SUPPLEMENTAL MEDIATION ANALYSES

STUDY 1

Nonparametric bootstrapping is arguably a superior approach to establishing mediation as compared with the Sobel approach (see Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). We therefore tested the predicted model of blame motivation as a mediator of the relationship between perceived intent and perceived harm based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples. Mediation is considered to be significant if the 95% Bias Corrected and accelerated confidence intervals for the indirect effect do not include zero (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher et al., 2007). Results fully corroborated the Sobel results reported in the main text. The total effect of intent on harm was significant (TE= 0.25, SE=0.07, p<.001), while the direct effect was not (DE=-.14, SE=0.09, p=.13). Blame motivation thus fully mediated the relationship between intent and harm (IE lower 95% CI=.43, upper 95% CI=.78, fully standardized), such that participants who saw the CEO's actions as highly intentional were more motivated to blame, and through this blame motivation, saw more harm. Because zero is not in the 95% confidence interval, the indirect effect is significantly different from zero at $p < .05$ (two tailed).

As noted in the main text, both the Sobel method and the bootstrapping method support the predicted model (intent→blame motivation→harm) over the alternative model (intent→harm→blame motivation). In both cases, the predicted model yields full mediation, while the alternative model yields relatively weak and partial mediation. In a "traditional" analysis of the alternative model, the residual direct effect of intent on blame motivation remained significant (and was, in fact, the strongest path in the model) after accounting for perceived harm as a possible mediator, standardized $\beta = .61$, p <.001.

Likewise, based on 10,000 bootsrapped samples of the alternative model, the direct effect of intent on blame motivation remained significant after accounting for perceived harm as a potential mediator (DE = .47, SE = .05, p <.001).

STUDY 3

Mediation results for Study 3 were essentially identical to those observed in Study 1. Bootstrapping results again fully corroborated the Sobel results reported in the main text, and again argued for the predicted model over the alternative model. Under the predicted model, the total effect of intent on harm was significant (TE= 0.17, SE=0.05, p<.001), while the direct effect was not (DE=.08, SE=0.05, p=.14). Thus, blame motivation fully mediated the relationship between intent and harm (IE lower 95% CI=.08, upper 95% CI=.30, fully standardized).

Also as in Study 1, both mediation approaches support the predicted model (intent→blame motivation→harm) over the alternative model (intent→harm→blame motivation). In both cases, the predicted model yields full mediation, while the alternative model yields only partial mediation. In a "traditional" analysis, the residual direct effect of intent on blame motivation remained significant (and was, again, the strongest path in the model) after accounting for perceived harm as a potential mediator, standardized β = .39, p <.001. Likewise, based on 10,000 bootstrapped samples of the alternative model, the direct effect of intent on blame motivation remained significant after accounting for perceived harm as a potential mediator (DE = .30, SE = .06, p <.001). Results were essentially identical if participants from the *intentional-caught* condition were excluded from the analysis.

REFERENCES

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 36*, 717-731.

Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 42*(1), 185–227.