Source Bias Manuscript Stimulus File

Study 1a

Instructions: In this study, we are interested in how descriptions of people may or may not fit with certain traits. As such, we will give you a description of someone and ask how much you will see them in particular ways.

for each condition, whether the bias or untrustworthiness measures came first is counterbalanced

Motivated reasoning/negative trait (biased) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "motivated to support a particular position," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "motivated to support a particular position," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "motivated to support a particular position," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "motivated to support a particular position," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Motivated reasoning/positive trait (unbiased) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "open to supporting either position," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "open to supporting either position," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "open to supporting either position," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "open to supporting either position," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Honesty/negative trait (untrustworthy) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to be dishonest," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to be dishonest," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to be dishonest," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to be dishonest," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Honesty/positive trait (trustworthy) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "committed to being honest," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "committed to being honest," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "committed to being honest," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "committed to being honest," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Study 1b

Instructions: In this study, we are interested in how descriptions of people may or may not fit with certain traits. As such, we will give you a description of someone and ask how much you will see them in particular ways.

for each condition, whether the bias or untrustworthiness measures came first is counterbalanced

Motivated reasoning/negative trait (biased) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "ideologically driven to take a particular position," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "ideologically driven to take a particular position," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "ideologically driven to take a particular position," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "ideologically driven to take a particular position," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Motivated reasoning/positive trait (unbiased) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "have no ideological drive to support one position or the other," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "have no ideological drive to support one position or the other," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "have no ideological drive to support one position or the other," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "have no ideological drive to support one position or the other," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Honesty/negative trait (untrustworthy) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to manipulate message recipients," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to manipulate message recipients," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to manipulate message recipients," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they were "willing to manipulate message recipients," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Honesty/positive trait (trustworthy) condition:
- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "had the best interests of the message recipients in mind," how much would you see them as having a **biased perspective**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "had the best interests of the message recipients in mind," how much would you see their opinion as a product of **personal bias**? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "had the best interests of the message recipients in mind," how much would you see this person as **trustworthy**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

- Imagine that you are about to receive a persuasive message from someone. If you were told that they "had the best interests of the message recipients in mind," how much would you perceive them as a **trustworthy person**? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Study 2

Instructions: First we would like to ask you some questions about you and your opinions. For the rest of the study, once you advance to the next screen, you will not be able to go back to the previous screen so please make sure you are ready to move on before clicking the next button.

What is your political affiliation?
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent
4. Other

How much would you support a junk food tax to reduce obesity? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

How much would you support a university tuition plan through which students would have to work as part-time secretarial and maintenance staff in order to maintain current tuition levels? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

How much do you support the building of nuclear power plants in western states? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

How much would you support the labeling of genetically modified food? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Dr. Brown, a new administrator at Ohio State has proposed a policy that would require all students to work as part-time secretarial and maintenance staff. The plan requires students who choose not to participate in the program to pay out-of-state tuition. In the new plan, the period of work would depend on the length of time left in the student's course of study, with a maximum requirement of four years of "university service." Of course, a number of students vehemently oppose such a bill.

Dr. Brown has his PhD in student affairs and has spent his career studying student success. His honest opinion is that his proposed university tuition plan would benefit Ohio State students immensely.

Biased Condition
Dr. Brown has the reputation of being quite biased and one-sided in his views on the university service program. He is a strong advocate for the program and not open to considering other perspectives on the issue.

Objective Condition
Dr. Brown has the reputation of being quite objective and balanced in his views on the university service program. He is a strong advocate for the program but is always open to considering other perspectives on the issue.

Dr. Brown issued the following brief summary of arguments in support of the new tuition policy...

1) This university service plan will keep tuition affordable for students

2) Because students won't want to participate in this program, enrollment will decrease, allowing easier access to football tickets.

3) OSU will be able to keep and recruit outstanding faculty

4) With less leisure time, students will have to learn how to structure their day in order to maximize their time to relax, an important life skill.

5) OSU will be able to offer a greater number of classes and have an overall smaller student to teacher ratio

6) Students' experiences as janitors and cafeteria workers may help them get a well-paying job in the future.

7) Anything that can help increase the quality of education of an OSU education, may enhance the desirability of a degree in the real world. That's what this program is capable of doing.

We are now interested in what you were thinking about as you were reading Dr. Brown's arguments.

Simply write down your first idea in the first box, your second idea in the second box and so on. You should record only the ideas you had while reading Dr.Brown's arguments. Please state your ideas as concisely as possible – a phrase is sufficient.

Thought 1.

Thought 2

Thought 3.

Thought 4.

Thought 5.

Thought 6.

Now we will ask you some questions about whether or not you think that the proposed tuition plan is a good idea.

Post-message Attitudes
- To what extent is the proposed tuition plan a good idea? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much do you support the proposed tuition plan? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much is the proposed tuition plan a positive? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Now we will ask you some questions about your impression of Dr.Brown, who advocated for the proposed tuition plan.

How strong were Dr. Brown's reasons for supporting the proposed tuition plan? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Perceptions of Bias
- To what extent do you feel that Dr.Brown's position on the university service program is a product of personal bias? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much do you think Dr.Brown has a biased perspective on the university service program? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How objective do you think Dr.Brown is in evaluating the university service program? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much) (reverse coded)

Perceptions of Expertise
- How qualified did you think Dr.Brown was to speak on the university service program? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

- To what extent does it seem like Dr.Brown is an expert on the university service program? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent does it seem like Dr. Brown message is knowledgeable about the university service program? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Perceptions of Trustworthiness
- To what extent does it seem like Dr.Brown is trustworthy? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent does it seem like Dr. Brown is honest? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much do you think Dr.Brown truly believes what he is saying? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Studies 3a, 3b, and 3c

In this study, we will tell you about a political campaign. We would like for you to treat it as though it is real and happening in your county.

In this campaign, Cami, a local citizen is campaigning for Ben Patton and against Jim Smith. Patton and Smith are running against each other in the race for county commissioner.
In a few screens, you will see a message from Cami opposing Jim Smith's candidacy.
____
In political campaign ads, the source is often familiar to readers - they know something about the source before they even receive the message.

In order to simulate this familiarity, we would like to provide you with information about Cami before you read her ad opposing Jim Smith.

Biased Condition:
The person giving you the message is Cami, a local citizen who is very active in county politics and even served as local county commissioner herself. As such, she is
highly **knowledgeable** about both the candidates in the election and the requirements to be a successful county commissioner. In fact, she has been an instrumental part of the Ben Patton campaign.

However, Cami has the reputation of being quite **biased** and one-sided in her view of Jim Smith. She is in the opposing party to Jim Smith and her personal investment in the campaign has motivated her to view Jim Smith more negatively than he actually is.

Despite this bias, she genuinely has the best interests of the community in mind. It's not that she is trying to mislead people. She **honestly** believes that Jim Smith would be a bad option for the community. It is just that her involvement with the campaign and political party has blinded her to Jim Smith's strengths, only allowing her to see his weaknesses.

Unbiased Condition:
The person giving you the message is Cami, a local citizen who is very active in county politics and even served as local county commissioner herself. As such, she is
highly **knowledgeable** about both the candidates in the election and the requirements to be a successful county commissioner. In fact, she has been an instrumental part of the Ben Patton campaign.

Additionally, Cami has the reputation of being quite **objective** and open-minded in her view of Jim Smith. She is in the opposing party to Jim Smith, but her personal involvement in the campaign seems to have provided her with an even more objective view of Jim Smith.

She genuinely has the best interests of the community in mind. She **honestly** believes that Jim Smith is a bad option for the community. Further, her involvement with the campaign has allowed her to see both Jim Smith's strengths and his weaknesses.

Now we will ask you some questions about your impression of Cami, who is advocating against Jim Smith.

As mentioned in the text, we counterbalanced whether participants responded to credibility or its constituent perceptions first and counterbalanced the order in which participants responded to the constituent perceptions

Perceptions of Bias
- How much do you think Cami has a biased perspective about Jim Smith? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- To what extent do you think that Cami's opinion on Jim Smith is the product of personal biases? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

Perceptions of Expertise
- To what extent do you think Cami is an expert on Jim Smith? (1 = very inexpert, 9 = very expert)
- To what extent does it seem like Cami is knowledgeable about Jim Smith? (1 = very unknowledgeable, 9 = very knowledgeable)

Perceptions of Trustworthiness
- When Cami shares her opinion on Jim Smith with others, to what extent do you think she shares her honest opinion? (1 = very dishonest, 9 = very honest)
- When Cami shares her opinion on Jim Smith with others, to what extent do you perceive that she tries to communicate the truth as she sees it? (1 = she communicates very untruthfully, 9 = she communicates very truthfully)

Source Liking
- How much do you like Cami? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How likeable do you think Cami is? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Perceptions of Credibility
- How much do you see Cami as a credible source about Jim Smith? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)
- To what extent do you view Cami as a credible source of information on Jim Smith? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)
- To what extent do you view Cami as a high quality source of information on Jim Smith? (1 = very low quality, 9 = very high quality)
- How much do you see Cami as a compelling source on Jim Smith? (1 = very uncompelling, 9 = very compelling)
- How much do you see Cami as a reliable source on Jim Smith? (1 = very unreliable, 9 = very reliable)

You will now receive the message from Cami about Jim Smith so that you can form an impression of Jim Smith.

Strong Arguments (Only Study 3b contained an argument quality manipulation):

Jim Smith is wrong for our county!

Jim Smith is uneducated. Smith only attended college for two semesters before dropping out. In contrast, Patton has a Masters degree in political science.

Jim Smith is secretive. During his time on the park board, Smith did not disclose a mysterious deficit in the county parks budget – a large chuck of tax payers' dollars seems to have gone missing on his watch. Patton has always made the financial statements of the organizations he is involved with available to the public.

Jim Smith is inexperienced. This would be Smith's first political position. Conversely, Patton's time as county treasurer has prepared him well to take on the additional responsibilities associated with the county commissioner position.

Jim Smith is uneducated, secretive, and inexperienced. He is wrong for our county. Join me in the fight against Jim Smith!

Moderate Arguments:
Jim Smith is wrong for our county!

Jim Smith is uneducated. Smith earned his college degree in music education, which has nothing to do with managing a government. Patton has a four year degree in Communications.

Jim Smith is secretive. After serving on the park board for two years, Smith left the position for reasons that he never disclosed. Patton has always been open about his absences from public office.

Jim Smith is inexperienced. He has served on the park board and the school board, but has no experience in criminal justice. Patton's time as a volunteer firefighter has provided him with connections to law enforcement and given him experience in emergency situations.

Jim Smith is uneducated, secretive, and inexperienced. He is wrong for our county. Join me in the fight against Jim Smith!

Thoughts
We are now interested in what you were thinking about as you were reading Cami's message.

Simply write down your first idea in the first box, your second idea in the second box, and so on. You should record only the ideas you had while reading Cami's message. Please state your ideas as concisely as possible - a phrase is sufficient.

Thought 1.

Thought 2

```
```

Thought 3.

```
```

Thought 4.

```
```

Thought 5.

```
```

Thought 6.

```
```

Thought ratings:
In the first thought box, you said:

" "

Please indicate whether this response was supportive of Jim Smith, neutral toward Jim Smith, opposed to Jim Smith (supportive of Ben Patton), or irrelevant to the topic of Jim Smith.

Attitude Questions:
- How much do you support Jim Smith as a candidate for your local county commissioner? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much would it be a good idea for Jim Smith to be elected to be your local county commissioner? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much is Jim Smith a good candidate for your local county commissioner? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Study 4

Instructions: In this study, we are interested in your impressions of others.

In a few screens, we will show you a transcript from a conversation that aid workers had at the beginning of an ebola outbreak in the Congo. The ebola outbreak started in a rural area, Rutu, but a few cases have appeared in a nearby city, Poko.

At the beginning of outbreaks like this, aid workers are often forced to make tough decisions about how to allocate limited resources to different areas in order to save the most lives. In the situation you are going to read about, the aid workers only had enough resources to treat either Rutu, the rural area, or Poko, the nearby city until more aid was able to be delivered. As such, they were in the tough situation of having to decide which area should receive aid first.

Aid workers are highly trained to deal with situations like these, and when they approach these questions, they try to maximize the number of lives they can save.

In the following transcript, you'll see a conversation between three people: Steve, who is in charge of making decisions about how to allocate resources, as well as Roger and Paul, who are highly trained aid workers brought on as consultants.

Source Bias Manipulation
Information in biased, but not objective condition in bold:

STEVE: Thank you so much for agreeing to be a part of our team. We're going to have to make some tough decisions today, and I really value both of your input. I feel lucky to have such a qualified team to work with. I don't think you've met each other yet so maybe we could start by having you introduce yourselves.

PAUL: Hi, nice to meet you! I'm Paul and I have a Master's degree in disaster management from Harvard. Recently, I have been working as a disaster relief fellow through the U.S. Disaster Recovery Corps.

ROGER: Nice you meet you too! I'm Roger I graduated from Yale's advanced emergency response training program, and lately have been involved with rapid responses to disease outbreak and natural disasters. **A few years ago I completed my Peace Corps in Rutu, the rural area in which this outbreak started, so this disaster has hit home pretty hard.**

STEVE: **I'm so sorry to hear that. It is always so much harder when a disaster feels personal in some way.** Alright. We have very little time to lose so let's get down to business. The information about what to do in this situation is a bit more mixed than it usually is.

The ebola outbreak started in Rutu, the rural area, but has just now started to spread to Poko, a nearby town. Because it started in Rutu, there are many more cases of ebola there. However, Poko has connections to many more towns so it would be much easier for the disease to spread from Poko to other areas. There is also some concern that because Poko is a city it would be easier for the disease to spread quickly within the city.

As you know, when we have to make decisions in these situations, we try to go where there is the most need and where we could prevent the most spread of disease. Unfortunately, in this situation, Rutu has the most need, but Poko has the most potential to spread the disease. Until we can get more aid workers here, we only have enough resources to go to either Rutu or Poko. I'd like to hear your thoughts on what you think we should do.

ROGER

I think we should start by sending aid to Rutu. My experience has taught me that it is generally best to start by going where the most need is and where the epidemic started. If we don't send our resources to Rutu, that entire area could be completely wiped out.

PAUL

I hear what Roger is saying, but I disagree. A number of studies have suggested that it is most effective to prevent the spread of disease to other cities first. Therefore, I think we need to send our resources to Poko first. If this disease starts spreading to other cities, we are going to have an even bigger mess on our hands.

Roger, I think your experience with doing the Peace Corps in Rutu might be coloring your perception of how to approach this situation. Do you really think that we should start by sending our resources to Rutu?

ROGER

Yes - I really believe that it is better to send resources to Rutu first. I think it is best to start where there is the biggest problem. One reason that the epidemic may be spreading to Poko is that people are fleeing Rutu because they are scared of getting the disease. If we can get the disease under control in Rutu first, we will have less of a problem to deal with in Poko.

Instructions: In the next part of the study, we are interested in your impressions of

ROGER , who thought that it was more important to send resources to Rutu first because more people had been infected there.

Perceptions of Bias
- How much would you see Roger as biased in his opinion of how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- How much would you perceive the position that Roger took on how to allocate resources as motivated by a personal bias? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- To what extent do you perceive that Roger's position reflects a bias? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- To what extent do you perceive that Roger's opinion on how to allocate resources is driven by a bias? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

Perceptions of Trustworthiness
- How much do you see Roger as trying to truthfully communicate information about how to allocate resources as he sees it? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

- How much do you perceive that Roger tries to convey the truth about how to allocate resources as he sees it? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent do you perceive that Roger tries to honestly share his viewpoint about how to allocate resources? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent does it seem like Roger wants to be honest about his perspective on how to allocate resources? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Perceptions of Expertise
- To what extent does it seem like Roger is an expert on how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent does it seem like Roger is knowledgeable about how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much do you think Roger knows about how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- To what extent do you perceive that Roger has expertise on how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Source Liking
- How much do you like Roger? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How likeable do you think Roger is? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much would you enjoy spending time with Roger? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How much would you enjoy Roger's company? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Credibility
- How much do you see Roger as a credible source about how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)
- To what extent do you view Roger as a credible source of information on how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)
- To what extent do you view Roger as a high quality source of information about how to allocate resources between Rutu and Poko? (1 = very low quality, 9 = very high quality)

Attitudes toward sending aid to Rutu
- To what extent is it a good idea to send resources to Rutu, the rural, most infected area, first? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How beneficial would it be to send resources to Rutu, the rural, most infected area, first? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)
- How good would it be to send resources to Rutu, the rural, most infected area, first? (1 = not at all, 9 = very much)

Allocating resources to Rutu or Poko
- If you were deciding whether to allocate resources to Rutu (the rural, most infected area) or Poko (the urban area with the most potential for disease spread), how likely would you be to choose Rutu or Poko? (1 = I would definitely choose Poko, 5 = I would be completely split in deciding between Rutu and Poko, 9 = I would definitely choose Rutu)

- How much do you think the aid team should send resources to Rutu or Poko first? (1 = send resources to Poko first, 9 = send resources to Rutu first)

Dividing resources between Rutu and Poko
- If you could split resources between Rutu and Poko, what percentage of resources would you allocate between Rutu and Poko? (This was measured on a sliding scale from 100% to Poko/0% to Rutu to 0% to Poko/100% to Rutu)

Additional Study (In Supplement)

Instructions: Imagine a situation in which someone is about to give you a persuasive message about the benefits of phosphate based laundry detergents and you are told the following things about the person who is giving you the message.

Biased Condition:
The person giving you the message is Dr. Brown, a chemist who works for the biggest phosphate detergent company in the United States. As such, he is highly **knowledgeable** about phosphate detergents. He developed the most recent line of phosphate detergents for his company, substantially improving their formula over previous versions.

However, Dr. Brown has the reputation of being quite **biased** and one-sided in his view of phosphate detergents. His personal investment in the product has motivated him to view the detergents more positively than they actually are.

Despite this bias, he genuinely has the best interests of the consumers in mind. It's not that he is trying to mislead people into purchasing a sub-par product. He **honestly** believes that phosphate detergents give the cleanest clothes possible. It just that his involvement with the product has blinded him to the weaknesses of phosphate detergents, only allowing him to see their strengths.

Objective Condition:
The person giving you the message is Dr. Brown, a chemist who works for the biggest phosphate detergent company in the United States. As such, he is highly **knowledgeable** about phosphate detergents. He developed the most recent line of phosphate detergents for his company, substantially improving their formula over previous versions.

Additionally, Dr. Brown has the reputation of being quite **objective** and open-minded in his view of phosphate detergents. His personal investment in the product tests seems to have provided him with an even more objective view of phosphate detergents.

He genuinely has the best interests of the consumers in mind. He **honestly** believes that phosphate detergents give the cleanest clothes possible. Further, his involvement with the product has allowed him to see both the strengths and weaknesses of phosphate detergents.

Now we will ask you some questions about your impression of Dr. Brown, who is advocating for phosphate-based laundry detergents.

As mentioned in the text, we counterbalanced whether participants responded to credibility or its constituent perceptions first and counterbalanced the order in which participants responded to the three constituent perceptions

Credibility
- How much would you see the person as a credible source? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)

- To what extent would you view this person as a credible source of information on this topic? (1 = very non-credible, 9 = very credible)
- To what extent would you view this person as a high quality source of information? (1 = very low quality, 9 = very high quality)
- How much would you see this person as a compelling source? (1 = very uncompelling, 9 = very compelling)
- How much would you see the author as a reliable source? (1 = very unreliable, 9 = very reliable)

Trustworthiness
- How much would you see this person as untrustworthy? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)
- How much would you perceive the author as an untrustworthy person? (1 = very untrustworthy, 9 = very trustworthy)

Bias:
- How much would you think this person has a unbiased perspective on phosphate based laundry detergents? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)
- How much would you think the person's opinion on phosphate based laundry detergents is NOT a product of personal bias? (1 = very biased, 9 = very unbiased)

Expertise:
- To what extent would it seem like this person is inexpert on phosphate based laundry detergents? (1 = very inexpert, 9 = very expert)
- To what extent would it seem like the author is unknowledgeable about phosphate based laundry detergents? (1 = very unknowledgeable, 9 = very knowledgeable)