

**Cognitive and emotional responses to Russian state-sponsored media narratives  
in international audiences**

Supplemental materials

**S1 – Demographic insights**

In Table E1, we present the key demographic insights for the respondents that participated in each of the four studies.

**Table E1**

*Demographic insights from each study*

Characteristics	Study 1 – Testing destruction narratives in Swedish participants	Study 2 – Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants	Characteristics	Study 3 – Testing destruction narratives in Dutch participants	Study 4 – Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants
<i>n</i>	340	353	<i>n</i>	366	375
Mean age (SD)	48.36 (16.28)	48.69 (17.27)	Mean age (SD)	50.54 (13.93)	50.05 (13.68)
Gender			Gender		
Male	174	163	Male	185	184
Female	166	190	Female	179	191
Non-binary	0	0	Non-binary	3	0
Region in Sweden			Region in the Netherlands		
Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmo including peripheral municipalities	138	128	Three big cities: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague	38	37
Larger cities and municipalities near larger cities	118	128	Remaining Zuid and Noord Holland, and Utrecht	109	111
Smaller cities / urban areas and rural municipalities	84	97	Groningen, Friesland and Drenthe	34	42
			Overijssel, Gelderland and Flevoland	86	86

			Zeeland, Noord-Brabant and Limburg		
Education level			Education level		
Primary education or equivalent	12	21	Primary education	10	9
Middle school or equivalent	125	124	MBO	118	114
Higher education/University	202	208	HBO	160	153
No completed education	1	0	WO	75	94
			No completed training	3	5
Mean trust in media (SD)	4.46 (1.69)	4.46 (1.55)	Mean trust in media (SD)	4.56 (1.34)	4.35 (1.51)
Mean political orientation regarding economic issues (SD)	3.80 (1.31)	3.89 (1.39)	Mean political orientation regarding economic issues (SD)	3.84 (1.36)	3.68 (1.33)
Mean political orientation regarding social issues (SD)	3.56 (1.46)	3.46 (1.58)	Mean political orientation regarding social issues (SD)	3.72 (1.44)	3.49 (1.39)

## S2 – Sample weighting

The target group for both Dutch and Swedish samples were citizens between 18-79 years.

While the distribution of the background characteristics were mostly like that of the overall populations, there were very slight overrepresentation of certain aspects due to non-response.

To account for this minorly disproportionate stratification in sampling, we applied sample weights to our analyses. The sample weights were calculated based on the expected age and gender distribution. These sample weights were the incorporated into our path analyses by using the R package *lavaan* (Rosseel, 2012) to estimate our path models, and *lavaan.survey* (Oberski, 2014) to add our sample weights. Full coding can be found on the repository.

### **S3 – Selecting age and gender as control variables**

As explained in the main text, upon beginning our analysis, we noted that our path models were just-identified and therefore fit statistics were unavailable. This was something we unfortunately did not anticipate prior. Therefore, to increase our degrees of freedom and thus obtain fit statistics, we decided to run our original models while controlling for age and gender. We selected these variables to control as they are background variables that have been used in numerous studies as standard control variables. Controlling for age and gender did not change the estimates of our explanatory variables (as shown when comparing Table 2 in the main text to S4 – Table 2). Further, the effect of age and gender on our response variables were mostly non-significant. However, when testing destruction narratives effects on our response variables in the Swedish sample, gender had a significant effect on institutional trust ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $b = 0.24$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ ,  $p = .004$ ) and fear ( $\beta = 0.18$ ,  $b = 0.58$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ). When testing the destruction narratives in the Dutch sample, age significantly predicted anger ( $\beta = 0.18$ ,  $b = 0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and fear ( $\beta = 0.17$ ,  $b = 0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p = .002$ ), and gender had a significant effect on fear ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $b = 0.37$ ,  $SE = 0.16$ ,  $p = .02$ ). Lastly, when testing suppression narratives effects on our response variables in the Dutch sample, age had a significant effect on shame ( $\beta = .12$ ,  $b = 0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p = .026$ ) and disgust ( $\beta = .20$ ,  $b = 0.70$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and gender had a significant effect on disgust ( $\beta = .10$ ,  $b = 0.36$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p = .041$ ).

### **S4 – Confirmatory analysis**

To be fully transparent we present the path coefficients from the original models specified in our registration.

**Table E2**

*Weighted path coefficients and statistics for the original models*

Testing destruction narratives in Swedish participants	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
H1a: Direct effect on institutional trust	-.05	-0.11	0.09	.203
H1b: Direct effect on anger	.15	0.60	0.20	.002
H1c: Direct effect on fear	.05	0.15	0.17	.381
H3a: Indirect effect on institutional trust	-.06	-0.12	0.07	.118
H3b: Indirect effect on anger	.04	0.14	0.09	.113
H3c: Indirect effect on fear	.03	0.11	0.07	.132
Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
H2a: Direct effect on outgroup trust	-.08	-0.10	0.07	.133
H2b: Direct effect on anger	.21	0.72	0.17	<.001
H2c: Direct effect on shame	.01	0.03	0.14	.813
H2d: Direct effect on disgust	.20	0.63	0.15	<.001
H4a: Indirect effect on outgroup trust	.02	0.02	0.02	.112
H4b: Indirect effect on anger	.04	0.12	0.08	.098
H4c: Indirect effect on shame	.01	0.03	0.02	.209
H4d: Indirect effect on disgust	.04	0.01	0.07	.101
Testing destruction narratives in Dutch participants	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
H1a: Direct effect on institutional trust	-.11	-0.19	0.07	.009
H1b: Direct effect on anger	.23	0.76	0.17	<.001
H1c: Direct effect on fear	.17	0.54	0.16	.001
H3a: Indirect effect on institutional trust	.01	0.02	0.06	.689
H3b: Indirect effect on anger	-.01	-0.02	0.04	.686
H3c: Indirect effect on fear	.00	-0.01	0.03	.689

Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
H2a: Direct effect on outgroup trust	-.09	-0.08	0.05	.099
H2b: Direct effect on anger	.04	0.15	0.17	.379
H2c: Direct effect on shame	.15	0.48	0.17	.005
H2d: Direct effect on disgust	.16	0.56	0.17	.001
H4a: Indirect effect on outgroup trust	.02	0.02	0.01	.216
H4b: Indirect effect on anger	.02	0.07	0.06	.210
H4c: Indirect effect on shame	.01	0.04	0.03	.236
H4d: Indirect effect on disgust	.02	0.07	0.06	.214

### S5 - Exploratory analyses

#### a. Discriminant validity

To check the discriminant validity of the threat mediators, we compared the effect sizes of the indirect pathways in the original models to corresponding models that positioned the opposite threat variables as the mediators. In all models, the effect size was smaller than or equal to those observed in the models with the opposing mediators. Full results can be viewed in Table E3.

**Table E3**

*Testing the discriminant validity of the threat mediators*

Study	Indirect effect on	Effect size for perceived realistic threat	Effect size for perceived symbolic threat
Study 1 - Testing destruction narratives in Swedish participants	Institutional trust	-.06	-.03
	Anger	.04	.03
	Fear	.03	.03
Study 2 - Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants	Outgroup trust	.00	.02
	Anger	.04	.04
	Shame	.01	.01
	Disgust	.04	.04

Study 3 - Testing destruction narratives in Dutch participants	Institutional trust	.01	.00
	Anger	-.01	.00
	Fear	.00	.00
Study 4 - Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants	Outgroup trust	.00	.02
	Anger	.02	.02
	Shame	.01	.01
	Disgust	.02	.02

### b. Testing with alternative mediator measures

As specified in our pre-registration, we reran the models using the perceived realistic and symbolic threat items used by Brambilla and Butz (2013). This led to significant changes for two models. When testing the suppression model in Swedish participants, there was a significant indirect effect through perceived symbolic threat for outgroup trust ( $\beta = .08$ ,  $b = 0.10$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p = .001$ ), anger ( $\beta = .20$ ,  $b = 0.70$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ), shame ( $\beta = .09$ ,  $b = .24$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = .002$ ), and disgust ( $\beta = .21$ ,  $b = 0.66$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ). When testing the destruction model in Dutch participants, there was a significant indirect effect through perceived realistic threat for institutional trust ( $\beta = -.06$ ,  $b = -0.11$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ ,  $p = .003$ ), anger ( $\beta = .11$ ,  $b = 0.36$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and fear ( $\beta = .09$ ,  $b = 0.29$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

### c. Exploratory control variables

We also reran our analyses while additionally controlling for media trust and economic orientation.

#### *Destruction narratives in Swedish participants*

A path model was estimated. This model fit the data very poorly, based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 85.27$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.744, RMSEA = .264, 90% CI [.217, .314], SRMR = 0.104. Additionally controlling for media trust and economic orientation did not affect the interpretation of the direct effects, with anger still significantly different between participants who saw the destruction narratives and those in the control

condition ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $b = 0.62$ ,  $SE = 0.21$ ,  $p = .003$ ) and no significant differences between groups on institutional trust ( $\beta = -.004$ ,  $b = -0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ ,  $p = .939$ ) or fear ( $\beta = .06$ ,  $b = 0.18$ ,  $SE = 0.19$ ,  $p = .341$ ). Controlling for these variables led to a significant mediation on institutional trust ( $\beta = -.07$ ,  $b = -0.13$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $p = .036$ ) and anger ( $\beta = .04$ ,  $b = 0.15$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = .034$ ), with a significant pathway between destruction narratives and realistic threat perceptions ( $\beta = .13$ ,  $b = 0.29$ ,  $SE = 0.14$ ,  $p = .033$ , in contrast to the models not controlling for media trust and economic orientation. The mediation on fear was, however, not affected ( $\beta = .05$ ,  $b = 0.15$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = .053$ ).

These results are peculiar. However, there is reason for caution in interpreting these findings as substantive as the model fit was extremely poor. An alternative statistical explanation for finding these significant mediation effects in this study is the presence of a collider structure induced by including media trust and economic orientation, in that, these variables act as a common effect of destruction narratives and the perception of realistic threat.

### ***Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants***

A path model was estimated. This model fit the data very poorly, based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 121.10$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.638, RMSEA = .306, 90% CI [.260, .354], SRMR = 0.100. Additionally controlling for media trust and social orientation did not affect the interpretation of the direct effects, with anger ( $\beta = .20$ ,  $b = 0.67$ ,  $SE = 0.18$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and disgust ( $\beta = .17$ ,  $b = 0.50$ ,  $SE = 0.16$ ,  $p = .002$ ) still significantly different between participants who saw the suppression narratives and those in the control condition, and no significant differences between groups on outgroup trust ( $\beta = -.09$ ,  $b = -0.11$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = .100$ ) or shame ( $\beta = -.01$ ,  $b = -0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.14$ ,  $p = .822$ ). Controlling for these variables also did not appear to affect the mediations on outgroup trust ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.02$ ,  $SE$

= 0.01,  $p = .130$ ), anger ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.07$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = .134$ ), shame ( $\beta = .01$ ,  $b = 0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.02$ ,  $p = .236$ ), or disgust ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.06$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ ,  $p = .146$ ).

### ***Testing destruction strategies in Dutch participants***

A path model was estimated. This model fit the data very poorly, based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 106.28$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.704, RMSEA = .284, 90% CI [.239, .332], SRMR = 0.098. Additionally controlling for media trust and economic orientation also did not affect the interpretation of the direct effects, with institutional trust ( $\beta = -.11$ ,  $b = -0.19$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = .010$ ), anger ( $\beta = .22$ ,  $b = 0.72$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and fear ( $\beta = .15$ ,  $b = 0.46$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p = .007$ ) still significantly different between participants who saw the destruction narratives and those in the control condition. Controlling for these variables also did not appear to affect the mediations on institutional trust ( $\beta = .01$ ,  $b = 0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $p = .882$ ), anger ( $\beta = .00$ ,  $b = -0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = .881$ ), and fear ( $\beta = .00$ ,  $b = -0.01$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ ,  $p = .882$ ).

### ***Testing suppression strategies in Dutch participants***

A path model was estimated. This model fit the data very poorly, based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 81.46$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.777, RMSEA = .247, 90% CI [.202, .295], SRMR = 0.076. Additionally controlling for media trust and social orientation did not affect the interpretation of the direct effects, with shame ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $b = 0.54$ ,  $SE = 0.18$ ,  $p = .003$ ) and disgust ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $b = 0.55$ ,  $SE = 0.18$ ,  $p = .003$ ) still significantly different between participants who saw the suppression narratives and those in the control condition, and no significant differences between groups on outgroup trust ( $\beta = -.06$ ,  $b = -0.05$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = .309$ ) or anger ( $\beta = .05$ ,  $b = 0.17$ ,  $SE = 0.18$ ,  $p = .338$ ). Controlling for these variables also did not appear to affect the mediations on outgroup trust ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = .882$ ).

= 0.02,  $p = .205$ ), anger ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.07$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $p = .197$ ), shame ( $\beta = .01$ ,  $b = 0.04$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p = .225$ ), or disgust ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $b = 0.06$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = .208$ ).

#### **d. Testing for path invariance**

Data from both the Dutch study and the Swedish study was used to establish path invariance in the destruction and suppression models across the states.

##### ***Destruction model***

To establish configural invariance, we tested the destruction model with all parameters being unconstrained across the groups. This resulted in a well-fitting model based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 21.03$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.974, RMSEA = .111, 90% CI [.067, .159], SRMR = .030. Thus configural invariance was assumed. Full path invariance was then assessed, constraining our parameters of interest to equality. Metric invariance was not achieved ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 14.08$ ,  $p = .049$ ,  $\Delta df = 7$ ,  $\Delta CFI = -0.018$ ,  $\Delta RMSEA = -0.025$ ). This indicated that some of the parameters were non-invariant between the Swedish participants and the Dutch participants. Partial path invariance was achieved by relaxing the pathways between the direct effects, and the pathways between perceived threat and anger and perceived threat and fear, allowing them to vary between the groups ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.80$ ,  $p = .246$ ,  $\Delta df = 2$ ,  $\Delta CFI = 0.003$ ,  $\Delta RMSEA = -0.015$ ). This indicates that our partially constrained destruction model did not fit the data significantly worse than the unconstrained destruction model, and that several of our pathways of interest appear to be statistically non-invariant between Dutch and Swedish participants.

##### ***Suppression model***

To establish configural invariance, we tested the suppression model with all parameters being unconstrained across the groups. This resulted in a well-fitting model based on our pre-specified cut-off values,  $\chi^2 = 32.64$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$ , CFI = 0.948, RMSEA = .145,

90% CI [.101, .192], SRMR = .035. Thus configural invariance was assumed. Full path invariance was then assessed, constraining our parameters of interest to equality, but this was not achieved ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 17.52, p = .041, \Delta df = 9, \Delta CFI = -0.026, \Delta RMSEA = -0.046$ ). This again indicated that some of the parameters were non-invariant between groups. Partial path invariance was achieved by relaxing the pathways between the condition and anger responses and the condition and disgust responses, allowing them to vary across groups ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 4.29, p = .746, \Delta df = 7, \Delta CFI = 0.002, \Delta RMSEA = -0.059$ ). This indicates that our partially constrained destruction model did not fit the data significantly worse than the unconstrained destruction model, and that only the pathways between the condition and anger and disgust should be treated as a non-invariant between groups.

#### **e. Further emotional responses**

As an exploratory analysis, we ran four one-way MANOVAs to analyse the differences between conditions on the six outstanding emotional variables captured in the survey: interest, guilt, happiness, surprise, sadness, and contempt. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that Dutch and Swedish participants indicated significantly higher contempt and significantly lower happiness after being exposed to either narrative strategy, when compared to their corresponding control conditions. Both Swedish and Dutch participants indicated significantly higher levels of sadness after being exposed to destruction narratives, compared to the control. Swedish participants indicated significantly higher levels of surprise after being exposed to suppression narratives, when compared to the control. Lastly, Dutch participants indicated significantly lower levels of interest after being exposed to suppression narratives, when compared to the control. A full overview can be found in Table E4.

**Table E4**

*Post-hoc comparisons of the remaining emotions*

Study	Emotion	Control group		Experimental group		<i>p</i>	95% conf	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		Lower bound	Upper bound
Study 1 – Testing destruction narratives in Swedish participants	Contempt	2.67	1.81	3.46	1.97	<.001	-1.20	-0.38
	Guilt	1.61	1.04	1.76	1.17	.187	-0.40	0.08
	Happiness	1.81	1.12	1.53	1.02	.019	0.05	0.52
	Interest	4.46	1.47	4.23	1.46	.143	-0.09	0.54
	Sadness	4.00	1.97	4.59	1.87	<.001	-1.00	-0.18
	Surprise	2.05	1.29	2.29	1.41	.103	-0.53	0.06
Study 2 – Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants	Contempt	1.72	1.18	2.69	1.89	<.001	-1.31	-.633
	Guilt	1.80	1.12	1.59	1.02	.069	-0.02	0.43
	Happiness	2.69	1.59	2.24	1.45	.001	0.13	0.77
	Interest	3.93	1.60	3.70	1.59	.176	-0.10	0.57
	Sadness	2.60	1.66	2.96	1.90	.061	-0.74	0.02
	Surprise	2.06	1.26	3.05	1.70	<.001	-1.31	-0.68
Study 3 – Testing destruction narratives in Dutch participants	Contempt	2.69	1.62	3.16	1.70	<.001	-0.81	-0.11
	Guilt	1.91	1.13	2.13	1.25	.079	-0.47	0.03
	Happiness	2.40	1.24	1.95	1.23	<.001	0.20	0.71
	Interest	4.60	1.40	4.62	1.40	.862	-0.32	0.26
	Sadness	3.68	1.70	4.58	1.61	<.001	-1.24	-0.56
	Surprise	2.96	1.37	2.69	1.42	.068	-0.02	0.56
Study 4 – Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants	Contempt	2.20	1.40	2.75	1.73	<.001	-0.87	-0.21
	Guilt	1.98	1.20	1.84	1.10	.249	-0.10	0.38
	Happiness	3.13	1.48	2.33	1.34	<.001	0.51	1.09
	Interest	4.42	1.53	3.74	1.55	<.001	0.37	1.00
	Sadness	3.14	1.72	3.37	1.90	.225	-0.61	0.14
	Surprise	3.20	1.53	3.43	1.65	.166	-0.56	0.10

**f. Including manipulation check as a mediator**

With thanks to our reviewer, as a final exploratory analysis, we integrated the manipulation check items as additional mediators into our models. We were interested in testing the indirect effects: specifically, testing whether the exposure to the narrative strategies increases the perceived focus on either the failure of Swedish/Dutch state institutions or criticism of Swedish/Dutch progressive policies (the manipulation check), which subsequently would predict effects on our response variables directly or through an

increase in perceived realistic or symbolic threats. We therefore estimated four separate serial mediation models, one for each strategy in each country, with perceived focus on Swedish/Dutch institutional failure or on critique of Swedish/Dutch progressiveness as the first mediator and perceived realistic/symbolic threat as the second. All model parameters are shown in table 5.

### ***Testing destruction narratives in Swedish participants***

For all three response variables, an increase in perceived focus on Swedish institutional failure predicted a hypothesized effect, a decrease in institutional trust and an increase in anger and fear. There was also a significant serial mediation effect through perceived focus on Swedish institutional failure and perceived realistic threat on each response variable. Perceived realistic threat did not significantly predict the response variables. This suggests that the effects of destruction narrative strategy on the response variables were driven mainly through the destruction articles' focus on Swedish institutional failure, as opposed to other, unaccounted for, aspects of the articles.

### ***Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants***

Testing this model in Swedish participants revealed no significant indirect effects for outgroup trust and shame. For anger and disgust, an increase in perceived criticism of Swedish progressiveness mediated suppression narratives effects on these response variables. This again points to the effects on these response variables as being driven mainly by the suppression articles' focus on criticism of progressiveness in Sweden, as opposed to other aspects of the articles.

### ***Testing destruction narratives in Dutch participants***

All three response variables were significantly mediated by perceived focus on Dutch institutional failure. For institutional trust and anger, the effect of destruction narratives were

also mediated by perceived realistic threat, although the effects were in the opposite direction to those hypothesised. Institutional trust and anger were also serially mediated by perceived focus on Dutch institutional failure and perceived realistic threat. These results again also point to a great deal of the effects that the destruction articles had on institutional trust and anger were driven by the articles focus on Dutch institutional failure, as opposed to other, unaccounted for, aspects of the articles.

***Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants***

Finally, perceived focus on criticism of Dutch progressiveness mediated the suppression articles’ effects on anger, shame, and disgust. Outgroup trust, anger and disgust were also serially mediated by perceived focus on criticism of Dutch progressiveness and perceived symbolic threat. As with the earlier three studies, this points to the majority of the effect of exposure to suppression narratives on the response variables was due to the intended focus on criticising Dutch progressiveness, rather than other aspects of the articles.

**Table E5**

*Weighted path coefficients and statistics for exploratory indirect effects*

Study 1: Testing indirect effects of destruction narratives in Swedish participants	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Narrative → Institutional failure → Institutional trust	-0.05	-0.10	0.05	.040
Narrative → Realistic threat → Institutional trust	0.01	0.01	0.08	.886
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Institutional trust	-0.06	-0.12	0.04	.003
Narrative → Institutional failure → Anger	0.10	0.38	0.12	.001
Narrative → Realistic threat → Anger	0.00	-0.01	0.09	.886
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Anger	0.03	0.13	0.04	.004
Narrative → Institutional failure → Fear	0.07	0.22	0.09	.013

Narrative → Realistic threat → Fear	0.00	-0.01	0.07	.885
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Fear	0.03	0.10	0.04	.004
<hr/>				
Study 2: Testing suppression narratives in Swedish participants	<i>β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
<hr/>				
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Outgroup trust	0.03	0.03	0.03	.300
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Outgroup trust	0.01	0.01	0.01	.510
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Outgroup trust	0.01	0.01	0.01	.154
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Anger	0.09	0.29	0.10	.002
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Anger	0.01	0.05	0.07	.514
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Anger	0.12	0.06	0.03	.096
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Shame	0.04	0.11	0.07	.124
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Shame	0.00	0.01	0.02	.538
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Shame	0.01	0.01	0.01	.223
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Disgust	0.08	0.26	0.09	.003
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Disgust	0.01	0.04	0.06	.515
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Disgust	0.02	0.05	0.03	.096
<hr/>				
Study 3: Testing indirect effects of destruction narratives in Dutch participants	<i>β</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
<hr/>				
Narrative → Institutional failure → Institutional trust	-0.06	-0.11	0.05	.025
Narrative → Realistic threat → Institutional trust	0.09	0.16	0.07	.018
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Institutional trust	-0.08	-0.15	0.04	<.001
Narrative → Institutional failure → Anger	0.18	0.60	0.12	<.001
Narrative → Realistic threat → Anger	-0.03	-0.09	0.04	.027
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Anger	0.03	0.08	0.03	.005
Narrative → Institutional failure → Fear	0.17	0.52	0.11	<.001

Narrative → Realistic threat → Fear	-0.01	-0.04	0.03	.178
Narrative → Institutional failure → Realistic threat → Fear	0.01	0.03	0.02	.142
<hr/>				
Study 4: Testing suppression narratives in Dutch participants	<i>B</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
<hr/>				
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Outgroup trust	0.00	0.00	0.02	.823
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Outgroup trust	0.00	0.00	0.01	.879
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Outgroup trust	0.02	0.02	0.01	.008
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Anger	0.06	0.21	0.07	.002
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Anger	0.00	-0.01	0.05	.879
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Anger	0.02	0.07	0.02	.002
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Shame	0.05	0.16	0.07	.015
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Shame	0.00	0.00	0.02	.879
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Shame	0.01	0.03	0.02	.080
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Disgust	0.06	0.20	0.07	.004
Narrative → Symbolic threat → Disgust	0.00	-0.01	0.05	.879
Narrative → Progressiveness critique → Symbolic threat → Disgust	0.02	0.08	0.03	.003