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Research Question
Under what conditions do political parties in multi-party systems attack each other in elections?
What does attacking mean?

“Sánchez suffers harsh attacks from PP, Podemos during investiture debate.” Link to El País story.
What does attacking mean?

The PP leader described the bid for power by the Socialists, who reaped one of their worst election results ever at the December polls, as a “farce.” Iglesias, meanwhile, described the prime ministerial hopeful as someone who had “surrendered to the oligarchs and the powers that be.”

Figure 1: Quote from the 2015 El País story about the investiture vote.
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The PP leader described the bid for power by the Socialists, who reaped one of their worst election results ever at the December polls, as a “farce.” Iglesias, meanwhile, described the prime ministerial hopeful as someone who had “surrendered to the oligarchs and the powers that be.”

Figure 2: Rajoy attacks the PSOE with a valence statement about its integrity.
The PP leader described the bid for power by the Socialists, who reaped one of their worst election results ever at the December polls, as a “farce.” Iglesias, meanwhile, described the prime ministerial hopeful as someone who had “surrendered to the oligarchs and the powers that be.”

Figure 3: Iglesias attacks Sánchez with a valence statement about his honesty.
Finding: In multi-party systems character-based attacks and policies/issues appear strongly connected.

Data: New data set with 5,053 valence statements by 60 parties in 18 campaigns in 10 countries.
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Theory and Hypotheses
Electoral competition between parties has predominantly been studied in terms of strategic programmatic behavior.

Spatial competition models by Hoteling (1929) and Downs (1957) started an enormously productive research agenda focusing on the two-party system of the U.S. and multi-party systems in Europe (e.g. Adams, Merrill III and Grofman, 2005; Adams and Somer-Topcu, 2009; Pereira, 2019; Fernandez Vazquez 2020).
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How parties compete in elections: Spatial

+ This research has given us key insights in strategic party behavior.
+ Government and opposition parties (Bawn and Somer-Topcu, 2012), mainstream and niche parties (Abou-Chadi, 2016), extreme parties (Cohen, 2019), electoral strategies of parties more generally (Somer-Topcu, 2015).

– This research predominantly examines behavior between elections and not during elections.
– This research ignores a second dimension of party competition and voter evaluation: valence (Stokes 1992).
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What is *valence*?

- An association with universally desirable traits, such as honesty, integrity, and competence (e.g. Stokes, 1992; Clark, 2009).
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What we know about the role of valence in elections?

Predominantly U.S. research has shown that the perception of party and candidate valence matters for:

- turnout (Ansolabehere, Iyengar and Simon, 1999; Brooks, 2006)
- voter efficacy (Ansolabehere and Iyengar, 1995)
- trust in parties (Brader, 2005; Whiteley, Clarke, Sanders and Stewart, 2015) and the political system (Leiter, Clark and Clark, 2019).
What we know about valence attacks in elections?

- Valence perceptions matter in elections!
- Cognitive psychology: negative messages are especially strong in their impact (Rozin, Berman and Royzman, 2010; Soroka and McAdams, 2010).
- Parties hence have a strong incentive to attack the valence image of competitors with negative messages.
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Schulz under fire for attack on ‘arrogant’ Merkel

Figure 5: Headline from the Irish Times, 26 June 2017.
More parties means more options for voters (Polk and Kölln, 2017).
Coalition governments are required (Strom, Müller, and Bergman, 2008).
Multi-party systems are hence more complex and uncertain than two-party systems.
Cost-benefit analysis of valence attacks becomes a lot harder and riskier.
Parties are more likely to attack competitors when they can minimize risk.
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Hypothesis 1: Incumbency

Argument: Valence attacks on incumbents are less likely to backfire or carry other unintended consequences.

- Incumbents implement policies and set the agenda.
- They usually run on their track record in government.
- The literature on retrospective voting highlights these considerations (Fiorina, 1981; Duch and Stevenson 2008; Healy and Malhotra, 2013).
- Incumbents will therefore highlight their past achievements in campaigns.
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**Education & Family**

**School governors point to 'diabolical' budget squeeze**

Figure 6: Headline from the BBC, 22 March 2017.
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Hypothesis 2: The role of issues

**Argument:** Valence attacks related to issues are less likely to backfire or carry other unintended consequences.

- The electoral systems of Europe are rooted in the cleavages of the industrial revolution (Lipset and Rokkan, 1967).
- This means that historically political parties have always placed an emphasis on developing ideologies and programmatic appeals (Przeworski, 1988).
- Even though elections are “presidentializing” more and more (Samuels and Shugart, 2010) individuals and their traits are not as central as in other systems.
- The public expectation of campaigns is one of policy discourse (Green, 2007).
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Hypothesis 2: The role of issues

I hypothesized that parties attack incumbents more.

However, parties are aware of the consequences they can face when they attack the person and not the person related to the content.

Here my differentiation between issue-related and nonissue-related valence attacks comes into play.
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Hypothesis 3: The role of issue ownership

*Argument:* Issue-related valence attacks where the attacker owns the issue are less likely to backfire or carry other unintended consequences.

- Not all issues are equal for political parties
- Parties can establish issue-ownership through a history of attention and focus to a specific issue (Petrocik, 1996; Rikker 1996).
- This gives them more credibility and authority with that issue. They become a trusted advocate for the issue in the eyes of the electorate (Belluci, 2006; Nyhuis, 2016).
- A party can use this credibility and authority to legitimize an attack they are issuing on an opponent.
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Unit of observation: each valence statement in every article.

60-100 articles from the largest center-left and center-right broadsheet newspaper each.

Front-page articles and 5% of other election-relevant articles.
Newspapers used for data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Left-Leaning Daily</th>
<th>Right-Leaning Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech R.</td>
<td>2010, 2013</td>
<td>Právo</td>
<td>Mladá fronta Dnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2007, 2011</td>
<td>Politiken</td>
<td>Jyllands-Posten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2009, 2013</td>
<td>Süddeutsche</td>
<td>Frankfurter Allg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2006, 2010</td>
<td>Népszabadság</td>
<td>Magyar Nemze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2010, 2012</td>
<td>de Volkskrant</td>
<td>De Telegraaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2007, 2011</td>
<td>Gazeta Wyborcza</td>
<td>Rzeczpospolita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2009, 2011</td>
<td>Público</td>
<td>Jornal de Notícias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2008, 2011</td>
<td>El País</td>
<td>El Mundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2010, 2014</td>
<td>Dagens Nyheter</td>
<td>Aftonbladet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>‘05, ‘10, ‘15</td>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview of elections and attack frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Attacks</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Attacks</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Attacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZ 2010</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>ES 2008</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>PT 2011</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 2013</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>ES 2011</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>SV 2010</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2009</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>HU 2006</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>SV 2014</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE 2013</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>NL 2012</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>UK 2005</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK 2007</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>PL 2011</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>UK 2010</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK 2011</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>PT 2009</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Valence attacks totals in the campaigns. Overall 5,053 valence attacks with 2,301 issue-related valence attacks and 2,752 nonissue-related valence attacks occurred.

For comparison: In the same time parties used 8,422 issue statements about their competitors. Valence attacks constitute ~37.5% of all targeted campaign discussions.
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<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK 2011</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>PT 2009</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Valence attacks totals in the campaigns. Overall 5,053 valence attacks with 2,301 issue-related valence attacks and 2,752 nonissue-related valence attacks occurred.

For comparison: In the same time parties used 8,422 issue statements about their competitors. Valence attacks constitute $\sim 37.5\%$ of all targeted campaign discussions.
Why these data?

- Newspaper articles are election outcome relevant party communication.
- Largest project that applied a unified coding standard to valence discussions in multiple countries.
- Avoids bias through use of left- and right-leaning newspaper.
- Not only valence attacks are coded but also whether or not these attacks were in relation to an issue.
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Why these data?

- Data set mirrors attack behavior and it is inherently dyadic (Poast, 2016, 2018; Weschle 2018; Adams, Weschle, and Wlezien, 2020).
- Focuses on the crucial one month campaign period that shapes the valence image (Abney et al, 2013).
- Based on Seeberg (2017) I am able to assign the ownership of issues to political parties (Petrocik, 1996; Rikker 1996).
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### Data set structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Sender</th>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Agg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Data structure for two election weeks in the 2015 BGE. Shown are monadic and dyadic attributes of the directed dyad pair between Labour and Conservatives.*

**Figure 7:** Dyadic data set structure with monadic and dyadic data attributes.
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**Figure 8:** Dyadic data set structure with monadic and dyadic data attributes.
## Data set structure

**Figure 9: Dyadic data set structure with monadic and dyadic data attributes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Sender</th>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Agg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Labour</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tories</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Data structure for two election weeks in the 2015 BGE. Shown are monadic and dyadic attributes of the directed dyad pair between Labour and Conservatives.*
Model

\[ y_{ijct} = \alpha + \beta Z_{jct} + \gamma V_{ict} + \delta X_{ijct} + \epsilon_{ijct} \]

- \( y_{ijct} \), the dependent variable, is a vector of dyadic valence attack outcomes: binary and weekly valence attack counts in directed party dyads.
  - Binary variable indicating attack occurrence.
  - All valence attacks, count.
  - Issue-related valence attacks, count.
  - Nonissue-related valence attacks, count.
  - Sender-owned issue-related valence attacks, count.
  - Receiver-owned issue-related valence attacks, count.
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Model

\[ y_{ijct} = \alpha + \beta Z_{jct} + \gamma V_{ict} + \delta X_{ijct} + \epsilon_{ijct} \]

- \( Z_{jct} \) is a matrix of characteristics of the receiving party: Target is Incumbent (Key IV) and Target is Niche
- \( V_{ict} \), a matrix of characteristics of the sender or attacking party: Ideology of Sender, Attacks Received at \( t-1 \)
- \( X_{ijct} \) is a matrix with dyad specific characteristics: \( \Delta \)Poll, \( \Delta \)Poll Change, \( \Delta \)Ideology, Coalition Potential
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Analysis and Results
H1: Incumbents are more likely to receive valence attacks than opposition parties.
**H1:** Incumbents are more likely to receive valence attacks than opposition parties.

Figure 10: Distribution of the dependent variables for hypothesis 1.
Results: Testing Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Target is Incumbent

Controls
Country Fixed Effects
Dyad Robust SE
N

*Note: * $p < .05$, Reported are odds ratios for model 1 and incident rate ratios for model 2.

The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks.
## Results: Testing Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is Incumbent</td>
<td>1.627* (0.245)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * $p < .05$, Reported are odds ratios for model 1 and incident rate ratios for model 2.

The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks.
### Results: Testing Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is Incumbent</td>
<td>1.627* (0.245)</td>
<td>1.322* (0.199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * $p < .05$, Reported are odds ratios for model 1 and incident rate ratios for model 2.

The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks.
H2: Incumbents are more likely than opposition parties to get attacked on *issue-related* than on *nonissue-related* valence.
**H2:** Incumbents are more likely than opposition parties to get attacked on *issue-related* than on *nonissue-related* valence.

Figure 11: Distribution of the dependent variables for hypothesis 2.
### Results: Testing Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is Incumbent</td>
<td>1.372* (0.123)</td>
<td>1.050 (0.097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p < .05, Reported are incident rate ratios. The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks. The dependent variables are counts of weekly valence attacks in party dyads.
**H3:** Incumbents are more likely than opposition parties to get attacked with issue-related valence attacks *on issues that the attacking party owns.*
Results: Testing Hypothesis 3

**H3:** Incumbents are more likely than opposition parties to get attacked with issue-related valence attacks *on issues that the attacking party owns.*

![Figure 12: Distribution of the dependent variables for hypothesis 3.](image)

Figure 12: Distribution of the dependent variables for hypothesis 3.
### Results: Testing Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sender Owned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poisson</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poisson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target is Incumbent</strong></td>
<td>1.714*</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.163)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Fixed Effects</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyad Robust SE</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * $p < .05$, Reported are incident rate ratios. The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks. The dependent variables are counts of weekly valence attacks in party dyads.*
Conclusion
Conclusion

- **Important:** Connection between spatial competition and valence attacks.
  - Valence attacks not necessarily bad - they can educate voters about the incumbents.
  - Attack behavior is not driven by electoral performance or ideology.
  - There is a strong element of retaliation in attack behavior.
  - Niche parties and potential coalition partners are significantly less likely to receive an attack in the first place. If attacked, they receive fewer attacks.
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Future Research

- How do coalition formation dynamics affect a party’s decision to attack competitors?
- What is the effect of valence attacks on vote choice (Somer-Topcu and Weitzel 2020), but also turnout and satisfaction with democracy?
- Theory: Developing a theory of legitimacy conditions across countries and time.
- Methods: Extend applicability of dyad robust standard error estimator.
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Results: Coefficient Plot for Hypothesis 1

- Weeks to Election
- Sender Ideology
- Target is Niche
- Target is Incumbent
- Dyad Ideology, dist.
- Dyad Poll, dist.
- Dyad Poll, change
- Coalition Potential
- Attacks received

- 1) Attack, binary
- 2) Attack, count zero-trunc.

Note: N = 1,672 and 566. All models include DRSE and country fixed effects.
Results: Coefficient Plot for Hypothesis 2

Dependent Variables

- 3) Issue-related
- 4) Nonissue-related

Note: N = 566 and 566. All models include DRSE and country fixed effects.
Results: Coefficient Plot for Hypothesis 3

Weeks to Election
Sender Ideology
Target is Niche
Target is Incumbent
Dyad Ideology, dist.
Dyad Poll, dist.
Dyad Poll, change
Coalition Potential
Attacks Received

Expected Log Count

Dependent Variables
5) Subject Owned
6) Receiver Owned
Note: N = 566 and 566. All models include DRSE and country fixed effects.
CCDP Survey
### Does the subject of the article you identified discuss any issue positions or valence characteristics of another party, of the government or of the establishment?

| Yes | No |

* must provide value

Note that if the subject discusses another party's leader or member of the parliament etc., you should still code this as "Yes" and code the party of that leader/member in the next question. If the subject refers to the "government" determine who was in government that year and code the party accordingly.

### If the subject talks about another party or the government, identify the first (or the only) other actor it talks about?

- Labour Party
- Liberal Democratic Party
- Conservative Party
- UKIP
- Scottish National Party
- Establishment

### Does the subject refer to an issue position of this other actor?

| Yes | No |

* must provide value

### What is the first (or the only) issue the subject refers to for the other actor?

- Taxes
- Social Policy/Public Services
- Inflation
- Unemployment
- Other Economic Performance
- Centralization vs. Regional Autonomy
- Environment
- Immigration, Asylum
- Justice System
- Law and Order, Security, Terrorism
- National Way of Life, Nationalism
- Traditional Morality, Family Values, Religion
- Europe/European Union
- Internationalism (not EU)
- Foreign Intervention
- Agriculture/Rural Affairs
- Other Issue

"Social policy/public services" is an umbrella category on welfare state related policies that includes (but is not limited to) sub-issues such as: Social services, Education, Social security, Health care, Public housing, Public transportation, Childcare, Family policies (e.g., maternity leave, Elderly care, Minimum wage

### Issue direction

- -1
- 0 (status quo; no clear position taken/vague; or just mentions the issue)
- 1
- 99 (takes a contradictory position)

Refer to your notes to decide how to code this variable

### How confident are you with your answer to the questions so far about the issue you identified above?

| Fully confident | Somewhat confident | Not confident |

* must provide value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| When the subject discusses the other actor's position on the issue you identified above, does the subject refer to any valence characteristics of this other actor? | Yes  No  
Valence includes references to party/leader honesty, integrity, character, competence, performance; party unity; leader charisma. You should answer this question "yes" only if the subject is clearly and openly saying that they are the competent, unified, honest etc. party/leader to deal with that issue. If they do not clearly discuss their competence, integrity etc. when discussing this specific issue, say no. |
| What is the valence content?                                            | Party/Govt/Est honesty/integrity/character  
Party/Govt/Est (past, current, future) competence/performance  
Party/Govt/Est unity  
Party/Govt/Est other valence dimension  
Leader honesty/integrity/character  
Leader (past, current, future) competence/performance  
Leader charisma  
Leader other valence dimension  
Other target actor (e.g., an MP of the party, the deputy leader, a minister etc.) |
| Is the valence category referred to in a negative or positive light?     | negative direction  neutral  positive direction |
| When the subject discusses the position of the other actor on the issue you identified above, does the subject refer to a second valence characteristic of the party/government/establishment? | Yes  No  
Valence includes references to party/leader honesty, integrity, character, competence, performance; party unity; leader charisma. You should answer this question "yes" only if the subject is clearly and openly saying that they are the competent, unified, honest etc. party/leader to deal with that issue. If they do not clearly discuss their competence, integrity etc. when discussing this specific issue, say no. |
| How confident are you with your answers to the issue-related valence questions? | Fully confident  Somewhat confident  Not confident  
*must provide value* |
### Does the subject talk about the other actor’s valence (the actor you identified above) without any specific reference to an issue position?

- Yes
- No

Note that if the subject is saying that the other party is (in)competent/(dis)unified etc. to deal with a particular issue, you should have already coded it above as an issue category. This question should be answered as “yes” only if the subject says that the other actor is (in)competent, (dis)unified, (dis)honest, (not) charismatic, etc. WITHOUT a reference to any specific issue positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First (or Only) Valence Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party/Gov't honesty/integrity/character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/Gov't (past, current, future) competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/Gov't unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party/Gov't other valence dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader honesty/integrity/character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader (past, current, future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader other valence dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other target actor (e.g., an MP of the party, the deputy leader, a minister etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the valence category referred to in a negative or positive light?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How confident are you with your answer for identifying the questions related to this valence content?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* must provide value
CCDP Issues
## CCDP Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>Party making statements on its issue positions, issue-related valence, and general valence (country-specific party code, see Appendix, Table A1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement_type</td>
<td>Type of statement made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SelfIssue (purely issue-related standpoint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SelfIssueVal (issue-related valence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SelfVal (general valence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- additional country-specific values (see 6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var_value</td>
<td>Content of statement, dependent on statement_type. For statement_type == (Self/Other)Issue: Policy area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Social Policy/Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Other Economic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – Centralization vs. Regional Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 – Immigration, Asylum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 – Justice System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – Law and Order, Security, Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – National Way of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 – Traditional Morality, Family Values, Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 – Europe/EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 – Internationalism (not EU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 – Foreign Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – Agriculture/Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99 – Other Issue (for additional country-specific issue domains see Table 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IssueVal: (issue-related) Valence category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Party/government honesty/integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Party/govt (past, current, future) competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Party/government unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Leader honesty/integrity/character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Leader (past, current, future) competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – Leader charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SelfVal: Valence category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Party/government honesty/integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Party/govt (past, current, future) competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Party/government unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Leader honesty/integrity/character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Leader (past, current, future) competence/performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – Leader charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- additional country-specific values (see 6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction</td>
<td>Direction of statement made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 – negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99 – contradictory statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valen_issue</td>
<td>Issue/policy area related to issue valence statements: See codes for var_value if statement_type == Issue (only applicable for statement_type == IssueVal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CCDP Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>socialPol</td>
<td>Social policy issue/area sub-code (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., issue area==2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 – Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 – Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 – Elderly care/pensioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 – Public Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5 – Public Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 6 – Minimum Wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 7 – Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 8 – Childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 9 – Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 – Other family policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 99 – Other social policy/public services (for country-specific issue domains see Table 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socialPol_spend_dir</td>
<td>Direction of social policy statement (only applicable for statements on social policy, i.e., issue area==2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- -1 – decrease spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 0 – neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 – increase spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 99 – contradictory statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant_issue</td>
<td>Dominant issue in the article, i.e., the issue an article focuses on. The issue categories are identical to those of the parties’ statements; see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant_issue_social</td>
<td>Dominant issue in the article, in the case of a social policy issue being the main issue (dominant_issue==2); for issue categories, see above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content of statement, dependent on statement_type. For statement_type=

- **(Self/Other)Issue**: Policy area
  - 1 – Taxes
  - 2 – Social Policy/Public Services
  - 3 – Inflation
  - 4 – Unemployment
  - 5 – Other Economic Performance
  - 6 – Centralization vs. Regional Autonomy
  - 7 – Environment
  - 8 – Immigration, Asylum
  - 9 – Justice System
  - 10 – Law and Order, Security, Terrorism
  - 11 – National Way of Life
  - 12 – Traditional Morality, Family Values, Religion
  - 13 – Europe/EU
  - 14 – Internationalism (not EU)
  - 15 – Foreign Intervention
  - 16 – Agriculture/Rural Affairs
  - 99 – Other Issue

(for additional country-specific issue domains see Table 11)
Overview of Issue Statements and Valence Statements
### Overview of Issue Statements and Valence Statements - Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZ10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ13</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE09</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE13</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK07</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK11</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES08</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES11</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU06</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview of Issue Statements and Valence Statements - Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL11</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO09</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO11</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV10</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV14</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK05</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK10</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK15</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements Received by Incumbents and Opposition
Overview of Statements Received by Incumbents and Opposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Gov./Opp.</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Statements, received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZ2010</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2010</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2013</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2013</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2005</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2005</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2015</td>
<td>Gov.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2015</td>
<td>Opp.</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spanish Parties in the data set
Spanish Parties in the data set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>PSOE (Socialist Workers’ Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>PP (People’s Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>IU (United Left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>CiU (Convergence &amp; Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>EAJ/PNV (Basque Nationalist Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2008</td>
<td>UPyD (Union, Progress, and Democracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>PSOE (Socialist Workers’ Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>PP (People’s Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>IU-LV (Plural Left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>CiU (Convergence &amp; Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>EAJ/PNV (Basque Nationalist Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2011</td>
<td>UPyD (Union, Progress, and Democracy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements in Spain 2008 and 2011
Number of statements about PSOE in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Party Pair</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-PP</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-IU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-CiU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-ERC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-EAJ/PNV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PSOE-UPyD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of statements about PP in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Party Pair</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-PSOE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-IU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-CiU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-ERC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-EAJ/PNV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-08</td>
<td>PP-UPyD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of statements about PSOE in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Party Pair</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-PP</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-IU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-CiU</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-ERC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-EAJ/PNV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PSOE-UPyD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of statements about PP in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Party Pair</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Valence Attacks (DV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-PSOE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-IU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-CiU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-ERC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-EAJ/PNV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-11</td>
<td>PP-UPyD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legitimacy Mechanism
Testing the mechanism of legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in polling performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue attacks</strong></td>
<td>0.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poll, lag</strong></td>
<td>−0.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delta Poll, lag</strong></td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks received</strong></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks to Election</strong></td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, The DV is change in polling performance and estimated with OLS.
PM/Chancellor Coding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attacks (1 = yes)</td>
<td>Logit</td>
<td>Neg. Bin., trunc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target is PM</td>
<td>0.647*</td>
<td>0.367*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1,684.341</td>
<td>2,402.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
## Valence Attacks and Issue Ownership with PM coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3) Issue Rel.</th>
<th>(4) Nonissue Rel.</th>
<th>(5) Sender Owns</th>
<th>(6) Receiver Owns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is PM</td>
<td>0.353*</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.527*</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2,056.796</td>
<td>2,026.615</td>
<td>1,434.992</td>
<td>1,332.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

for Daniel Weitzel
Different Issue Ownership classification
Valence Attacks and Issue Ownership With Different Issue Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Version 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sender Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.586*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1,503.791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. Reported are expected log counts.
Campaign Fixed Effects
Valence Attacks and Incumbency with Campaign Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attacks (1 = yes)</td>
<td>Logit</td>
<td>Neg. Bin., trunc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.539* (0.221)</td>
<td>0.285* (0.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1,673.576</td>
<td>2,396.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daniel Weitzel
## Valence Attacks and Issue Ownership with Campaign Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3) Issue Rel.</th>
<th>(4) Nonissue Rel.</th>
<th>(5) Sender Owns</th>
<th>(6) Receiver Owns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.306*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.459*</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
<td>(0.233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2,055.053</td>
<td>2,017.679</td>
<td>1,407.271</td>
<td>1,395.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, Reported are expected log counts.
Receiver Ideology
## Valence Attacks and Incumbency with Receiver Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.487*</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.227)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology of Receiver</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>−0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1,682.533</td>
<td>2,404.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Valence Attacks and Issue Ownership with Receiver Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.316* (0.118)</td>
<td>0.539* (0.054)</td>
<td>0.178 (0.218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology (Target)</td>
<td>−0.002 (0.004)</td>
<td>−0.001 (0.006)</td>
<td>0.011 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad RSE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2,054.673</td>
<td>2,030.002</td>
<td>1,512.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Zero-inflated negative binomial model
### Valence Attacks with zero-inflated negative binomial regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attacks, number of</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.315*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>−1,983.567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. Reported are expected log counts.*
Multi-Level Models
### Valence Attacks and Incumbency in Multi-Level Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.656*</td>
<td>0.231*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1,683.303</td>
<td>2,100.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p < .05\)
### Valence Attacks and Issue Ownership in Multi-Level Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3) Issue Rel.</th>
<th>(4) Nonissue Rel.</th>
<th>(5) Sender Owns</th>
<th>(6) Receiver Owns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>0.317*</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.610*</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
<td>(0.097)</td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2,100.790</td>
<td>2,090.237</td>
<td>1,504.347</td>
<td>1,332.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Junior Partners
## Results: Testing Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Attacks (1 = yes)</th>
<th>(2) Attacks, number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is Junior</td>
<td>1.257 (0.211)</td>
<td>1.048 (0.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *p < .05, Reported are odds ratios for model 1 and incident rate ratios for model 2.

The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks.
## Results: Testing Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(3) Issue-Related</th>
<th>(4) Nonissue Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is Junior</td>
<td>1.179 (0.147)</td>
<td>0.786 (0.113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p < .05, Reported are incident rate ratios. The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks. The dependent variables are counts of weekly valence attacks in party dyads.
### Results: Testing Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(5) Sender Owned</th>
<th>(6) Receiver Owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poisson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target is Junior</td>
<td>1.496* ( (0.203) )</td>
<td>0.754 ( (0.113) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Robust SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *p < .05, Reported are incident rate ratios. The unit of observation are directed party dyads in campaign weeks. The dependent variables are counts of weekly valence attacks in party dyads.