

Online Appendix for “Linking Issue Stances and Trait Inferences: A Theory of Moral Exemplification”

Table A1 shows the results of the seemingly unrelated regression model predicting trait perceptions of Sam Brownback, as reported in the text (see p. 14).

Table A1. Effect of Brownback's Stance on Trait Perceptions

	Care Index	Authority Index
Treatment	0.30 *** (0.07)	-0.02 (0.07)
Death Penalty Opposition	-0.07 ** (0.02)	-0.03 (0.03)
Treatment*Opposition	0.10 ** (0.03)	0.09 * (0.03)
Party ID	-0.09 ** (0.03)	-0.16 *** (0.03)
Online Sample	-0.07 (0.06)	-0.15 * (0.07)
Constant	2.91 *** (0.10)	3.42 *** (0.11)
Observations	525	525

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, two-tailed. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table A2 shows the results of the seemingly unrelated regression model predicting trait perceptions of Jim Inhofe, as reported in the text (see p. 17).

Table A2. Effect of Inhofe's Stance on Trait Perceptions

	Care Index	Loyalty Index
Treatment	-0.70 *** (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)
Support for EI	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)
Treatment*Support	0.21 *** (0.03)	0.23 *** (0.03)
Party ID	-0.04 ** (0.01)	-0.07 *** (0.02)
Constant	3.07 *** (0.07)	3.49 *** (0.07)
Observations	508	508

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, two-tailed. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table A3 shows the results of an OLS regression model predicting death penalty attitudes (referenced on p. 13). The dependent variable is a 7-point scale with higher values indicating greater opposition to the death penalty. As expected, higher values on the Care Foundation predict greater opposition to the death penalty ($p < .001$) and higher values on the Authority foundation predict greater support for the death penalty ($p < .05$).

Table A3. Effect of Moral Foundations on Death Penalty	
	Opposition to the Death Penalty
Care Foundation	0.91 *** (0.18)
Fairness Foundation	-0.01 (0.19)
Authority Foundation	-0.38 * (0.18)
Loyalty Foundation	-0.32 (0.16)
Sanctity Foundation	-0.13 (0.12)
Party Identification	-0.01 (0.02)
Ideology	-0.03 (0.02)
Constant	0.49 *** (0.13)
Observations	275

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed. Standard errors in parentheses.

Details on the experiments combined in Study 2

During the summer prior to the online experiment, a nearly identical laboratory experiment was run utilizing undergraduate students enrolled in political science courses at a large southern university. A few small differences between the experiments are worth discussing. First, besides the obvious differences in the samples, subjects in the student experiment were compensated with extra credit, rather than a small monetary payment. Second, there were two differences in the ordering of the variables. In the online experiment, attitudes towards the death penalty were assessed after the treatment and dependent variables, while it was assessed prior to the treatment in the lab experiment. However, analyses show that attitudes towards the death penalty do not differ across samples, treatment conditions, or as an interaction of the two. Additionally, in the online experiment the manipulation check was given before the outcome variables, while it was given after the outcomes in the lab experiment. However, as shown below, the results are highly similar across experiments. The quality of the data appears to be similar as well, as judged by a manipulation check. The treatment increased knowledge of Brownback’s issue stance by 72 percentage points in the lab experiment, and 68 percentage points in the online experiment. Moreover, these treatment effects are statistically indistinguishable ($p=.86$).

Table A4 shows the results from Study 2 (a seemingly unrelated regression predicting trait impressions) broken down by sample (as referenced on p. 14). For each dependent variable, the results are shown for the student sample, for the online study recruited from Mechanical Turk, and finally as a pooled model (as reported in the text).

Table A4. Study 2 Treatment Effects by Sample

	Care Index			Authority Index		
	Student	Online	Pooled	Student	Online	Pooled
Treatment	0.29 ** (0.09)	0.31 ** (0.10)	0.30 *** (0.07)	-0.13 (0.09)	0.08 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.07)
Death Penalty Opposition	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10 ** (0.04)	-0.07 ** (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.03)
Treatment*Opposition	0.07 (0.04)	0.13 ** (0.05)	0.10 ** (0.03)	0.06 (0.05)	0.10 (0.05)	0.09 * (0.04)
Party ID	-0.07 (0.04)	-0.12 ** (0.04)	-0.09 ** (0.03)	-0.12 ** (0.04)	-0.21 *** (0.05)	-0.16 *** (0.03)
Online Sample			-0.07 (0.07)			-0.15 * (0.07)
Constant	2.86 *** (0.13)	2.92 *** (0.16)	2.91 *** (0.11)	3.36 *** (0.13)	3.37 *** (0.17)	3.42 *** (0.11)
Observations	250	275	525	250	275	525

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$, two-tailed. Standard errors in parentheses.

Figure A1 displays the marginal treatment effects (as in Figure 1), as estimated from each of the models in Table A4. As is clear, the substantive results are highly similar across samples.

Figure A1: Treatment Effects Across Experiments

