Supplementary File

Table A1

Complete Details of Excluded Responses

Data Quality Measures	Procedure	Cut-off Point	Amount of Exclusions	Derived from
Speeding		We applied the Dynata criterion of excluding respondents with a completion time of less than one third of the median completion time of the full sample.	T1: $n = 59$ T2: $n = 22$	
Attention Checks	We used three attention check items on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) I know how to count to ten. I have never used a computer. My birthday is on February 30.	Depending on the polarity of the item, we flagged participants with responses on the scale points 1-4 (i.e., "I know how to count to ten.") or 4-7 (i.e., "I have never used a computer.") and excluded those who failed all three attention checks	T1: $n = 35$ T2: $n = 11$	Huang et al. (2012) Meade & Craig (2012)
Incomplete Responses		Responses that did not fully complete the questionnaire	T1: $n = 266$ T2: $n = 108$	

Table A2

Complete Details of Systematic Differences of Samples Between Wave One and Wave Two

Variables	Indicator	Effect Size	Interpretation
Age	$t(1569) = -2.77, p = .006$	Cohen's $d = -0.14$, 95% CI [-0.244, -0.042]	The age of the respondents who also completed the second wave was significantly older than for respondents who only completed the first wave but the effect size of Cohen's d is small (Pek & Flora, 2018).
Gender	$\chi^2(1, N = 937) = 5.27, p = .022$	$\phi = 0.08$	We observed a systematic difference in the gender of respondents who only completed the first wave compared to respondents who also completed the second wave. The effect size is small (Pek & Flora, 2018).
Education	$\chi^2(7, N = 937) = 12.08, p = .098$		There was no systematic difference in the education of respondents who only completed the first wave compared to respondents who also completed the second wave.

Table A3

Complete Details of Measures

Variables	Time	Items	Scale	Statistics	Derived from
Most Favorite Party [FILTER]	T1; T2	*Now it's about that party in the Bundestag with which you can most readily identify. Even if it is difficult for you, please choose the party with which you can most identify.* CDU/CSU SPD AfD FDP DIE LINKE BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN			Own concept
PDC Most Favorite Party	T1; T2	*Please now think about the style of the [FILTER PARTY] in the Bundestag election campaign and the behavior of the [FILTER PARTY] as a whole, and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.* *Please answer from 1 - "strongly disagree" to 7 - "strongly agree".* The [FILTER PARTY] is disrespectful to other parties. The [FILTER PARTY] uses deceitful campaign techniques, for instance illegal campaign financing.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: $\rho = .73$, $M = 2.51$, $SD = 1.31$; T2: $\rho = .69$, $M = 2.43$, $SD = 1.32$	Reiter and Matthes (2021)
Least Favorite Party [FILTER]	T1; T2	*Now it's about that party in the Bundestag with which you can least identify. Even if it is difficult for you, please choose the party with which you can least identify.* CDU/CSU SPD AfD FDP DIE LINKE BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN			Own concept

Table A3 (continued)

Complete Details of Measures

Variables	Time	Items	Scale	Statistics	Derived from
PDC Least Favorite Party	T1; T2	*Please now think about the style of the [FILTER PARTY] in the Bundestag election campaign and the behavior of the [FILTER PARTY] as a whole, and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.* *Please answer from 1 - "strongly disagree" to 7 - "strongly agree".* The [FILTER PARTY] is disrespectful to other parties. The [FILTER PARTY] uses deceitful campaign techniques, for instance illegal campaign financing.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ρ = .81, *M* = 5.15, *SD* = 1.69; T2: ρ = .77, *M* = 4.90, *SD* = 1.66	Reiter and Matthes (2021)
Attitudes Toward DC Regulation	T1; T2	*In election campaigns, we often talk about so-called dirty campaigning - i.e., offending criticism that is disrespectful or involves unfair methods. Please now think about your attitudes toward dirty campaigning in the Bundestag election campaign and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.* *Please answer from 1 - "strongly disagree" to 7 - "strongly agree".* Dirty campaigning should legally be more regulated. The sponsors of dirty campaigning should be prosecuted more vigorously. Dirty campaigning should be legally penalized more strongly.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ω = .93, 95% CI [.92, .95], *M* = 5.43, *SD* = 1.42; T2: ω = .94, 95% CI [.92, .95], *M* = 5.41, *SD* = 1.44	Nelson et al. (2021)
Perceptions of Harmful Consequences of DC for Democracy	T1; T2	*Please now think about the effects of dirty campaigning in the Bundestag election campaign and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.* *Please answer from 1 - "strongly disagree" to 7 - "strongly agree".* Dirty campaigning makes election campaigns look manipulated. Dirty campaigning makes election campaigns look unprofessional. Dirty campaigning makes election campaigns look uninformative. Dirty campaigning does not help to solve political problems effectively. Dirty campaigning contributes to a hostile political atmosphere. Dirty campaigning harms the transparency of a democracy.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ω = .91, 95% CI [.89, .92], *M* = 5.31, *SD* = 1.28; T2: ω = .90, 95% CI [.88, .92], *M* = 5.36, *SD* = 1.26	Norris (2014); Sydnor (2019)

Table A3 (continued)

Complete Details of Measures

Variables	Time	Items	Scale	Statistics	Derived from
Distrust in Politicians	T1; T2	*The next questions are about your political attitudes. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.* *Please answer from 1 - "strongly disagree" to 7 - "strongly agree".* Politicians in Germany are more concerned with their own interests than with actual policies. Politicians in Germany are not fulfilling their obligations and duties. Politicians in Germany rarely keep their promises to the people. Politicians in Germany do not take the concerns of the population seriously.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ω = .88, 95% CI [.86, .90], *M* = 4.86, *SD* = 1.45; T2: ω = .89, 95% CI [.87, .91], *M* = 4.87, *SD* = 1.47	Craig et al. (1990); Norris (2011)
Trust in Democracy	T1; T2	*[Included in the battery with distrust in politicians]* Democracy is the right form of government for Germany. Democracy is better than other forms of government for Germany. I have confidence in the democratic procedures and processes in Germany. I am satisfied with the way democracy works in Germany. I am satisfied in which direction democracy is developing in Germany.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ω = .75, 95% CI [.69, .79], *M* = 4.73, *SD* = 1.35; T2: ω = .72, 95% CI [.65, .78], *M* = 4.77, *SD* = 1.36	Craig et al. (1990); Norris (2011)
Ideology	T1	*Many people use the terms "left" and "right" when referring to different political attitudes. We have a scale here that runs from left to right.* *When you think of your own political views, where would you rank those views on this scale?* *Please decide on one of the boxes between "left" and "right.*	Twelve-point scale (0 = *left* to 10 = *right*; 11 = *don't know*) Recoded (11 = *don't know* recoded as missing)	*M* = 4.73, *SD* = 1.75	Wagner et al. (2018)

Table A3 (continued)

Complete Details of Measures

Variables	Time	Items	Scale	Statistics	Derived from
Political Interest	T1; T2	*How interested are you…* in politics in general? in the federal election on September 26, 2021?	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *not interested at all* to 7 = *very interested*)	T1: ρ = .87, *M* = 5.61, *SD* = 1.49; T2: ρ = .85, *M* = 5.59, *SD* = 1.47	Wagner et al. (2018)
Perceived Civil Negative Campaigning	T1; T2	*Please think about the style and behavior of the parties in the election campaign and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements* The parties are very critical but respectful to each other. The candidates criticize each other sharply but refrain from offenses. The election campaign of the parties is characterized by harsh political arguments but gets by without slurs.	Seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*)	T1: ω = .87, 95% CI [.85, .89], *M* = 3.90, *SD* = 1.18; T2: ω = .88, 95% CI [.86, .90], *M* = 3.98, *SD* = 1.19	Reiter and Matthes (2021)

References

Craig, S. C., Niemi, R. G., & Silver, G. E. (1990). Political Efficacy and Trust: A Report on the NES Pilot Study Items. *Political Behavior*, *12*(3), 289–314.

Huang, J. L., Curran, P. G., Keeney, J., Poposki, E. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2012). Detecting and Deterring Insufficient Effort Responding to Surveys. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *27*(1), 99–114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9231-8

Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, *17*(3), 437–455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028085

Nelson, M. R., Ham, C. D., Haley, E., & Chung, U. C. (2021). How Political Interest and Gender Influence Persuasion Knowledge, Political Information Seeking, and Support for Regulation of Political Advertising in Social Media. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *21*(3), 225–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2021.1978352

Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P. (2014). *Why Electoral Integrity Matters*. Cambridge University Press.

Pek, J., & Flora, D. B. (2018). Reporting effect sizes in original psychological research: A discussion and tutorial. *Psychological Methods*, *23*(2), 208–225. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000126

Reiter, F., & Matthes, J. (2021). "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly". A Panel Study on the Reciprocal Effects of Negative, Dirty, and Positive Campaigning on Political Distrust. *Mass Communication and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2021.1934702

Sydnor, E. (2019). *Disrespectful Democracy: The Psychology of Political Incivility*. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/sydn18924

Wagner, M., Aichholzer, J., Eberl, J.-M., Meyer, T. M., Berk, N., Büttner, N., Boomgaarden, H., Kritzinger, S., & Müller, W. C. (2018). *AUTNES Online Panel Study 2017 (SUF edition)*. https://doi.org/10.11587/I7QIYJ