Appendix

**Complete list of measures and items of the main study**

| **Empathy-State (Tapus et al., 2007): 5-point Likert scale, from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’** | |
| --- | --- |
| 1.Pity for CA | I felt sorry for the conversational assistant.  I hoped that this treatment would stop soon.  I do not understand how people can treat a conversational assistant like this.  Watching the conversational assistant in this situation made me angry.  I shared the conversational assistant’s happiness. (reverse-coded). |
| 2.Empathy with CA | I sympathized with the conversational assistant’s situation.  The conversational agent did not feel anything. (reverse-coded)  Seeing the conversational assistant in this situation did not affect me. (reverse-coded)  I felt for the conversational assistant.  I did not mind what happened to the conversational assistant at all. (reverse-coded)  I kept a distance from the incidents in the video. (reverse-coded)  I was very close to the incidents in the video. |

| **Empathy-Trait (Paulus, 2009): 5-point Likert scale, (1) never (2) rarely (3) sometimes (4) often (5) always** |
| --- |
| I have warm feelings for people, who are less well off than I am.  I can imagine a person’s feelings in a novel very well.  In emergency situations, I feel anxious and uncomfortable.  In an argument, I try to understand both sides before I make a decision.  When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel I must protect him/her.  In a very emotional situation, I feel helpless.  After watching a film, I feel like I am one of the people in that film.  Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.  Things touch me very much, even if I only observe them.  I believe every problem has two sides and therefore I try to consider both.  I would describe myself as a rather soft-hearted person.  When I watch a good movie, I can easily put myself in the main character's place.  In delicate situations I tend to lose control over myself.  If I find someone else's behavior strange, I will try to put myself in their shoes.  When I read an interesting story or a good book, I will try to imagine how I would feel if the events happened to me.  Before I criticize someone, I try to imagine how things would look from his/her point of view. |

| **Friendliness and Competence (Carolus et al., 2018): 5-point Likert, from ‘do not agree at all’ to ‘totally agree’** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Friendliness:** likeable, friendly, warm, enjoyable, fun, polite | **Competence:** competent, informative, helpful, analytical, knowledgeable, useful |

**Complete list of measures and items of the pretest**

| **User Experience Questionnaire (Schrepp et al., 2014): 7-point semantic differential** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attractiveness:** annoying-enjoyable, good-bad, unlikable-pleasing, unpleasant-pleasant, attractive- unattractive, friendly-unfriendly | **Perspicuity**:not understandable-understandable, easy to learn-difficult to learn, complicated-easy, clear-confusing | **Efficiency**:fast-slow, inefficient-efficient, impractical-practical, organized-cluttered |

| **General positivity towards the computer (Johnson et al., 2004): 9-point semantic differential** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Original Items:** bad-good, unhappy-happy, tense-relaxed, unimportant-important, weak-powerful, submissive- dominant, unhelpful-helpful, unintelligent-Intelligent, uninsightful-insightful | **Additional items:** impolite-polite, aggressive-tame, pitiable-admirable, violent-peaceful, objective-unobjective |