**Online Appendix A**

**Appendix A, Table 1: Five Responses to Attacks on Incumbent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response Type | Attack: Taking Advantage |
| Denial | Candidate did nothing wrong:   * pay raises enacted before s/he took office; * only personal money used to pay for family vacation; * office complex where district office is located no longer owned by candidate’s brother; * overbilling was due to a clerical error and quickly corrected; * investigation by Attorney General found no evidence of wrongdoing |
| Counterattack | Opponent is the one deserving of criticism because s/he:   * filed false business tax return; * accepted illegal campaign contributions; * steered government contracts to business clients and campaign donors; * opposed stricter ethics laws for state officials |
| Counterimaging | Candidate is a (wo)man of character as s/he:   * helped support family after father died; * put him/herself through college and earned scholarship to graduate school; * started own business that creates many jobs; * has served country (active duty/military reserves), community (volunteer work), those less fortunate (established college scholarship fund), and church (charitable activities, missions) |
| Justification | Candidate’s actions were reasonable/warranted:   * pay raises did not apply to anyone currently in office; * vacation followed official trade meetings, with the party reimbursed for personal expenses; * district office is the same used by predecessor, and rent has not increased since then; * dispute over fee charged for professional services settled amicably; * no personal or close political connections to recipients of state contracts |
| Mudslinging | Opponent is desperate and has become “relentlessly negative,” thereby:   * failing to discuss the issues people really care about; * ignoring the fact that voters are sick of campaign mudslinging; * contributing to voter pessimism and low turnout; * exhibiting weak leadership skills, and a lack of class and integrity |

**Appendix A, Table 2: Counterbalancing Order for Each of Twenty Research Groups**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research Group | Challenger  (attacker) | Incumbent  (responder) | Response  type |
| 1 | D – Hall | R – Stanley | denial |
| 2 | D – Stanley | R – Hall | denial |
| 3 | R – Hall | D – Stanley | denial |
| 4 | R – Stanley | D – Hall | denial |
| 5 | D – Hall | R – Stanley | counterattack |
| 6 | D – Stanley | R – Hall | counterattack |
| 7 | R – Hall | D – Stanley | counterattack |
| 8 | R – Stanley | D – Hall | counterattack |
| 9 | D – Hall | R – Stanley | counterimaging |
| 10 | D – Stanley | R – Hall | counterimaging |
| 11 | R - Hall | D – Stanley | counterimaging |
| 12 | R - Stanley | D – Hall | counterimaging |
| 13 | D - Hall | R – Stanley | justification |
| 14 | D – Stanley | R – Hall | justification |
| 15 | R - Hall | D – Stanley | justification |
| 16 | R - Stanley | D – Hall | justification |
| 17 | D - Hall | R – Stanley | mudslinging |
| 18 | D - Stanley | R – Hall | mudslinging |
| 19 | R - Hall | D – Stanley | mudslinging |
| 20 | R - Stanley | D - Hall | mudslinging |
| Note: Hall is always the female candidate, Stanley is always the male candidate. | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 3: Perceived Negativity of the Attack Ad, by Respondent’s Party Identification**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Party Identification | Too Negative | Negative | Not Really  Negative | Total |
| Strong Democrat | 25.58% | 62.79% | 11.63% | 100.00% |
| 11 | 27 | 5 | 43 |
| Democrat | 29.82% | 66.67% | 3.51% | 100.00% |
| 34 | 76 | 4 | 114 |
| Weak Democrat | 22.81% | 74.56% | 2.63% | 100.00% |
| 26 | 85 | 3 | 114 |
| Independent | 26.67% | 65.56% | 7.78% | 100.00% |
| 24 | 59 | 7 | 90 |
| Weak Republican | 22.34% | 72.34% | 5.32% | 100.00% |
| 21 | 68 | 5 | 94 |
| Republican | 34.94% | 54.22% | 10.84% | 100.00% |
| 29 | 45 | 9 | 83 |
| Strong Republican | 20.41% | 73.47% | 3.12% | 100.00% |
| 10 | 36 | 3 | 49 |
| Other | 36.84% | 52.63% | 10.53% | 100.00% |
| 7 | 10 | 2 | 19 |
| Don't Know | 25.93% | 46.30% | 27.78% | 100.00% |
| 14 | 25 | 15 | 54 |
| Total | 26.67% | 65.30% | 8.03% | 100.00% |
| 176 | 431 | 53 | 660 |

**Appendix A, Table 4: Perceived Negativity of the Attack Ad, by Respondent’s Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Too Negative** | **Negative** | **Not Really**  **Negative** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 29.74% | 63.27% | 7.00% | 100.00% |
| 102 | 217 | 24 | 343 |
| **Male** | 23.20% | 67.71% | 9.09% | 100.00% |
| 74 | 216 | 29 | 319 |
| **Total** | 26.59% | 65.41% | 8.01% | 100.00% |
| 176 | 433 | 53 | 662 |

**Appendix A, Table 5: Effects of Attack Ads on Vote Choice and Candidate Evaluations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Vote for Incumbent | | Favorability, Incumbent | | Favorability, Challenger | |
|  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* |
| All Respondents | Baseline  evaluation | 662 | 0.503 | 662 | 4.624 | 662 | 4.631 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 662 | 0.322 | 662 | 3.000 | 662 | 4.119 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.181* |  | *-1.624* |  | *-0.512* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Same PID as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 244 | 0.869 | 244 | 5.270 | 244 | 4.148 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 244 | 0.570 | 244 | 3.549 | 244 | 3.504 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.299* |  | *-1.721* |  | *-0.643* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Opposite PID as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 253 | 0.111 | 253 | 4.174 | 253 | 5.348 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 253 | 0.071 | 253 | 2.419 | 253 | 4.933 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.040* |  | *-1.755* |  | *-0.415* |
|  | p = 0.122 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Independents | Baseline  evaluation | 165 | 0.564 | 165 | 4.358 | 165 | 4.248 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 165 | 0.339 | 165 | 3.079 | 165 | 3.782 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.224* |  | *-1.279* |  | *-0.467* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Same Gender as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 335 | 0.510 | 335 | 4.609 | 335 | 4.627 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 335 | 0.319 | 335 | 3.000 | 335 | 4.155 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.191* |  | *-1.609* |  | *-0.472* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Opposite Gender as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 327 | 0.495 | 327 | 4.639 | 327 | 4.636 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 327 | 0.324 | 327 | 3.000 | 327 | 4.083 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.171* |  | *-1.639* |  | *-0.554* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Note: For vote choice, difference is calculated as proportion (post-attack vote) – proportion (baseline vote). For favorability, difference is calculated as mean (post-attack) – mean (baseline). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 6: Effects of Attack Ads on Vote Choice and Candidate Evaluations,**

**by Attacker’s Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Female Attacker & Male Incumbent | | | | | | Male Attacker & Female Incumbent | | | | | |
|  |  | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | |
|  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* |
| All Respondents | Baseline  evaluation | 340 | 0.479 | 340 | 4.544 | 340 | 4.624 | 322 | 0.528 | 322 | 4.708 | 322 | 4.640 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 340 | 0.332 | 340 | 3.021 | 340 | 4.056 | 322 | 0.311 | 322 | 2.978 | 322 | 4.186 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.147* |  | *-1.524* |  | *-0.568* |  | *-0.217* |  | *-1.730* |  | *-0.453* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Same PID as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 126 | 0.841 | 126 | 5.183 | 126 | 4.167 | 118 | 0.898 | 118 | 5.364 | 118 | 4.127 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 126 | 0.579 | 126 | 3.595 | 126 | 3.270 | 118 | 0.559 | 118 | 3.500 | 118 | 3.754 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.262* |  | *-1.587* |  | *-0.897* |  | *-0.339* |  | *-1.864* |  | *-0.373* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.001 | |
| Opposite PID as Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 123 | 0.065 | 123 | 4.106 | 123 | 5.439 | 130 | 0.154 | 130 | 4.238 | 130 | 5.262 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 123 | 0.089 | 123 | 2.407 | 123 | 4.976 | 130 | 0.054 | 130 | 2.431 | 130 | 4.892 |
| *diff* |  | *0.024* |  | *-1.699* |  | *-0.463* |  | *-0.100* |  | *-1.808* |  | *-0.369* |
|  | p = 0.474 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.008 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Independents | Baseline  evaluation | 91 | 0.538 | 91 | 4.253 | 91 | 4.154 | 74 | 0.595 | 74 | 4.486 | 74 | 4.365 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 91 | 0.319 | 91 | 3.055 | 91 | 3.901 | 74 | 0.365 | 74 | 3.108 | 74 | 3.635 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.220* |  | *-1.198* |  | *-0.253* |  | *-0.230* |  | *-1.378* |  | *-0.730* |
|  | p = 0.003 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.037 | | p = 0.005 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Same Gender as  Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 166 | 0.494 | 166 | 4.355 | 166 | 4.446 | 169 | 0.527 | 169 | 4.858 | 169 | 4.805 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 166 | 0.337 | 166 | 3.006 | 166 | 4.024 | 169 | 0.302 | 169 | 2.994 | 169 | 4.284 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.157* |  | *-1.349* |  | *-0.422* |  | *-0.225* |  | *-1.864* |  | *-0.521* |
|  | p = 0.004 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Opposite Gender as  Incumbent/Target | Baseline  evaluation | 174 | 0.466 | 174 | 4.724 | 174 | 4.793 | 153 | 0.529 | 153 | 4.542 | 153 | 4.458 |
| Post-attack  evaluation | 174 | 0.328 | 174 | 3.034 | 174 | 4.086 | 153 | 0.320 | 153 | 2.961 | 153 | 4.078 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.138* |  | *-1.690* |  | *-0.707* |  | *-0.209* |  | *-1.582* |  | *-0.379* |
|  | p = 0.009 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Note: For vote choice, difference is calculated as proportion (post-attack vote) – proportion (baseline vote). For favorability, difference is calculated as mean (post-attack) – mean (baseline). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 7: Net Effects of Response Ads on Vote Choice and Candidate Evaluations,**

**by Incumbent’s Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | | | | | | Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | |
|  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* |
| Denial | Baseline  evaluation | 65 | 0.508 | 65 | 4.538 | 65 | 4.677 | 62 | | 0.435 | 62 | 4.339 | 62 | 4.677 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 65 | 0.585 | 65 | 4.138 | 65 | 3.185 | 62 | | 0.371 | 62 | 3.661 | 62 | 3.984 |
| *diff* |  | *0.077* |  | *-0.400* |  | *-1.492* |  | | *-0.065* |  | *-0.677* |  | *-0.694* |
|  | p = 0.378 | | p = 0.003 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.464 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Counterattack | Baseline  evaluation | 62 | 0.452 | 62 | 4.484 | 62 | 4.742 | 61 | | 0.541 | 61 | 4.803 | 61 | 4.852 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 62 | 0.516 | 62 | 3.371 | 62 | 3.081 | 61 | | 0.475 | 61 | 3.082 | 61 | 2.918 |
| *diff* |  | *0.065* |  | *-1.113* |  | *-1.661* |  | | *-0.066* |  | *-1.721* |  | *-1.934* |
|  | p = 0.472 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.469 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Counterimaging | Baseline  evaluation | 65 | 0.569 | 65 | 4.677 | 65 | 4.692 | 73 | | 0.493 | 73 | 4.562 | 73 | 4.425 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 65 | 0.600 | 65 | 4.323 | 65 | 3.877 | 73 | | 0.493 | 73 | 4.027 | 73 | 4.000 |
| *diff* |  | *0.031* |  | *-0.354* |  | *-0.815* |  | | *0.000* |  | *-0.534* |  | *-0.425* |
|  | p = 0.722 | | p = 0.012 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 1.000 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Justification | Baseline  evaluation | 63 | 0.397 | 63 | 4.540 | 63 | 4.603 | 59 | | 0.644 | 59 | 5.068 | 59 | 4.356 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 63 | 0.397 | 63 | 3.683 | 63 | 3.746 | 59 | | 0.712 | 59 | 4.254 | 59 | 3.017 |
| *diff* |  | *0.000* |  | *-0.857* |  | *-0.857* |  | | *0.068* |  | *-0.814* |  | *-1.339* |
|  | p = 1.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.431 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Mudslinging | Baseline  evaluation | 85 | 0.471 | 85 | 4.494 | 85 | 4.459 | 67 | 0.537 | | 67 | 4.806 | 67 | 4.896 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 85 | 0.341 | 85 | 3.047 | 85 | 3.894 | 67 | 0.418 | | 67 | 3.299 | 67 | 4.104 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.129* |  | *-1.447* |  | *-0.565* |  | *-0.119* | |  | *-1.507* |  | *-0.791* |
|  | p = 0.089 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.167 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Note: For vote choice, difference is calculated as proportion (post-response vote) – proportion (baseline vote). For favorability, difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (baseline). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 8: Effects of Response Ads on Vote Choice and Candidate Evaluations,**

**by Incumbent’s Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | | | | | | Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | | **Vote for**  **Incumbent** | | | **Favorability,**  **Incumbent** | | **Favorability,**  **Challenger** | |
|  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Prop* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* |
| Denial | Post-attack  evaluation | 65 | 0.354 | 65 | 2.969 | 65 | 3.892 | 62 | | 0.242 | 62 | 2.645 | 62 | 4.516 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 65 | 0.585 | 65 | 4.138 | 65 | 3.185 | 62 | | 0.371 | 62 | 3.661 | 62 | 3.984 |
| *diff* |  | *0.231* |  | *1.169* |  | *-0.708* |  | | *0.129* |  | *1.016* |  | *-0.532* |
|  | p = 0.008 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.119 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Counterattack | Post-attack  evaluation | 62 | 0.274 | 62 | 3.097 | 62 | 4.226 | 61 | | 0.262 | 61 | 2.705 | 61 | 4.262 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 62 | 0.516 | 62 | 3.371 | 62 | 3.081 | 61 | | 0.475 | 61 | 3.082 | 61 | 2.918 |
| *diff* |  | *0.242* |  | *0.274* |  | *-1.145* |  | | *0.213* |  | *0.377* |  | *-1.344* |
|  | p = 0.006 | | p = 0.088 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.015 | | | p = 0.009 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Counterimaging | Post-attack  evaluation | 65 | 0.492 | 65 | 3.431 | 65 | 3.862 | 73 | | 0.342 | 73 | 3.274 | 73 | 3.808 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 65 | 0.600 | 65 | 4.323 | 65 | 3.877 | 73 | | 0.493 | 73 | 4.027 | 73 | 4.000 |
| *diff* |  | *0.108* |  | *0.892* |  | *0.015* |  | | *0.151* |  | *0.753* |  | *0.192* |
|  | p = 0.109/.218 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.910 | | p = 0.065 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.019 | |
| Justification | Post-attack  evaluation | 63 | 0.222 | 63 | 2.825 | 63 | 4.254 | 59 | | 0.390 | 59 | 3.034 | 59 | 3.915 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 63 | 0.397 | 63 | 3.683 | 63 | 3.746 | 59 | | 0.712 | 59 | 4.254 | 59 | 3.017 |
| *diff* |  | *0.175* |  | *0.857* |  | *-0.508* |  | | *0.322* |  | *1.220* |  | *-0.898* |
|  | p = 0.034 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.002 | | p = 0.000 | | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | |
| Mudslinging | Post-attack  evaluation | 85 | 0.318 | 85 | 2.835 | 85 | 4.059 | 67 | 0.313 | | 67 | 3.164 | 67 | 4.463 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 85 | 0.341 | 85 | 3.047 | 85 | 3.894 | 67 | 0.418 | | 67 | 3.299 | 67 | 4.104 |
| *diff* |  | *0.024* |  | *0.212* |  | *-0.165* |  | *0.104* | |  | *0.134* |  | *-0.358* |
|  | p = 0.744 | | p = 0.172/.031 | | p = 0.034 | | p = 0.209 | | | p = 0.344 | | p = 0.003 | |
| Note: For vote choice, difference is calculated as proportion (post-response vote) – proportion (post-attack vote). For favorability, difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (post-attack). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 9a: Effects of Response Ads on Vote Choice,**

**by Response Type and Incumbent Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | | Mudslinging | | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | | *Prop* | *N* | | *Prop* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 21 | 0.571 | 23 | 0.435 | 30 | 0.767 | 19 | | 0.474 | 33 | | 0.576 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 21 | 0.952 | 23 | 0.913 | 30 | 0.867 | 19 | | 0.842 | 33 | | 0.667 |
| *diff* |  | *0.381* |  | *0.478* |  | *0.100* |  | | *0.368* |  | | *0.091* |
|  | p = 0.004 | | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.317 | | p = 0.017 | | | p = 0.447 | | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/**  **Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 31 | 0.129 | 24 | 0.125 | 14 | 0.143 | 25 | | 0.040 | 29 | 0.034 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 31 | 0.258 | 24 | 0.125 | 14 | 0.214 | 25 | | 0.080 | 29 | 0.000 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.129* |  | *0.000* |  | *0.071* |  | | *0.040* |  | *-0.034* | |
|  | p = 0.199 | | p = 1.000 | | p = 0.622 | | p = 0.552 | | | p = 0.313 | | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 13 | 0.538 | 15 | 0.267 | 21 | 0.333 | 19 | | 0.211 | 23 | 0.304 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 13 | 0.769 | 15 | 0.533 | 21 | 0.476 | 19 | | 0.368 | 23 | 0.304 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.231* |  | *0.267* |  | *0.143* |  | | *0.158* |  | *0.000* | |
|  | p = 0.216 | | p = 0.136 | | p = 0.346 | | p = 0.283 | | | p = 1.000 | | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 18 | 0.556 | 23 | 0.522 | 21 | 0.619 | 27 | | 0.593 | 29 | 0.517 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 18 | 0.833 | 23 | 0.826 | 21 | 0.762 | 27 | | 0.963 | 29 | 0.724 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.278* |  | *0.304* |  | *0.143* |  | | *0.370* |  | *0.207* | |
|  | p = 0.070 | | p = 0.028 | | p = 0.317 | | p = 0.001 | | | p = 0.104 | | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 29 | 0.000 | 26 | 0.000 | 29 | 0.103 | 19 | | 0.105 | 27 | 0.074 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 29 | 0.000 | 26 | 0.077 | 29 | 0.207 | 19 | | 0.368 | 27 | 0.037 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.000* |  | *0.077* |  | *0.103* |  | | *0.263* |  | *-0.037* | |
|  | - | | p = 0.149 | | p = 0.277 | | p = 0.056 | | | p = 0.553 | | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 15 | 0.333 | 12 | 0.333 | 23 | 0.391 | 13 | 0.385 | | 11 | 0.364 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 15 | 0.533 | 12 | 0.667 | 23 | 0.609 | 13 | 0.692 | | 11 | 0.545 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.200* |  | *0.333* |  | *0.217* |  | *0.308* | |  | *0.182* | |
|  | p = 0.269 | | p = 0.103 | | p = 0.140 | | p = 0.116 | | | p = 0.392 | | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as proportion (post-response vote) – proportion (post-attack vote). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 9b: Effects of Response Ads on Incumbent Favorability,**

**by Response Type and Incumbent Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | | Mudslinging | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 21 | 3.762 | 23 | 3.348 | 30 | 4.067 | 19 | | 3.105 | 33 | 3.515 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 21 | 5.048 | 23 | 3.870 | 30 | 5.167 | 19 | | 4.789 | 33 | 3.939 |
| *diff* |  | *1.286* |  | *0.522* |  | *1.100* |  | | *1.684* |  | *0.424* |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.090 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.000 | | | p = 0.021 | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/**  **Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 31 | 2.419 | 24 | 2.583 | 14 | 2.286 | 25 | | 2.560 | 29 | 2.172 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 31 | 3.548 | 24 | 2.875 | 14 | 3.429 | 25 | | 3.120 | 29 | 2.138 | |
| *diff* |  | *1.129* |  | *0.292* |  | *1.143* |  | | *0.560* |  | *-0.034* | |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.271 | | p = 0.026 | | p = 0.032 | | | p = 0.813 | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 13 | 3.000 | 15 | 3.533 | 21 | 3.286 | 19 | | 2.895 | 23 | 2.696 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 13 | 4.077 | 15 | 3.400 | 21 | 3.714 | 19 | | 3.316 | 23 | 2.913 | |
| *diff* |  | *1.077* |  | *-0.133* |  | *0.429* |  | | *0.421* |  | *0.217* | |
|  | p = 0.024 | | p = 0.546 | | p = 0.196 | | p = 0.190 | | | p = 0.203 | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 18 | 3.167 | 23 | 3.391 | 21 | 3.905 | 27 | | 3.519 | 29 | 3.483 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 18 | 4.889 | 23 | 3.870 | 21 | 4.429 | 27 | | 5.185 | 29 | 4.000 | |
| *diff* |  | *1.722* |  | *0.478* |  | *0.524* |  | | *1.667* |  | *0.517* | |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.053 | | p = 0.061 | | p = 0.000 | | | p = 0.011 | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 29 | 2.241 | 26 | 2.154 | 29 | 2.724 | 19 | | 2.368 | 27 | 2.630 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 29 | 3.069 | 26 | 2.385 | 29 | 3.966 | 19 | | 3.263 | 27 | 2.296 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.828* |  | *0.231* |  | *1.241* |  | | *0.895* |  | *-0.333* | |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.265 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.063 | | | p = 0.195 | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 15 | 2.800 | 12 | 2.583 | 23 | 3.391 | 13 | 3.000 | | 11 | 3.636 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 15 | 3.333 | 12 | 3.083 | 23 | 3.739 | 13 | 3.769 | | 11 | 3.909 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.533* |  | *0.500* |  | *0.348* |  | *0.769* | |  | *0.273* | |
|  | p = 0.056 | | p = 0.191 | | p = 0.119 | | p = 0.054 | | | p = 0.192 | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (post-attack). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 9c: Effects of Response Ads on Challenger Favorability,**

**by Response Type and Incumbent Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | | Mudslinging | | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Mean* | *N* | | *Mean* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 21 | 3.000 | 23 | 3.652 | 30 | 3.033 | 19 | | 3.579 | 33 | | 3.212 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 21 | 2.143 | 23 | 2.652 | 30 | 3.167 | 19 | | 2.737 | 33 | | 3.182 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.857* |  | *-1.000* |  | *0.133* |  | | *-0.842* |  | | *-0.030* |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.004 | | p = 0.475 | | p = 0.004 | | | p = 0.839 | | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/**  **Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 31 | 4.806 | 24 | 4.667 | 14 | 5.286 | 25 | | 5.120 | 29 | 5.138 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 31 | 4.194 | 24 | 3.292 | 14 | 5.357 | 25 | | 4.760 | 29 | 5.000 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.613* |  | *-1.375* |  | *0.071* |  | | *-0.360* |  | *-0.138* | |
|  | p = 0.014 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.671 | | p = 0.153 | | | p = 0.103 | | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 13 | 3.154 | 15 | 4.400 | 21 | 4.095 | 19 | | 3.789 | 23 | 3.913 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 13 | 2.462 | 15 | 3.400 | 21 | 3.905 | 19 | | 3.421 | 23 | 3.522 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.692* |  | *-1.000* |  | *-0.190* |  | | *-0.368* |  | *-0.391* | |
|  | p = 0.032 | | p = 0.004 | | p = 0.550 | | p = 0.286 | | | p = 0.016 | | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 18 | 3.889 | 23 | 3.609 | 21 | 3.238 | 27 | | 3.778 | 29 | 4.138 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 18 | 2.889 | 23 | 2.478 | 21 | 3.429 | 27 | | 2.593 | 29 | 3.517 | |
| *diff* |  | *-1.000* |  | *-1.130* |  | *0.190* |  | | *-1.185* |  | *-0.621* | |
|  | p = 0.007 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.104 | | p = 0.001 | | | p = 0.006 | | |
| **Opposite PID as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 29 | 5.172 | 26 | 5.000 | 29 | 4.793 | 19 | | 4.211 | 27 | 5.074 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 29 | 4.690 | 26 | 3.346 | 29 | 4.966 | 19 | | 3.684 | 27 | 4.963 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.483* |  | *-1.654* |  | *0.172* |  | | *-0.526* |  | *-0.111* | |
|  | p = 0.011 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.170 | | p = 0.037 | | | p = 0.376 | | |
| **Independents** | Post-attack  evaluation | 15 | 4.000 | 12 | 3.917 | 23 | 3.087 | 13 | 3.769 | | 11 | 3.818 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 15 | 3.933 | 12 | 2.833 | 23 | 3.304 | 13 | 2.923 | | 11 | 3.545 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.067* |  | *-1.083* |  | *0.217* |  | *-0.846* | |  | *-0.273* | |
|  | p = 0.670 | | p = 0.030 | | p = 0.233 | | p = 0.021 | | | p = 0.391 | | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (post-attack). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 10a: Effects of Response Ads on Vote Choice,**

**by Response Type and Shared Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | Mudslinging | | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | *Prop* | *N* | | *Prop* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 32 | 0.313 | 32 | 0.344 | 32 | 0.500 | 34 | 0.265 | 36 | | 0.278 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 32 | 0.594 | 32 | 0.563 | 32 | 0.531 | 34 | 0.412 | 36 | | 0.333 |
| *diff* |  | *0.281* |  | *0.219* |  | *0.031* |  | *0.147* |  | | *0.056* |
|  | p = 0.024 | | p = 0.079 | | p = 0.803 | | p = 0.200 | | p = 0.609 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 33 | 0.394 | 30 | 0.200 | 33 | 0.485 | 29 | 0.172 | 49 | 0.347 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 33 | 0.576 | 30 | 0.467 | 33 | 0.667 | 29 | 0.379 | 49 | 0.347 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.182* |  | *0.267* |  | *0.182* |  | *0.207* |  | *0.000* | |
|  | p = 0.140 | | p = 0.029 | | p = 0.135 | | p = 0.078 | | p = 1.000 | | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 34 | 0.235 | 37 | 0.270 | 25 | 0.320 | 38 | 0.342 | 35 | 0.343 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 34 | 0.353 | 37 | 0.486 | 25 | 0.320 | 38 | 0.711 | 35 | 0.457 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.118* |  | *0.216* |  | *0.000* |  | *0.368* |  | *0.114* | |
|  | p = 0.287 | | p = 0.055 | | p = 1.000 | | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.329 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 28 | 0.250 | 24 | 0.250 | 48 | 0.354 | 21 | 0.476 | 32 | 0.281 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 28 | 0.393 | 24 | 0.458 | 48 | 0.583 | 21 | 0.714 | 32 | 0.375 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.143* |  | *0.208* |  | *0.229* |  | *0.238* |  | *0.094* | |
|  | p = 0.252 | | p = 0.131 | | p = 0.025 | | p = 0.116 | | p = 0.425 | | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as proportion (post-response vote) – proportion (post-attack vote). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 10b: Effects of Response Ads on Incumbent Favorability,**

**by Response Type and Shared Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | Mudslinging | | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Mean* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 32 | 2.875 | 32 | 2.938 | 32 | 3.781 | 34 | 2.706 | 36 | | 2.778 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 32 | 3.969 | 32 | 3.344 | 32 | 4.281 | 34 | 3.471 | 36 | | 2.972 |
| *diff* |  | *1.094* |  | *0.406* |  | *0.500* |  | *0.765* |  | | *0.194* |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.079 | | p = 0.016 | | p = 0.005 | | p = 0.109 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 33 | 3.061 | 30 | 3.267 | 33 | 3.091 | 29 | 2.966 | 49 | 2.878 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 33 | 4.303 | 30 | 3.400 | 33 | 4.364 | 29 | 3.931 | 49 | 3.102 | |
| *diff* |  | *1.242* |  | *0.133* |  | *1.273* |  | *0.966* |  | *0.224* | |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.556 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.002 | | p = 0.125 | | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 34 | 2.618 | 37 | 2.811 | 25 | 3.400 | 38 | 3.026 | 35 | 3.229 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 34 | 3.706 | 37 | 3.189 | 25 | 4.040 | 38 | 4.289 | 35 | 3.457 | |
| *diff* |  | *1.088* |  | *0.378* |  | *0.640* |  | *1.263* |  | *0.229* | |
|  | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.021 | | p = 0.036 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.199 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 28 | 2.679 | 24 | 2.542 | 48 | 3.208 | 21 | 3.048 | 32 | 3.094 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 28 | 3.607 | 24 | 2.917 | 48 | 4.021 | 21 | 4.190 | 32 | 3.125 | |
| *diff* |  | *0.929* |  | *0.375* |  | *0.813* |  | *1.143* |  | *0.031* | |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.175 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.012 | | p = 0.891 | | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (post-attack). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix A, Table 10c: Effects of Response Ads on Challenger Favorability,**

**by Response Type and Shared Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Denial | | Counterattack | | Counterimaging | | Justification | | Mudslinging | | |
|  |  |  | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | *Mean* | *N* | | *Mean* |
| Male Incumbent, Female Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 32 | 4.031 | 32 | 3.844 | 32 | 3.875 | 34 | 4.294 | 36 | | 4.056 |
| Post-response  evaluation | 32 | 3.250 | 32 | 2.813 | 32 | 3.813 | 34 | 3.676 | 36 | | 3.833 |
| *diff* |  | *-0.781* |  | *-1.031* |  | *-0.063* |  | *-0.618* |  | | *-0.222* |
|  | p = 0.001 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.645 | | p = 0.002 | | p = 0.073 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 33 | 3.758 | 30 | 4.633 | 33 | 3.848 | 29 | 4.207 | 49 | 4.061 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 33 | 3.121 | 30 | 3.367 | 33 | 3.939 | 29 | 3.828 | 49 | 3.939 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.636* |  | *-1.267* |  | *0.091* |  | *-0.379* |  | *-0.122* | |
|  | p = 0.003 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.702 | | p = 0.184 | | p = 0.224 | | |
| Female Incumbent, Male Attacker | **Same Gender**  **as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 34 | 4.529 | 37 | 4.378 | 25 | 4.080 | 38 | 4.053 | 35 | 4.343 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 34 | 4.029 | 37 | 3.000 | 25 | 4.400 | 38 | 3.132 | 35 | 4.029 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.500* |  | *-1.378* |  | *0.320* |  | *-0.921* |  | *-0.314* | |
|  | p = 0.009 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.043 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.086 | | |
| **Opposite Gender as Incumbent/ Responder** | Post-attack  evaluation | 28 | 4.500 | 24 | 4.083 | 48 | 3.667 | 21 | 3.667 | 32 | 4.594 | |
| Post-response  evaluation | 28 | 3.929 | 24 | 2.792 | 48 | 3.792 | 21 | 2.810 | 32 | 4.188 | |
| *diff* |  | *-0.571* |  | *-1.292* |  | *0.125* |  | *-0.857* |  | *-0.406* | |
|  | p = 0.011 | | p = 0.000 | | p = 0.183 | | p = 0.018 | | p = 0.010 | | |
| Note: Difference is calculated as mean (post-response) – mean (post-attack). Significance tests are 2-tailed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |