicate your ethnicity or race.

- White (1)
- Hispanic or Latino (2)
- Black or African American (3)
- Native American or American Indian (4)
- Asian / Pacific Islander (5)
- Other (please specify) (6)
- Q25.5 Please indicate your household income.
  - 0 0-\$24,999 (1)
  - o \$25,000-\$49,999 (2)
  - o \$50,000-\$74,999 (3)
  - o \$75,000-\$99,999 (4)
  - Over \$100,000 (5)

## Exposure to random treatment Emotions

Q12. 1 When you think about Miller's behavior, how does it make you feel? 0=Not at all 100=Extremely





#### **Stimulus Control Questions**

Q13.1 Please indicate to what extent to the following words describe Miller's behavior at the debate. 0=Not at all 100=Extremely



Q61 Please indicate to what extent to the following words describe Miller's behavior at the debate. 0=Not at all 100=Extremely



## Moral Values Part 1

Q17.1 When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale: [1] = Not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong) [2] = Not very relevant [3] = Slightly relevant [4] = Somewhat relevant [5] = Very relevant [6] = Extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

	Not al all relevant (1)	Not very relevant (2)	Slightly relevant (3)	Somewha t relevant (4)	Very relevant (5)	Extremel y relevant (6)
Whether or not someone suffered emotionally (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Whether or not some people were treated differently than others (2)	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country (3)	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority (4)	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	0
Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency (5)	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	0
Whether or not someone was good at math (6)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable (7)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whether or not someone acted unfairly (8)	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	Ο
Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group (9)	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	0
Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society (10)	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	0
Whether or not someone did something disgusting (11)	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0
Whether or not someone was cruel (12)	0	0	0	0	Ο	0

Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights (13)	0	Ο	0	Ο	0	0
Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty (14)	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0
Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder (15)	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	0
Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of (16)	0	0	Ο	Ο	0	0

## Moral Values Part 2

Q18.1 Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement: [1] Strongly disagree [2] Moderately disagree [3] Slightly disagree [4] Slightly agree [5] Moderately agree [6] Strongly agree

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
disagree	disagree (2)	disagree	agree (4)	agree (5)	agree (6)
(1)		(3)			

Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue. (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly. (2)	Ο	0	0	0	0	0
I am proud of my country's history. (3)	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0
Respect for authority is something all children need to learn. (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0
People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed. (5)	0	Ο	Ο	0	Ο	0
It is better to do good than to do bad. (6)	0	Ο	0	0	0	0

One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal. (7)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Justice is the most important requirement for a society. (8)	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	0
People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong. (9)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Men and women each have different roles to play in society. (10)	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural. (11)	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0

It can never be right to kill a human being. (12)	0	0	0	0	0	0
I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing. (13)	0	0	0	0	0	0
It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself. (14)	0	Ο	0	0	0	0
If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty. (15)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chastity is an important and valuable virtue. (16)	0	0	0	0	0	0

People who are successful in business have a right to enjoy their wealth as they see fit. (17)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Society works best when it lets individuals take responsibility for their own lives without telling them what to do. (18)	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
The government should do more to advance the common good, even if that means limiting the freedom and choices of individuals. (19)	0	0	Ο	0	0	0

Property owners should be allowed to develop their land or build their homes in any way they choose, as long as they don't endanger their neighbors. (20)	0	0	Ο	0	0	0
Whether or not everyone was free to do as they wanted. (21)	0	0	0	0	Ο	0
I think everyone should be free to do as they choose, so long as they don't infringe upon the equal freedom of others. (22)	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0
People should be free to decide what group norms or traditions they themselves want to follow. (23)	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	0

## Partisanship

Q21.1 Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent or what?

- Republican (1)
- o Democrat (2)
- o Independent (3)
- Other (4)
- Q21.2 Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican? • Strong (1)
  - Not very strong (2)
- Q21.3 Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or not a very strong Democrat? • Strong (1)
  - Not very strong (2)

Q21.4 Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic Party?

- Republican (1)
- o Democrat (2)
- Neither (3)

Q21.5 Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic Party?

- Republican (1)
- o Democrat (2)
- Neither (3)

## Liberal/Conservative

Q22.1 In general, how would you describe your political views?

- Very conservative (1)
- Conservative (2)
- Moderate (3)
- o Liberal (4)
- Very liberal (5)

## A8. Table 1 with Full Models

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive
VARIABLES	Emotion	Emotion	Emotion	Emotion
	1111011011	1111011011	1111011011	13111011011
Civil	-3.52*	9.08***	-20.21*	8.73
	(1.77)	(1.84)	(8.34)	(8.74)
Uncivil	27.50***	-24.13***	-15.79*	0.71
	(1.53)	(1.60)	(7.55)	(7.91)
Individualizing foundations	-1.09	-4.14***	-7.03***	-0.68
0	(0.85)	(0.88)	(1.66)	(1.74)
Binding foundations	2.89**	5.11***	3.71*	3.94*
C	(0.93)	(0.97)	(1.76)	(1.84)
Individualizing*Civil			4.71*	0.35
C C			(2.28)	(2.39)
Individualizing*Uncivil			9.65***	-7.26***
			(2.01)	(2.10)
Binding*Civil			-1.18	-0.31
			(2.46)	(2.58)
Binding*Uncivil			-0.33	2.05
			(2.15)	(2.25)
Republican	-3.32#	8.10***	-3.11#	7.85***
	(1.85)	(1.93)	(1.83)	(1.92)
Democrat	3.52*	5.49**	3.61*	5.35**
	(1.78)	(1.85)	(1.76)	(1.84)
Male	-3.47**	-3.61**	-3.67**	-3.60**
	(1.30)	(1.36)	(1.29)	(1.35)
White	0.95	-1.64	1.25	-1.76
	(1.49)	(1.56)	(1.48)	(1.55)
Age	-0.11**	-0.14**	-0.12**	-0.13**
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Education	0.23	0.04	0.32	-0.02
-	(0.72)	(0.75)	(0.71)	(0.74)
Income	-0.59	0.70	-0.55	0.68
	(0.52)	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.53)
Constant	21.10***	46.15***	44./3***	35.34***
	(4.12)	(4.29)	(6.31)	(6.62)
Observations	1 517	1 517	1 517	1 517
Adjusted R-squared	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.29

# Table A8.1: How Commitment to Individualizing Foundations Moderates Emotional Responses to Civil, Neutral, and Uncivil Treatments (Full model)

Standard errors in parentheses\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, # p<0.10

The full model reveals that Democrats express more negative emotion than both Independents and Republicans but partisans of all stripes express more positive emotion than Independents. Men express less negative and positive emotion than women while older respondents express less negative and positive emotion than young people. The effect of race, education, and income on the emotion scales cannot be statistically distinguished from zero.

## A9. Robustness Check with Full Individualizing and Binding Indices

Table A9.1: How Commitment to Individualizing Foundations Moderates Emotional Responses to Civil, Neutral, and Uncivil Treatments (Full Individualizing and Binding Indices)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive
VARIABLES	Emotion	Emotion	Emotion	Emotion
Civil	-3.59*	8.82***	-12.81	0.30
	(1.77)	(1.85)	(11.25)	(11.75)
Uncivil	27.44***	-24.31***	-14.77	3.55
	(1.54)	(1.60)	(10.15)	(10.60)
Individualizing foundations	-0.61	-2.08#	-5.90**	0.89
	(1.06)	(1.10)	(1.92)	(2.01)
Binding foundations	2.19*	4.49***	2.64#	3.77*
	(0.92)	(0.96)	(1.60)	(1.67)
Individualizing*Civil			2.97	2.13
			(2.69)	(2.81)
Individualizing*Uncivil			9.79***	-7.81**
			(2.40)	(2.51)
Binding*Civil			-0.97	-0.20
			(2.30)	(2.40)
Binding*Uncivil			-0.39	1.68
			(2.04)	(2.13)
Republican	-3.22#	7.92***	-3.19#	7.80***
-	(1.87)	(1.95)	(1.86)	(1.94)
Democrat	3.62*	5.43**	3.53*	5.51**
	(1.79)	(1.86)	(1.78)	(1.85)
Male	-3.45**	-4.04**	-3.43**	-4.20**
	(1.31)	(1.36)	(1.30)	(1.36)
White	0.95	-1.74	1.13	-1.75
	(1.49)	(1.56)	(1.49)	(1.56)
Age	-0.11*	-0.14**	-0.12**	-0.13**
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Education	0.15	-0.14	0.30	-0.30
	(0.72)	(0.75)	(0.71)	(0.74)
Income	-0.57	0.70	-0.45	0.61
	(0.52)	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.54)
Constant	21.82***	40.20***	43.13***	30.19***
	(4.99)	(5.20)	(8.28)	(8.65)
Observations	1,517	1,517	1,517	1,517
Adjusted R-squared	0.28	0.27	0.29	0.28

Note: Standard errors in parentheses\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, # p<0.10 N=15 16

The robustness check which uses the full individualizing and binding indices in the models yields virtually identical results using solely the index based on the relevance items from the MFQ survey. The binding foundations do not moderate how respondents respond to civility or incivility while the individualizing foundations moderate responses to incivility. We have recreated Figure 2 from the main text using the predicted margins calculated based on Models 3 and 4 above.

#### Figure 9.2: How Commitment to Individualizing Foundations Moderates Emotional

Responses to Uncivil, Civil, and Neutral Treatments (Full Individualizing and Binding

Indices)



The graph on the left showing how individualizing foundations affect reported negative emotion in the civil, neutral, and uncivil conditions looks virtually identical to Figure 2 in the main text. The graph on the right confirms that individualizers have a much less positive response to incivility than non-individualizers while both while commitment to individualizing foundations does not affect responses to the neutral condition. The only difference is that individualizers seem to experience slightly more positive emotion in the civil condition than non-individualizers, but the effect is not statistically significant. Overall, then, the two graphs communicate the same story that Figure 2 in the main text does.