Understanding Non-normative Civil Resistance Under Repression:

Evidence from Hong Kong and Chile

Supplemental Material

Table of content

Appendix A:

Deviations from preregistrations

1. We were presented with the opportunity to collect data during the 2019, December 8 mass protest in Hong Kong very shortly before the protest. While we did preregister the study, we realized afterwards that many of the hypotheses and analytical plans were not ideal and had to be improved. Therefore, we only used the preregistration as a general guideline for the data analyses, and treated the study as *fully exploratory*. After completing the analyses of the Hong Kong dataset, we used the analyses and results as a basis to preregister the study in Chile, which served as a *confirmatory replication* of Study 1. For full disclosure, we provide the links to both preregistrations, while acknowledging the exploratory nature of Study 1 and the confirmatory nature of Study 2. Therefore, below we focus the discussion on deviations from the preregistration for Study 2.
2. In Study 2, we preregistered a set of hypotheses regarding general movement participation, in addition to non-normative (referred to as "radical" in the preregistration) participation. In the present manuscript, we focus on non-normative resistance. Therefore, we do not report results regarding general movement participation in the current paper.
3. In addition to the three hypotheses regarding the potential motivations for non-normative resistance, as reported here, in Study 2, we also tested a fourth hypothesis – namely, that engagement in non-normative resistance might be driven by demand for retributive justice in response to perceived police violence. Movement participants, however, scored extremely high on the items measuring retributive justice and there was little variance in the data. The lack of variance rendered statistical hypothesis testing inappropriate. Since we were unable to test this hypothesis with the current data, we dropped it from the manuscript.
4. To test the "moralization" hypothesis, we additionally hypothesized and tested whether holding strong moral convictions (Skitka, 2012; Skitka & Houston, 2001) with respect to

the goals of the movement (e.g., social equality, democracy) would motivate support for extreme measures to achieve these goals. While we found support for this idea, we felt that reporting this finding in the main manuscript would not add substantially to the "moralization" hypothesis. Moreover, we did not expect experience of police violence to predict moral conviction about social equality because general moral principles are considered rather stable and resistant to change (Skitka et al., 2005), and because social equality and police violence are two distinct issues. This additional variable therefore did not fit into the hypothesized mediational model to address the second research question. For these reasons, we did not report the results of moral conviction.

5. Saab et al. (2016) examined the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis by testing the interaction between efficacy of aggressive actions and efficacy of non-aggressive actions in predicting tendencies toward aggression. They argued that when perceived efficacy of aggressive actions is low, a negative relationship between efficacy of non-aggressive actions and tendencies toward aggression would reflect a "nothing-to-lose" mindset. We preregistered this interaction effect as additional evidence for the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis. However, this analytical approach differs considerably from our general approach to testing the other two hypotheses. Moreover, the interaction effect can only be tested with regard to future non-normative intentions and not regarding past engagement in non-normative resistance. For these reasons, we believed that reporting the results in the manuscript would cause more distraction and confusion rather than clarity regarding the hypothesis for the readers. In summary, we found a significant interaction effect of perceived political efficacy of normative and non-normative actions, in line with the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis in Study 1. However, we did not find a significant interaction for solidarity/empowerment efficacy in Study 1. In Study 2, we did not find a significant interaction effect. Thus, the overall pattern did not provide consistent evidence for the

"nothing-to-lose" hypothesis, resonating with the general conclusion drawn from our own analytical approaches.

6. We did not preregister the full mediational model. We did preregister the indirect effects of experiencing police violence on willingness to engage in non-normative protests via "radicalizing" motivations. In the full model, we added risk appraisals as parallel mediators. This addition is consistent with our preregistered hypotheses regarding the role of risk appraisals in engagement in non-normative resistance.
7. In addition to the analyses reported in the manuscript, we also preregistered and conducted logistic regressions using past engagement in non-normative actions as an outcome variable, and the different motivations and risk appraisals as predictors. This analytical approach was meant to test the unique relationship between each predictor and actual engagement in non-normative resistance. The results were highly consistent with the main patterns of the GLMs and multiple regressions with future non-normative action intentions as the outcome. To avoid redundancy, we do not report the logistic regressions in the manuscript.

Appendix B:

Study procedures

Study 1. Two bilingual researchers translated the survey from English into Cantonese, and resolved any differences between them. Four research assistants went to the protest sites and handed out leaflets with a QR code for our online survey. The survey link was deactivated 24 hours after the start of the data collection so that most of the respondents were those who actively took part in the protest. To ensure voluntary participation in this study, respondents did not receive any compensation or incentive for completing the survey.

***Study 2*.** We adopted a committee approach to translating the survey from English into Spanish. Among four bilingual committee members, one translated the survey, and three reviewed the translation and resolved any differences among them. We recruited participants using two different procedures. First, we collected a student sample from five schools in a Chilean private university. These schools account for a half of the schools in the university and cover degrees from different fields. Second, we recruited a community sample using a snowball or referral procedure. We selected ten seeds based on one of the researchers' personal contacts. The ten seeds were asked to send the link with the survey to at least five other people whom they thought might be interested in participating in the study, and were instructed to recruit participants from different backgrounds. At the end of the survey completed by this second sample, the instruction regarding survey distribution was repeated. Data collection via both procedures continued until we reached the preregistered sample size.

Appendix C:

Additional sample characteristics

Study 1. The majority of the participants (75%) had completed higher education. About half of the participants (51%) self-identified as belonging to the middle class, and 43% identified as belonging to the lower class. Nearly all participants identified with a pro-democracy or pro-Hong Kong political party (Table S1). Whereas only six respondents had not taken part in any prior protest, 89 had participated in 1-3 protests, 168 in 4-6 protests, 143 in 7-10 protests, and 210 in 11 or more protests.

Table S1.

Political Orientation by Group Membership in Study 1.

Political orientation	**Non-normative protesters (%; n = 396)**	**Normative protesters (%; n = 220)**
Pro-establishment	0	0
Centrists	0	.47
Moderate democrats	23.06	54.98
Radical democrats	15.80	11.37
Localists	9.84	4.74
Self-determination	31.87	12.32
Hong Kong Independence	8.81	2.84
Other	1.30	1.90
No affiliation	3.11	6.16
Don't know	6.22	5.21
	100 (total)	100 (total)

Note. Participants indicated their political orientation by choosing one of the response options.

Study 2. In both the university and the community samples, the majority of the participants (> 85%) had pursued or completed higher education. The two samples were also comparable in terms of social class ($M_{community}$ = 5.35, $M_{university}$= 5.47; 1 = lowest class, 10 = highest class). Participants who had engaged in non-normative resistance were significantly more left-leaning than normative protesters and the inactive (Table S2). Among the participants, 202 had not taken part in any protest to support the movement in the past, 119 had taken part in 1-3 protests, 108 in 4-6 protests, 71 in 7-10 protests, and 159 in 11 or more protests.

Table S2.

Political Orientation by Group Membership in Study 2.

	Non-normative protesters	**Normative protesters**	**The inactive**
		Mean (*SD*)	
Political orientation	3.07 (1.74)[a]	4.12 (1.97)[b]	7.25 (2.05)[c]

Note. Political orientation was measured by a one-item scale (1 = more left, 10 = more right). Different superscript letters indicate statistical significance at $p < .05$.

Appendix D:

List of normative and non-normative actions

Study 1:

Normative actions

1. Chorusing “Glory to Hong Kong” in public space
2. Shouting slogans out of the window at home
3. Forming human chains
4. Deliberately shopping in stores that support the movement
5. Boycotting stores that support the government
6. Donating to movement organizations on-site
7. Online donation to crowdfunding webpage
8. Donating material goods other than money
9. Delivering material goods on-site
10. Voicing opinion on the “Lennon Wall”
11. Sharing news and messages that support the movement
12. Voicing pro-movement opinion in online platform
13. Signing online petition that concerns the movement

Non-normative actions

1. Protesting in front of police stations
2. Obstructing government operations and public transportation
3. Jumping subway gates
4. Blocking police advancement
5. Attacking pro-government businesses
6. Committing vigilante violence against pro-government individuals

Study 2:

Normative actions

1. Expressing opinions in support of the movement in social media
2. Sharing news and messages that support the movement in social media
3. Participating in mass protests
4. Participating in casseroles (i.e., hitting pots)
5. Participating in cultural activities (e.g., concerts) in support of the movement
6. Singing "Chile woke up" in the streets or other public space
7. Singing songs from the window of your home
8. Forming a human chain
9. Donating, in person, to organizations that participate in the social movement
10. Donating, through a website, to organizations that participate in the social movement
11. Donating materials goods to organizations that participate in the social movement
12. Participating in the distribution of material goods at the site of the events
13. Signing an online petition related to the movement

Non-normative actions

1. Occupying or taking over streets/buildings to disrupt government institutions and public transportation
2. Participating in barricades
3. Jumping subway gates
4. Remaining on the front line of the protests and stopping the advance of the Carabineros or Special Forces
5. Protesting outside a police station
6. Participating in fires on private property (e.g., pharmacies, supermarkets)
7. Participating in the plundering of private property (e.g., pharmacies, supermarkets)

Appendix E:

Study 2 Materials

Because we did not specifically target active movement participants in this study, we also included items capturing anti-movement sentiments to make the survey appear more balanced. Participants' responses to these items were not included in the current analyses.

Frequency of Past Participation was measured with the same scale as in Study 1. The response options were also in line with the actual number of large-scale protests that had occurred during the movement at the time of data collection.

Engagement in Different Acts of Resistance. Participants indicated whether they had engaged in a list of 19 normative and non-normative activities during the movement. The activities were very similar to those in Study 1, but some were modified to fit the Chilean context. Participants also had the option to indicate any action that they had engaged in but was not included in the list. Two independent coders from Chile classified these different actions into normative and non-normative actions (See Appendix C). There were no cases of disagreement between the two coders.

Emotions Experienced During Participation. Emotions were measured with the same scales as in Study 1. We created two composite scores for positive (α = .74) and negative (α = .82) emotions, respectively.

Moralization of Non-normative Resistance. Moral judgment (i.e., perceived righteousness and necessity) of non-normative resistance (r= .87) and demonization of the police (r= .81) were measured with the same scales as in Study 1.

Efficacy of Non-normative and Normative Resistance. Efficacy was measured with the same scales as in Study 1. Different from Study 1, the scree plots of EFAs revealed a one-factor solution for each type of protest tactics, suggesting that the Chilean participants did not distinguish between efficacies for achieving different goals. Thus, we combined the efficacy

items to create two composite scores, capturing perceived general efficacy of normative resistance (α = .89) and non-normative resistance (α = .95), respectively.

Experience of Police Violence. In addition to the three ways that people could have experienced police violence (i.e., "experienced police violence directly;" "witnessed police violence in person;" "fled from the police to avoid being attacked."), participants also indicated whether they had "lost an eye" or "witnessed someone losing an eye." This change was made because the Chilean protests were characterized by widespread eye injuries as a result of riot police's use of rubber bullets and tear gas. A total score was created to reflect the overall experience of police violence (0 = no experience; 5 = experienced in all five ways).

Perceived likelihood of risks (α = .86), willingness to bear risks (α = .90), fear of participation (r= .66), and willingness to engage in future non-normative actions (α = .84) were all measured with the same scales as in Study 1.

Appendix F:

Bivariate Correlations

Table S3.

Bivariate Correlations in Study 1.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1.	Identification with "Militant" camp															
2.	Identification with peaceful camp	-.34***														
3.	Moral judgment of NNR	.23***	-.10*													
4.	Demonization of police	.11**	.04	.41***												
5.	Hope	.12**	.06	.10*	.06											
6.	Despair	-.03	-.02	.09*	.07	-.34***										
7.	Political efficacy of NNR	.22***	-.04	.39***	.26	.16***	.01									
8.	Solidarity & empowerment efficacy of NNR	.20***	-.04	.51***	.29	.21***	.002	.59***								

9.	Political efficacy of NR	.05	.06	.003	.09*	.20***	-.17***	.29***	.25***							
10.	Solidarity & empowerment efficacy of NR	.02	.18***	.08	.10*	.23***	-.13**	.23***	.31***	.49***						
11.	Experience of police violence	.36***	-.14***	.31***	.18***	.02	.05	.23***	.22***	.05	.03					
12.	Likelihood of risks	.14***	-.02	.23***	.18***	-.02	.18***	.23***	.27***	.05	-.01	.19***				
13.	Willingness to bear risks	.28***	-.13**	.23***	.16***	.07	.07	.19***	.25***	-.02	.08*	.29***	.19***			
14.	Fear of participation	-.11**	.05	-.21	-.16***	-.16***	.11**	-.12**	-.14***	-.02	-.08*	-.19***	.01	-.25***		
15.	Willingness to engage in NNR	.47***	-.32***	.47***	.23***	.14***	.08*	.39***	.41***	.05	-.001	.40***	.29***	.48***	-.29***	
16.	Willingness to engage in NR	.06	.09*	.35***	.21***	.07	.08*	.28***	.29***	.02	.14***	.17***	.11***	.11**	-.13***	.20***

Note. NNR: non-normative resistance, NR: normative resistance; * indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S4.

Bivariate Correlations in Study 2.

		1	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
1.	Moral judgment of NNR											
2.	Demonization of police	.73***										
3.	Hope	.35***	.32									
4.	Despair	.16***	.16***	.03								
5.	Efficacy of NNR	.78***	.76***	.41***	.12**							
6.	Efficacy of NR	.24***	.37***	.19***	.004	.34***						
7.	Experience of police violence	.69***	.71***	.28***	.19***	.69***	.31***					
8.	Likelihood of risks	.50***	.63***	.24***	.19***	.54***	.30***	.54**				
9.	Willingness to bear risks	.48***	.42***	.22***	.10*	.46***	.22**	.48***	.43***			
10.	Fear of participation	-.01	.11**	-.09*	.13**	.05	.11**	-.02	.23***	-.06		
11.	Willingness to engage in NNR	.71***	.60***	.30***	.16***	.64***	.19***	.65***	.47***	.55***	-.07	
12.	Willingness to engage in NR	.74***	.78***	.46***	.09*	.74***	.43***	.73***	.56***	.48***	.03	.65***

Note. NNR: non-normative resistance, NR: normative resistance; * indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Appendix G:

Additional Results for Efficacy of Normative and Non-normative Resistance

Study 1. The repeated-measure GLM also revealed a significant main effect of group membership on political efficacy, $F(1, 614) = 16.85$, $p < .001$, and on solidarity/empowerment efficacy, $F(1, 614) = 13.04$, $p < .001$. Non-normative protesters viewed both types of efficacy ($M_{\text{political}} = 4.89$, $M_{\text{solidarity/empowerment}} = 5.73$) as more efficacious than did normative protesters ($M_{\text{political}} = 4.47$, $M_{\text{solidarity/empowerment}} = 5.45$). The main effects of protest tactic were also significant, such that non-normative tactics ($M = 5.59$) were viewed as more politically efficacious than normative tactics ($M = 3.90$), $F(1, 614) = 477.87$, $p < .001$. Unlike political efficacy, however, non-normative tactics ($M = 5.59$) were viewed as *less* efficacious in terms of achieving solidarity and empowerment goals than normative tactics ($M = 5.68$), $F(1, 614) = 7.29$, $p = .007$.

Study 2. The repeated-measure GLM also revealed a significant main effects of group membership, $F(2, 656) = 349.24$, $p < .001$, and protest tactic, $F(2, 656) = 18.83$, $p < .001$. These main effects showed that non-normative protesters ($M = 5.05$) perceived higher efficacy than normative protesters ($M = 4.4$) and the inactive ($M = 2.14$). Further, normative tactics ($M = 4.25$) were viewed as slightly more efficacious than non-normative tactics ($M = 4.12$). To parallel Study 1, we conducted an analysis that included only active movement participants. This revealed that movement participants viewed non-normative tactics ($M = 4.86$) as somewhat more efficacious than normative tactics ($M = 4.64$), $F(1, 514) = 3.11$, $p = .078$. Even though this effect was not significant, it was in the same direction as in Study 1.

Appendix H:

Predicting willingness to engage in future non-normative actions

Given the relatively high correlations among some of the predictors (see Appendix F), we calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) to measure the amount of multicollinearity in all the multiple regressions reported below. The highest VIF value was 2.15, suggesting that multicollinearity was not a concern for our analyses (Myers, 1990).

Study 1

Moralization of Non-normative Resistance. In the multiple regression, controlling for frequency of past movement participation, perceived righteousness and necessity of non-normative actions positively predicted willingness to engage in future non-normative actions in support of the movement, $\beta = .43$, $p < .001$, whereas police demonization did not, $\beta = .04$, $p = .243$.

Hope and despair. Feelings of hope ($\beta = .18$, $p < .001$) and despair ($\beta = .13$, $p = .002$) both positively predicted willingness to engage in non-normative actions, thus providing mixed evidence for the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis.

Efficacy of Normative and Non-normative Resistance. In the multiple regression testing perceived political and solidarity/empowerment efficacy of normative and non-normative actions as simultaneous predictors, both perceived political efficacy and solidarity/empowerment efficacy of *non-normative* resistance uniquely positively predicted willingness to engage in future non-normative actions, $\beta s > .22$, $ps < .001$. Perceived solidarity/empowerment efficacy of *normative* resistance uniquely negatively predicted willingness to engage in non-normative actions, $\beta = -.14$, $p = .001$, whereas perceived political efficacy of *normative* resistance did not, $\beta = -.03$, $p = .464$.

Taken together, the multiple regression results supported the "moralization" hypothesis in terms of perceived righteousness of non-normative resistance. While police demonization did not uniquely predict future non-normative intentions, this was likely due to

its shared variance with perceived righteousness of non-normative resistance (r = .41). The results provided mixed evidence for the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis. Whereas perceived solidarity and empowerment (but not political) efficacy of normative resistance negatively predicted future non-normative intentions, feelings of hope and despair both positively predicted future non-normative intentions. The finding regarding emotions again suggests that it was heightened emotional investment in general, rather than despair in particular, that drove non-normative resistance. Finally, we obtained consistent evidence for the "strategic choice" hypothesis, such that both types of efficacy of non-normative resistance positively predicted non-normative action intentions.

Risk-related factors. The multiple regression where all risk-related variables were entered as simultaneous predictors (controlling for frequency of past participation) revealed that, as predicted, past experiences of police violence (β = .24), perceived likelihood of risks (β = .18), and willingness to bear risks (β = .34) all positively predicted willingness to engage in non-normative actions in the future, *ps* < .001. In contrast, fear of participation negatively predicted non-normative action intentions, β = -.15, p < .001.

Study 2

Moralization of Non-normative Resistance. In line with H1a and H1b, in the multiple regression analysis controlling for frequency of past movement participation, perceived righteousness and necessity of non-normative actions (β = .42) and police demonization (β = .11) both had unique positive relationships with future non-normative intentions, *ps* < .007.

Hope and Despair. Inconsistent with the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis, hope positively predicted willingness to engage in non-normative actions (β = .14, p < .001), whereas despair did not (β = .08, p = .136).

Efficacy of Normative and Non-normative Resistance. Willingness to engage in future non-normative actions was uniquely positively predicted by perceived efficacy of non-

normative resistance, β = .39, $p < .001$, but not by perceived efficacy of normative resistance, β = -.04, $p = .122$. These findings lent additional support for the "strategic choice" hypothesis, but not the "nothing-to-lose" hypothesis.

***Risk-related factors*.** As hypothesized, past experiences of police violence (β = .27), perceived likelihood of risks (β = .12), and willingness to bear risks (β = .21) all uniquely positively predicted willingness to engage in non-normative actions in the future, $ps < .001$. In this context, fear of participation, however, did not significantly predict non-normative action intentions, β = -.04, $p = .194$.

Overall, these results supported our hypotheses regarding how experience of repression and perceptions of risks may play a role in "radicalization," with the exception that the relationship between fear and future willingness to engage in non-normative actions was not significant.

Appendix I:

Positive and negative emotions

Study 1. An exploratory factor analysis (principal axis factoring with an oblique rotation) revealed a two-factor solution (based on the scree plot) for emotions experienced during movement participation. Positive emotions loaded onto one factor, whereas negative emotions loaded onto the other. A further examination of the negative emotions showed that despair, sadness, disappointment, and fear loaded onto one factor, reflecting primarily avoidance motivation, whereas anger, hatred, and outrage loaded onto the second factor, reflecting approach motivation. Contempt did not load highly onto either factor. We created three composite scores for emotions, including positive emotions ($\alpha = .63$), avoidance-oriented negative emotions ($\alpha = .70$), and approach-oriented negative emotions ($\alpha = .68$), excluding contempt.

Compared to normative protesters, non-normative protesters reported to have experienced significantly more intense positive emotions, as well as avoidance- and approach-oriented negative emotions (Table S5). In the multiple regression, all three emotion variables were entered as predictors and frequency of past movement participation as a covariate. Both positive and approach-oriented negative emotions predicted stronger willingness to engage in future non-normative resistance, $\beta s > .12$, $ps < .01$, whereas avoidance-oriented negative emotions did not, $\beta = .05$, $p = .23$.

To test whether these emotions mediated the relationship between exposure to police violence and willingness to engage in future non-normative resistance, we conducted an indirect effect analysis using Process (Model 4). Past experiences of police violence were entered as the IV, positive emotions, approach-oriented negative emotions, and avoidance-oriented negative emotions as parallel mediators, and willingness to engage in future non-normative actions as the DV, with frequency of past participation as a covariate. Past experiences of police violence predicted stronger intention to engage in future non-normative

resistance via positive emotions (*b* = .04, LCI = .01, UCI = .07), but not approach-oriented negative emotions (*b* = .02, LCI = -.004, UCI = .06) or avoidance-oriented negative emotions (*b* = .01, LCI = -.005, UCI = .03).

Table S5.

Means and Standard Deviations by Group Membership for Positive Emotions, and Avoidance-and Approach-Oriented Negative Emotions (Study 1).

	Mean (SD)		*F*	*p*	Partial eta-squared (LCI, UCI)
	Non-normative Protesters (*n* = 396)	Normative protesters (*n* = 220)			
Positive emotions	5.21 (0.94)	4.96 (0.98)	9.65	.002	.02 (.003, .04)
Avoidance negative emotions	4.67 (1.20)	4.25 (1.22)	17.45	<.001	.07 (.01, .05)
Approach negative emotions	5.78 (.91)	5.21 (1.23)	43.90	<.001	.07 (.04, .10)

Study 2. As in Study 1, we conducted an EFA for all the emotion items. The results again revealed a two-factor solution with positive emotions loading onto one factor and negative emotions loading onto the second factor. A closer examination of negative emotions alone, however, revealed only one factor, collapsing across all negative emotions. For completeness and in keeping with Study 1, we still report the results of positive emotions (α = .74), avoidance-oriented negative emotions (α = .68), and approach-oriented negative emotions (α = .75). Replicating the finding in Study 1, non-normative protesters again reported to have experienced significantly more intense positive emotions, and avoidance- and approach-oriented negative emotions, compared to their normative counterparts (Table S6). In the multiple regression, both positive and approach-oriented negative emotions predicted stronger willingness to engage in future non-normative resistance, βs > .29, *ps* < .001, whereas avoidance-oriented negative emotions did not, β = -.09, *p* = .06.

We also conducted the same indirect effect analysis as in Study 1 to test whether these emotions mediated the relationship between exposure to police violence and willingness to engage in future non-normative resistance. The results showed that exposure to police violence predicted stronger intention to engage in future non-normative resistance via positive emotions (*b* = .04, LCI = .02, UCI = .08) and approach-oriented negative emotions (*b* = .10, LCI = .05, UCI = .15), but not avoidance-oriented negative emotions (*b* = -.02, LCI = -.005, UCI = .00).

Table S6.

Means and Standard Deviations by Group Membership for Positive Emotions, and Avoidance-and Approach-Oriented Negative Emotions (Study 2).

	Mean (SD)			*F*	*p*	Partial eta-squared (LCI, UCI)
	Non-normative protesters (N = 276)	Normative protesters (*n* = 240)	The inactive (*n* = 143)			
Positive emotions	5.42 (1.04)	4.79 (1.39)	N/A	34.64	< .001	.06 (.03,.11)
Avoidance negative emotions	3.89 (1.47)	3.54 (1.49)	N/A	7.35	.01	.01 (.002, .04)
Approach negative emotions	5.29 (1.51)	4.22 (1.75)	N/A	54.05	<.001	.07 (.06, .14)