

Digital Appendices to

Seeing bias in irony: How recipients infer speakers' stereotypes from their ironic remarks about social-category members.

Digital Appendix A:	Overview of designs study 1 and 2	p. 2
Digital Appendix B:	Example anecdotes of materials, study 1 and 2	pp. 3
Digital Appendix C:	Overview of materials, study 1	pp. 4-5
Digital Appendix D:	Overview of materials, study 2	pp. 7-10
Digital Appendix E:	Participants' own perceived essentialism, study 1	pp. 11
Digital Appendix F:	Additional analyses on the speaker's essentialism items (Experiment 2).	pp. 12

Appendix A. Overview of designs study 1 and 2

		Behavior sequence 1			Behavior sequence 2			
		Communication pattern				Communication pattern		
Set	Valence of behavior	all literal	ironic about positive behavior	ironic about negative behavior	Valence of behavior	all literal	ironic about positive behavior	ironic about negative behavior
1.	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic
2.	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal
3.	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic
4.	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal
5.	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic
6.	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal
7.	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic
8.	Negative	Literal	Literal	Ironic	Positive	Literal	Ironic	Literal

Appendix B. Example anecdotes with behavior (positive, negative) and remark (literal, ironic) of manipulations from Experiments 1 and 2.

Experiment			
1	Context	<i>During the lunch your colleagues talk about the company drinks that are held every Friday. One colleague tells that...</i>	
		Negative behavior	Positive behavior
	Behavior	one Ruysdaeler always goes home just before the drinks.	one Ruysdaeler always goes to the drinks and joins going to the bar afterwards
		<i>Here on your other colleague reacts:</i>	
	Literal remark	“Well, what a boring Ruysdaeler!”	“Well, what a sociable Ruysdaeler!”
	Ironic remark	“Well, what a sociable Ruysdaeler!”	“Well, what a boring Ruysdaeler!”
2	Context	<i>Colleagues talk about what a busy madhouse it had been lately. “I found it quite difficult to keep track of what was going on everywhere.” “Yes indeed, at the Brinkers department they made an overview of all projects with a schedule. ...”</i>	
		Negative behavior	Positive behavior
	Behavior	“After that, the projects did progress pretty bad.”	“After that, the projects did progress pretty good.”
	Literal remark	“Oh, that’s really very clumsy of the Brinkers”	“Oh, that’s really very handy of the Brinkers”
	Ironic remark	“Oh, that’s really very handy of the Brinkers”	“Oh, that’s really very clumsy of the Brinkers”

Note. Translated from Dutch

Appendix C: Overview of materials in eight sets used in Study 1.

Participants read that the study dealt with communication within companies. Participants were asked to imagine being a new employee in a company housed in several buildings. They read: “Each building is named after an artist and in each building, a separate team is working. These teams are clearly distinct from each other and have their own specific culture. Colleagues within each team have a strong bond. You work only with people from your own team in the Vermeer Building. Because you are just new, you hardly have an impression of the culture within the company and the differences between the teams working in the different buildings. A typical group in the company are the people from the Ruysdael Building, also known as Ruysdaelers. During the daily lunch with your colleagues you hear more and more stories about the Ruysdaelers. Based on these stories you form an impression of the Ruysdaelers and their culture. On the next pages, you will read eight short stories you hear about the Ruysdaelers during lunch. After each story one of your colleagues comments.”

Set	Negative (cold) behavior	Positive (warm) behavior
	Context During lunchbreak your colleague tells that the Ruysdaelers had a busy period at their department. A deadline was approaching, so all Ruysdaelers had to work hard. One Ruysdaeler was not very fast. When another Ruysdaeler noted this, ... (<i>Tijdens de lunchpauze vertelt uw collega dat de Ruysdaelers een drukke periode hebben gehad op de afdeling. Een deadline naderde, dus alle Ruysdaelers moesten hard aan de slag. Bij één Ruysdaeler ging het niet zo snel. Toen een andere Ruysdaeler dit in de gaten kreeg, ...</i>)	
	... he ignored him. (<i>heeft hij hem genegeerd.</i>)	... he helped him. (<i>heeft hij hem geholpen.</i>)
1	<u>Your other colleague reacts upon this (<i>Hierop reageert uw andere college</i>)*</u> :	
	Literal remark Gee, that is a mean Ruysdaeler! (<i>Goh, dat is een gemene Ruysdaeler!</i>)	Gee, that is a nice Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, dat is een aardige Ruysdaeler!</i>)
	Ironic remark Gee, that is a nice Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, dat is een aardige Ruysdaeler!</i>)	Gee, that is a mean Ruysdaeler! (<i>Goh, dat is een gemene Ruysdaeler!</i>)
	Context You are having lunch with your colleagues. One colleague tells that a Ruysdaeler, after 20 years of loyal service to the company, is retiring. The Ruysdaeler who is responsible for organizing farewell parties, ... (<i>U zit met uw collega's te lunchen. Een collega vertelt dat een Ruysdaeler, na 20 jaar trouwe dienst bij het bedrijf, met pensioen gaat. De Ruysdaeler die voor het organiseren van afscheidsfeesten verantwoordelijk is ...</i>)	
	Behavior ... organized nothing for this occasion. (<i>heeft voor deze gelegenheid niets georganiseerd.</i>)	... organized a party for this occasion. (<i>heeft voor deze gelegenheid een feest georganiseerd.</i>)
2	Literal remark Wow, what a rude Ruysdaeler! (<i>Wow, wat een lompe Ruysdaeler!</i>)	Wow, what an attentive Ruysdaeler! (<i>Wow, wat een attente Ruysdaeler!</i>)
	Ironic remark Wow, what an attentive Ruysdaeler! (<i>Wow, wat een attente Ruysdaeler!</i>)	Wow, what a rude Ruysdaeler! (<i>Wow, wat een lompe Ruysdaeler!</i>)
	Context During lunch, your colleague tells about a meeting he had that morning. At this meeting the team leaders of each team were present, including a Ruysdaeler. During the meeting, it was announced that your team had performed very well over the last half year. (<i>Tijdens de lunch vertelt uw collega over een vergadering die hij die ochtend had. Bij deze vergadering waren van ieder team de teamleiders aanwezig, dus ook een Ruysdaeler. Tijdens het overleg werd bekend gemaakt dat uw team erg goed had gepresteerd afgelopen half jaar.</i>)	

3	Behavior	The Ruysdaeler was the only one who ignored your colleague. (<i>De Ruysdaeler negeerde uw collega als enige.</i>)	The Ruysdaeler was the first to congratulate your colleague. (<i>De Ruysdaeler feliciteerde uw collega hier als eerste mee.</i>)
	Literal remark	Well, that is a rude Ruysdaeler (<i>Zo, dat is een botte Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Well, that is a friendly Ruysdaeler (<i>Zo, dat is een vriendelijke Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Ironic remark	Well, that is a friendly Ruysdaeler (<i>Zo, dat is een vriendelijke Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Well, that is a rude Ruysdaeler (<i>Zo, dat is een botte Ruysdaeler.</i>)
<hr/>			
	Context	During lunchbreak your colleague tells that she was at the Ruysdaelers' office yesterday. Right at that moment, a new employee arrived for the first time at the Ruysdaelers'. (<i>Tijdens de lunchpauze vertelt uw collega dat zij gisteren op kantoor was bij de Ruysdaelers. Juist op dat moment kwam een nieuwe medewerkster voor het eerst langs bij de Ruysdaelers.</i>)	
4	Behavior	The Ruysdaeler who let her in immediately continued with his work. He only escorted the new employee to her office and did not introduce her to anyone. (<i>De Ruysdaeler die haar binnenliet ging direct door met zijn werkzaamheden. Hij bracht de nieuwe collega alleen naar haar kantoor en stelde haar aan niemand voor.</i>)	The Ruysdaeler who let her in stopped with his regular work. He gave the new employee a tour of the office and introduced her to everyone. (<i>De Ruysdaeler die haar binnenliet onderbrak zijn werkzaamheden. Hij gaf de nieuwe collega een rondleiding en stelde haar aan iedereen voor.</i>)
	Literal remark	Gee, what a cold Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een kille Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gee, what a warm Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een warme Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Ironic remark	Gee, what a warm Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een warme Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gee, what a cold Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een kille Ruysdaeler.</i>)
<hr/>			
	Context	During lunchbreak you sit next to your colleague who recently became a father. He just told this to a Ruysdaeler. (<i>Tijdens de lunchpauze komt uw collega naast u zitten die net vader is geworden. Hij heeft dit zojuist aan een Ruysdaeler verteld.</i>)	
5	Behavior	The Ruysdaeler ignored this news and started talking about the weather. (<i>De Ruysdaeler negeerde dit nieuws en begon over het weer te praten.</i>)	The Ruysdaeler was interested and asked about his wife and the baby. (<i>De Ruysdaeler was geïnteresseerd en hij vroeg hoe het met zijn vrouw en de baby is.</i>)
	Literal remark	Gosh, what an uninterested Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, wat een ongeïnteresseerde Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gosh, what an involved Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, wat een betrokken Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Ironic remark	Gosh, what an involved Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, wat een betrokken Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gosh, what an uninterested Ruysdaeler (<i>Goh, wat een ongeïnteresseerde Ruysdaeler.</i>)
<hr/>			
	Context	During lunch, you talk about the company drinks that are held every Friday. One colleague tells that... (<i>Tijdens de lunch wordt er gepraat over de bedrijfsborrel die iedere vrijdag gehouden wordt. Een collega vertelt dat ...</i>)	
6	Behavior	...one Ruysdaeler always goes home just before the drinks (<i>...één Ruysdaeler altijd precies vóór de borrel naar huis gaat.</i>)	...one Ruysdaeler is always present at the drinks and afterwards joins to the bar (<i>...één Ruysdaeler altijd bij de borrel is en erna nog mee gaat naar de kroeg.</i>)
	Literal remark	Well, what a boring Ruysdaeler! (<i>Nou, wat een</i>	Well, what a sociable Ruysdaeler! (<i>Nou, wat een</i>

		<i>saaie Ruysdaeler!</i>	<i>gezellige Ruysdaeler!</i>
	Ironic remark	Well, what a sociable Ruysdaeler! (<i>Nou, wat een gezellige Ruysdaeler!</i>)	Well, what a boring Ruysdaeler! (<i>Nou, wat een saaie Ruysdaeler!</i>)
	Context	During lunchbreak your colleague tells that he is in a project group with a Ruysdaeler, who is ill with the flu. (<i>In de lunchpauze vertelt uw collega dat hij in een projectgroep zit met een Ruysdaeler, die geveld is door de griep.</i>)	
7	Behavior	Another Ruysdaeler refused to take on additional tasks. (<i>Een andere Ruysdaeler weigerde om extra taken op zich te nemen.</i>)	Another Ruysdaeler is prepared to take on additional tasks. (<i>Een andere Ruysdaeler is bereid is om extra taken op zich te nemen.</i>)
	Literal remark	Phew, that's an unsympathetic Ruysdaeler. (<i>Poeh, dat is een onsympathieke Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Phew, that's a sympathetic Ruysdaeler. (<i>Poeh, dat is een sympathieke Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Ironic remark	Phew, that's a sympathetic Ruysdaeler. (<i>Poeh, dat is een sympathieke Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Phew, that's an unsympathetic Ruysdaeler. (<i>Poeh, dat is een onsympathieke Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Context	During lunchyour colleague tells that he collaborates with a Ruysdaeler in a complex project. Your colleague had problems understanding the project. (<i>Tijdens de lunchpauze vertelt uw collega dat hij samenwerkt met een Ruysdaeler in een complex project. Uw collega kwam er niet helemaal uit.</i>)	
8	Behavior	The Ruysdaeler ignored this and did not explain it any further. (<i>De Ruysdaeler negeerde dit en legde het niet verder uit.</i>)	The Ruysdaeler noticed this and explained it further again. (<i>De Ruysdaeler merkte dit en legde het nog eens extra uit.</i>)
	Literal remark	Gee, what a selfish Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een egoïstische Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gee, what a social Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een sociale Ruysdaeler.</i>)
	Ironic remark	Gee, what a social Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een sociale Ruysdaeler.</i>)	Gee, what a selfish Ruysdaeler (<i>Jeetje, wat een egoïstische Ruysdaeler.</i>)

Note. Dutch texts (in italics) were used in the Study. English translations in plain text. *Repeated in all sets.

Appendix D: Overview of materials in eight sets, embedded in script of lunch conversation, used in Study 2.

Set	Negative (incompetent) behavior	Positive (competent) behavior
Context	P1: I am happy things have finally calmed down. It was such a madhouse lately! P2: Yes! Glad that is over. Although you never know when it starts again. P3: Well, let's hope the storm has died down for a while. P2: I found it quite difficult to keep track of what was going on everywhere. Weren't you bothered by that? P1: Yes, sometimes. At the other department, at the Brinkers', they made an overview of all projects with a schedule. ... (P1: <i>Ik ben blij dat het eindelijk weer wat rustiger is. Het was zo'n gekkenhuis de afgelopen periode!</i> P2: <i>Ja! Gelukkig is dat voorbij. Alhoewel je nooit weet wanneer het weer begint.</i> P3: <i>Nou, laten we hopen dat de storm voorlopig een beetje geluwd is.</i> P2: <i>Ik vond het af en toe best moeilijk om bij te houden wat er nou allemaal aan de hand was overal. Hadden jullie daar geen last van?</i> P1: <i>Ja, soms inderdaad wel. Op de andere afdeling, bij de Brinkers, hadden ze een overzicht van alle projecten met een planning gemaakt.</i> ...)	
1 Behavior	After which, the projects progressed pretty badly. (<i>De projecten verliepen daarna wel behoorlijk slecht.</i>)	After that, the projects progressed really well. (<i>De projecten verliepen daarna wel behoorlijk goed.</i>)
Literal remark	P2: Oh, that's really very clumsy of the Brinkers (<i>Oh, dat is echt heel klunzig van die Brinkers</i>)	P2: Oh, that's really very handy of the Brinkers (<i>Oh, dat is echt heel handig van die Brinkers</i>)
Ironic remark	P2: Oh, that's really very handy of the Brinkers (<i>Oh, dat is echt heel handig van die Brinkers</i>)	P2: Oh, that's really very clumsy of the Brinkers (<i>Oh, dat is echt heel klunzig van die Brinkers</i>)
Context	P2: But, how we can best deal with this bustle...? P3: That's why I really liked at that meeting. You were not there, were you? P1: No, I had a day off then. P3: Well, at that meeting, everyone could express their uncertainties or questions about the policies of the managing board. Why, for instance, they chose to share the work in this manner. The questions of the Brinkers... (P2: <i>Maar hoe we nou het beste met die drukte kunnen omgaan ...?</i> P3: <i>Daarom vond ik die meeting ook erg fijn. Daar was jij niet bij, toch?</i> P1: <i>Nee, ik was toen vrij.</i> P3: <i>Nou, bij die meeting kon iedereen zijn onzekerheden of vragen over het beleid van de directie voorleggen. Waarom er bijvoorbeeld voor gekozen wordt het werk op deze manier in te delen. De vragen van de Brinkers...</i>)	
2 Behavior	... led to a lot of confusion. (<i>...leidden tot een boel verwarring</i>)	... led to a lot of clarity. (<i>...leidden tot een boel duidelijkheid</i>)
Literal remark	P1: Right, Brinkers, for all your stupid questions. (<i>Juist, Brinkers, voor al uw domme vragen</i>)	P1: Right, Brinkers, for all your smart questions. (<i>Juist, Brinkers, voor al uw slimme vragen</i>)
Ironic remark	P1: Right, Brinkers, for all your smart questions. (<i>Juist, Brinkers, voor al uw slimme vragen</i>)	P1: Right, Brinkers, for all your stupid questions. (<i>Juist, Brinkers, voor al uw domme vragen</i>)
Context	P2: Oh yeah, and then, later in that meeting, we could offer suggestions about how we see the work in the future. How things can potentially be done differently... (P2: <i>Oh ja. En toen konden we later in die meeting nog suggesties doen over hoe wij het werk in de toekomst zien. Hoe het eventueel anders kan...</i>)	
3 Behavior	All proposals of the Brinkers were then rejected. (<i>Alle voorstellen van de Brinkers werden toen verworpen</i>)	All proposals of the Brinkers were then accepted. (<i>Alle voorstellen van de Brinkers werden toen aangenomen</i>)

	Literal remark	P3: Gee, those were worthless suggestions. (<i>Jeetje, dat waren waardeloze suggesties</i>)	P3: Gee, those were valuable suggestions. (<i>Jeetje, dat waren waardevolle suggesties</i>)
	Ironic remark	P3: Gee, those were valuable suggestions. (<i>Jeetje, dat waren waardevolle suggesties</i>)	P3: Gee, those were worthless suggestions. (<i>Jeetje, dat waren waardeloze suggesties</i>)
	Context	P3: The tomato soup of the cafeteria is pretty ok today! P1: Well, rather you than me. I am having a salad today. Something different. Hey, by the way, did you also hear about the presentation the Brinkers gave?... (<i>P3: Die tomatensoep van de kantine is trouwens best te doen, vandaag! P1: Nou, jij liever dan ik. Ik heb vandaag een salade. Weer eens iets anders. He, trouwens, heb je ook gehoord van die presentatie die de Brinkers hadden gegeven?...</i>)	
4	Behavior	They lost that client. (<i>Ze hebben die klant verloren.</i>)	They gained that client (<i>Ze hebben die klant binnengehaald.</i>)
	Literal remark	P3: Well, these Brinkers are lousy presenters. (<i>Nou, die Brinkers kunnen belabberd presenteren</i>)	P3: Well, these Brinkers are excellent presenters. (<i>Nou, die Brinkers kunnen uitstekend presenteren.</i>)
	Ironic remark	P3: Well, these Brinkers are excellent presenters. (<i>Nou, die Brinkers kunnen uitstekend presenteren.</i>)	P3: Well, these Brinkers are lousy presenters. (<i>Nou, die Brinkers kunnen belabberd presenteren</i>)
	Context	P2: Did you already have a look at our new company website? P3: No, I didn't have the chance yet. Why? P2: Well, the Brinkers also made the content and the design of the new website. They delivered that to the communication department. Communication posted it online... (<i>P2: Heb jij onze nieuwe website eigenlijk al bekeken? P3: Nee, ik heb er nog geen kans toe gehad. Hoezo? P2: Nou, de Brinkers hebben ook de inhoud en het ontwerp voor die nieuwe website gemaakt. Dat hebben ze aan de communicatieafdeling aangeleverd. Communicatie heeft het ...</i>)	
5	Behavior	...after lots of modifications. (<i>na veel aanpassingen online gezet.</i>)	... without any modifications. (<i>zonder aanpassingen online gezet.</i>)
	Literal remark	P1: Gosh, that was really poor work of the Brinkers. (<i>Goh, dat was echt zwak werk van de Brinkers</i>)	P1: Gosh, that was really decent work of the Brinkers. (<i>Goh, dat was echt degelijk werk van de Brinkers</i>)
	Ironic remark	P1: Gosh, that was really decent work of the Brinkers. (<i>Goh, dat was echt degelijk werk van de Brinkers</i>)	P1: Gosh, that was really poor work of the Brinkers. (<i>Goh, dat was echt zwak werk van de Brinkers</i>)
	Context	P2: Now that we're talking about the Brinkers; didn't they have to write the annual review this year? With the numbers and all? And after completion, it was sent to the finance department. I learned from the financial controller... (<i>P2: Nu we het toch over de Brinkers hebben; ze moesten dit jaar het jaaroverzicht schrijven? Met al die cijfers en zo? En als het klaar was, mocht het dan naar de boekhouder. Ik begreep van de boekhouder ...</i>)	
6	Behavior	...that he still had a lot of work with it. (<i>...dat hij er daarna nog erg veel aan moest doen</i>)	...that he had very little left to do with it. (<i>...dat hij er daarna nog erg weinig aan hoefde te doen</i>)
	Literal remark	P1: Gee, then they delivered awful work. (<i>Jee, dan hebben ze erbarmelijk werk geleverd</i>)	P1: Gee, then they delivered useful work. (<i>Jee, dan hebben ze bruikbaar werk geleverd</i>)

	Ironic remark	P1: Gee, then they delivered useful work. (<i>Jee, dan hebben ze bruikbaar werk geleverd</i>)	P1: Gee, then they delivered awful work. (<i>Jee, dan hebben ze erbarmelijk werk geleverd</i>)
	Context	(P1: How long do we have left? P2: Eeuhm ... oh, still 5 minutes. P1: Nice. I always like to sit for a while after eating. Doing nothing. P3: Did I already tell you about the project I have to do? P1: Yes. Right? That you have to adapt all folders to the current numbers? P3: Yeah, that is it. I called one of the Brinkers the other day, because I knew she was responsible for this project last year. I thought it might be handy to ask her for some tips and tricks. She then explained some things to me... (<i>P1: Hoe lang hebben we nog? P2: Eeuhm ... oh, nog 5 minuten. P1: Fijn. Ik vind het altijd lekker om na het eten nog even te zitten. Niets doen. P3: Had ik jullie trouwens al verteld van dat project dat ik moet gaan doen? P1: Ja. Toch? Dat je alle folders moet aanpassen aan de huidige cijfers? P3: Ja, dat ja. Ik belde laatst iemand van de Brinkers, omdat ik wist dat zij dit project vorig jaar heeft gedaan. Ik dacht dat het misschien wel handig was om haar om tips en trucs te vragen. Ze heeft me toen het een en ander uitgelegd...</i>)	
7	Behavior	After which I still had a lot to figure out before I could even start. (<i>Ik moest daarna alsnog veel uitzoeken voordat ik aan de slag kon.</i>)	After which I could start with hardly anything left to figure out. (<i>Ik kon daarna zonder veel uit te zoeken aan de slag.</i>)
	Literal remark	P2: Wow, that was a really bad explanation of that Brinker. (<i>Wow, dat was een hele slechte toelichting van die Brinker.</i>)	P2: Wow, that was a really good explanation of that Brinker. (<i>Wow, dat was een hele goede toelichting van die Brinker</i>)
	Ironic remark	2: Wow, that was a really good explanation of that Brinker. (<i>Wow, dat was een hele goede toelichting van die Brinker</i>)	P2: Wow, that was a really bad explanation of that Brinker. (<i>Wow, dat was een hele slechte toelichting van die Brinker.</i>)
	Context	P1: Adapting such a folder isn't always easy. Lots of searching and fine print. One is better in it than the other. P2: Yeah, that's true. P1: The other day, the Brinkers for instance had to re-write an external folder. There was some client who had asked that through the boss. So, the Brinkers then re-wrote this folder... (<i>P1: Zo'n folder aanpassen is ook niet altijd makkelijk. Veel zoekwerk en kleine lettertjes. De een is er beter is dan de ander. P2: Ja, dat is waar. P1: Laatst moesten de Brinkers bijvoorbeeld een externe folder herschrijven. Er was een of andere opdrachtgever die dat had gevraagd via de baas. En de Brinkers gingen die folder dus herschrijven...</i>)	
8	Behavior	The director first had to have it adjusted before he could forward it to the client. (<i>De directeur moest hem eerst nog laten aanpassen en kon hem toen pas doorsturen naar de opdrachtgever</i>)	The director could forward it to the client without any adjustments. (<i>De directeur kon hem zonder aanpassen doorsturen naar de opdrachtgever..</i>)
	Literal remark	P3: Hmm, Brinkers are lousy text writers (<i>Hmm, Brinkers zijn beroerde tekstschrijvers</i>)	P3: Hmm, Brinkers are capable text writers (<i>Hmm, Brinkers zijn capabele tekstschrijvers</i>)
	Ironic remark	P3: Hmm, Brinkers are capable text writers (<i>Hmm, Brinkers zijn capabele tekstschrijvers</i>)	P3: Hmm, Brinkers are lousy text writers (<i>Hmm, Brinkers zijn beroerde tekstschrijvers</i>)
	Context	P1: How long do we have left? P2: Hello, buy a watch! Or check your phone. We are going back to work later, because we had five minutes left. P1: Good point. Oh! Talking about point! I finally read that book by Dan Brown: Deception Point. Do you remember that you recommended it to me? P3: Yes! And? Did you like it? P1: Yes, pretty good. But I believe I like the Da Vinci Code better. P3: Oh, I have to think about those books. It's been a while since I read them P2: And five minutes have passed a long time ago now. Shall we go back to work? P3: Yes, let's go! (<i>P1: Hoe lang hebben we</i>	

nu nog? P2: Hallo, koop eens een horloge! Of kijk op je telefoon. We gaan straks weer aan de slag, want net hadden we nog 5 minuten. P1: Goed punt. Oh! Over punt gesproken! Ik heb eindelijk dat boek van Dan Brown gelezen. Deception Point. Dat had jij toch aangeraden? P3: Ja! En? Hoe vond je het? P1: Ja, wel leuk. Maar ik geloof dat ik de Da Vinci Code beter vind. P3: Oh, daar moet ik even over nadenken. Het is alweer zo lang geleden dat ik ze heb gelezen. P2: En die vijf minuten zijn inmiddels ook al lang geleden. Zullen we? P3: Ja, aan de arbeid!)

Note. Text was spoken by three persons (P1, P2, P3). Dutch texts (in italics) were used in the Study. English translations in plain text.

Appendix E. Analyses on participants' own perceived essentialism items (Experiment 1).

In Experiment 1, we measured participants' own perceived essentialism of positive and negative behaviors. Because the five essentialism items did not form a reliable scale, we conducted a 3 (Communication Pattern condition) X 2 (Behavioral valence: positive, negative) MANOVA with the five separate essentialism items as dependent variables, and with repeated measures on behavioral valence. We did not observe multivariate effects of communication pattern condition on participants own perceived essentialism (communication pattern main effect Wilks' $\Lambda = .94$, $F(10,340)=1.07$, $p=.38$, $\eta_p^2=.03$; interaction Wilks' $\Lambda = .91$, $F(10,340)=1.73$, $p=.07$, $\eta_p^2=.05$).

Follow-up univariate repeated measures ANOVAs on the separate items, revealed significant interactions for Expectedness of behavior, $F(2,174)=3.11$, $p=.047$, $\eta_p^2=.04$, repetition likelihood, $F(2,174)=5.84$, $p=.004$, $\eta_p^2=.06$, and generalizeability (to other sit; $F(2,174)=4.75$, $p=.01$, $\eta_p^2=.05$). No significant interaction was observed for attribution (sit-pers; $F<1$) and typicality of behavior ($F(2,174)=2.18$, $p=.12$, $\eta_p^2=.02$). Main effects of Behavioral valence were only observed on repetition likelihood, $F(1,174)=33.14$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.16$, generalizeability, $F(1,174)=10.46$, $p=.001$, $\eta_p^2=.06$, and not on expectedness ($F< 1$), attribution ($F< 1.1$), and typicality ($F< 1$).

No main effects for Communication pattern were observed. The cell means suggest that ironic remarks about negative behaviors (thus introducing positive evaluations) unexpectedly induce recipients to report more negative expectations (i.e., negative behaviors are judged as more essential, while positive behaviors are less essential). However, separate Oneway ANOVAs for perceived essentialism measures about positive and negative behavior do not reveal any significant effects for positive behaviors, and only two for negative behaviors (expectedness and typicality; see Table Appendix E).

Table Appendix E. Means (and standard deviations) of participants' own perceived essentialism of positive and negative behaviors in the three communication pattern conditions (Experiment 1).

Dependent variable	Communication pattern condition		
	all literal (<i>n</i> = 56)	ironic about positive behavior (<i>n</i> = 54)	ironic about negative behavior (<i>n</i> = 67)
Participants' own perceived essentialism of positive behaviors			
<i>Expectedness</i>	4.26 _a (0.99)	4.31 _a (1.39)	3.94 _a (1.23)
<i>Repetition likelihood</i>	74.15 _a (18.67)	75.78 _a (15.99)	68.69 _a (18.36)
<i>Attribution</i>	4.83 _a (1.05)	4.93 _a (1.08)	4.75 _a (1.07)
<i>Typicality</i>	4.05 _a (0.80)	3.96 _a (1.14)	3.98 _a (1.03)
<i>Generalizeability</i>	5.18 _a (0.88)	5.27 _a (1.03)	4.90 _a (1.06)
Participants' own perceived essentialism of negative behaviors			
<i>Expectedness</i>	3.88 _a (0.82)	4.19 _{ab} (1.18)	4.45 _b (1.19)
<i>Repetition likelihood</i>	64.45 _a (18.51)	60.76 _a (17.61)	66.44 _a (17.59)
<i>Attribution</i>	4.97 _a (1.03)	4.96 _a (1.12)	4.87 _a (1.14)
<i>Typicality</i>	3.69 _a (0.92)	3.87 _{ab} (1.33)	4.22 _b (1.13)
<i>Generalizeability</i>	4.88 _a (1.00)	4.72 _a (0.98)	4.95 _a (1.25)

Note. Higher numbers indicate a higher score on the respective construct; for attribution low score indicate situational-, high scores dispositional attribution. Means with a different subscript (a,b) in rows differ significantly according to Tukey posthoc tests ($p < .05$).

Appendix F. Additional analyses on the speaker's essentialism items (Experiment 2).

In Experiment 2, we measured participants' perception of the speaker's essentialism of positive and negative behaviors. The main article reports analysis on the speaker's essentialism scale. In experiment 1 we conducted a multivariate ANOVA because the essentialism items (focusing on participants' own perceived essentialism) did not form a reliable scale (see Appendix E). For consistency reasons we also conducted the multivariate analysis on the individual items in addition to the analysis on the speaker's essentialism scale.

We conducted a 3 (Communication Pattern condition) X 2 (Behavioral valence: positive, negative) ANOVAs with the five separate essentialism items as dependent variables, and with repeated measures on behavioral valence. We observed multivariate effects of communication pattern condition on speakers' essentialism (communication pattern main effect Wilks' $\Lambda = .80$, $F(10,182) = 2.16$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$; interaction Wilks' $\Lambda = .81$, $F(10,182) = 1.99$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$).

Subsequent univariate repeated measures ANOVAs revealed that the predicted interaction was significant for all five items: Expectedness of behavior, $F(2,95) = 6.69$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$; repetition likelihood, $F(2,95) = 7.04$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$; attribution, $F(2,95) = 7.51$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$; typicality of behavior, $F(2,95) = 7.32$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$, and generalizeability (to other situations), $F(2,95) = 5.82$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$.

Separate ANOVAs for perceived essentialism measures of positive behavior show significant effects for expectedness of positive behavior, $F(2,95) = 5.35$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$, but not for the other four measures (F s: 1.34 – 2.11). For negative behavior, however, all perceived essentialism measures show significant effects of communication pattern in line with the Irony Bias: Expectedness of behavior, $F(2,95) = 4.30$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$; repetition likelihood, $F(2,95) = 4.65$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$; attribution, $F(2,95) = 10.61$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$; typicality of behavior, $F(2,95) = 5.94$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$; and generalizeability, $F(2,95) = 5.14$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. See the Table below for means and cell comparisons.

Table Appendix F. Means (and standard deviations) of perceived essentialism in speakers of positive and negative behaviors in the three communication pattern conditions (Experiment 2).

Dependent variable	Communication pattern condition		
	all literal (<i>n</i> = 39)	ironic about positive behavior (<i>n</i> = 28)	ironic about negative behavior (<i>n</i> = 31)
Perceived essentialism in speakers of positive behaviors			
<i>Expectedness</i>	4.38 _{ab} (1.49)	3.71 _a (1.71)	4.98 _b (1.25)
<i>Repetition likelihood</i>	65.25 _a (20.45)	59.05 _a (24.23)	70.29 _a (18.39)
<i>Attribution</i>	4.75 _a (1.18)	4.31 _a (1.38)	4.41 _a (1.27)
<i>Typicality</i>	4.68 _a (1.19)	4.38 _a (1.41)	5.03 _a (1.27)
<i>Generalizeability</i>	4.76 _a (1.03)	4.53 _a (1.45)	5.04 _a (1.18)
Perceived essentialism in speakers of negative behaviors			
<i>Expectedness</i>	4.79 _{ab} (1.32)	5.38 _a (1.66)	4.31 _b (1.23)
<i>Repetition likelihood</i>	66.98 _{ab} (18.19)	72.43 _a (21.80)	57.33 _b (18.53)
<i>Attribution</i>	4.93 _a (1.17)	5.64 _a (1.35)	4.19 _b (1.13)
<i>Typicality</i>	4.82 _{ab} (1.31)	5.57 _a (1.50)	4.36 _b (1.28)
<i>Generalizeability</i>	4.96 _{ab} (1.16)	5.54 _a (1.49)	4.48 _b (1.18)

Note. Higher numbers indicate a higher score on the respective construct; for attribution low score indicate situational-, high scores dispositional attribution. Means with a different subscript (a,b) in rows differ significantly according to Tukey posthoc tests ($p < .05$).