

Online Appendix

This appendix contains the wording of the political and non-political messages used in the selective exposure experiment. Each message was initially displayed to respondents by title only. Exposure (forced or by choice) included both title and message. The second section of the appendix includes a supplemental analysis of the forced exposure group.

1. Wording of political messages and non-political news.

Local United Front Group: Consider the Risks for Our Community

While reading, “United Front, a local group of {least-liked group}, holds first meeting downtown,” I was surprised to learn that some people feel this activity presents no risk to our community. Free speech is important but do we really know what this group is about? Although not every person with these beliefs is extreme, just the presence of this group is inflammatory. What about their plans to hold a protest here in town? Can we be sure this will not turn into a violent confrontation? It is wrong to call anyone who opposes these meetings “narrow minded.” And it is important that our local leaders and residents face reality. Our freedoms are important but not at the expense of our safety and security.

United Front Group in Our Community: They Deserve Free Speech Rights, Too

While reading, “United Front, a local group of {least-liked group}, holds first meeting downtown,” I was surprised to learn that some people feel this activity presents a risk to our community. It is important to keep the community free from harassment and violence, but has anyone really stopped to consider what this group is about? While I may disagree with the group’s political views, they have the same right as anyone else to hold meetings. Very few members of this group are extreme. Besides, if they hold a protest in town, they’ll be subject to the same rules as all other political groups. It is important that our local leaders and the public face reality and

avoid over-reacting. It is important to keep the community free from harassment and violence; but if we sacrifice their freedom, we'll sacrifice ours as well.

Local United Front Group: Weighing the Pros and Cons for Our Community

While reading, "United Front, a local group of {least-liked group}, holds first meeting downtown," I was not surprised to learn that different people had strong, and opposite, reactions to this activity. However, we should stop to consider all viewpoints before passing judgment. While I may disagree with the group's political and moral views, they have the same right as anyone else to hold meetings. Not every member of this group is extreme. Nonetheless, for some residents just the very presence of this group will be upsetting. What if they decide to hold a protest in town? We can't be sure in advance if this will or will not result in violence or harassment. On the other hand, if they hold a protest, they'll be subject to the same rules as all other political groups. It is wrong to call anyone who opposes these meetings "narrow minded." But it is also important that our local leaders and the public face reality and avoid jumping to conclusions. Free speech and public safety are both important considerations.

The Most Inspirational Moments from the 2016 Rio Olympics

Now that the 2016 summer Olympics has come to an end, we can look back at the monumental moments that impressed and inspired us. From a runner finishing a race with one shoe to Michael Phelps becoming one of the most decorated Olympians of all time, these superhuman athletes had us gasping, crying and laughing at the funny, moving and shocking moments of the worldwide event. Here are two examples: Michael Phelps ended his record-breaking career as the most decorated athlete in Olympic history. Leading the U.S. to victory in the 400-meter medley relay, Phelps retired with his 23rd gold medal -- 28 medals total. Rosie MacLennan is the first Canadian to win consecutive gold medals in the same event at the Summer Games. She's also the first Canadian flag-bearer since Carolyn Waldo in 1988 to win gold at the Games where they were honored.

2. Conditional Effects of Political Messages on Political Tolerance – Forced Exposure Group

| Variable | Coefficients |
|---|--------------|
| Forced Exposure Treatment | |
| Forced Control | (base) |
| Forced FS | 0.016 |
| Forced Risk | 0.030 |
| Forced Balanced | 0.139 |
| Pre-Treatment Message Preference | |
| Preference | -0.013 |
| Forced FS x Preference | 0.381* |
| Forced Risk x Preference | 0.123 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference | 0.293 |
| Country | |
| USA | 0.295** |
| Forced FS x USA | -0.057 |
| Forced Risk x USA | -0.280 |
| Forced Balanced x USA | -0.121 |
| Preference x USA | 0.229 |
| Forced FS x Preference x USA | -0.007 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x USA | -0.004 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x USA | -0.232 |
| Authoritarianism (Auth) | |
| Auth | -0.047 |
| Forced FS x Auth | -0.271 |
| Forced Risk x Auth | 0.030 |
| Forced Balanced x Auth | -0.421 |
| Auth x Preference | -0.327 |
| Forced FS x Preference x Auth | 0.360 |
| forced Risk x Preference x Auth | 0.367 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x Auth | 0.607 |
| Forced FS x Auth x USA | 0.029 |
| Forced Risk x Auth x USA | -0.331 |
| Forced Balanced x Auth x USA | 0.333 |
| Auth x USA | -0.163 |
| Forced FS x Preference x Auth x USA | -0.411 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x Auth x USA | -0.388 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x Auth x USA | -0.491 |
| DTA | |
| DTA | 0.038 |
| Forced FS x DTA | -0.020 |
| Forced Risk x DTA | 0.009 |
| Forced Balanced x DTA | -0.068 |
| DTA x Preference | -0.016 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Forced FS x Preference x DTA | -0.188 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x DTA | 0.052 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x DTA | 0.016 |
| DTA x USA | 0.011 |
| Forced FS x Preference x DTA x USA | 0.014 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x DTA x USA | 0.047 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x DTA x USA | -0.104 |
| Auth x DTA | -0.237 |
| Auth x DTA x USA | 0.179 |
| Forced FS x Auth x DTA | 0.552* |
| Forced Risk x Auth x DTA | 0.605* |
| Forced Balanced x Auth x DTA | 0.326 |
| Forced FS x Auth x DTA x USA | -0.413 |
| Forced Risk x Auth x DTA x USA | -0.676 |
| Forced Balanced x Auth x DTA x USA | -0.227 |
| Preference x Auth x DTA | -0.068 |
| Forced FS x Preference x Auth x DTA | -0.055 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x Auth x DTA | -0.279 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x Auth x DTA | 0.258 |
| DTA x Preference x USA | -0.078 |
| DTA x Preference x USA | 0.407 |
| Forced FS x Preference x DTA x USA | 0.051 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x DTA x USA | 0.131 |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x DTA x USA | 0.197 |
| DTA x Preference x Auth x USA | -0.002 |
| DTA x Preference x Auth x USA | 0.324 |
| Forced FS x Preference x DTA x Auth x USA | -0.485 |
| Forced Risk x Preference x DTA x Auth x USA | |
| Forced Balanced x Preference x DTA x Auth x USA | |
| Least-Liked Group Affect | 0.063*** |
| Political Knowledge | 0.061* |
| White | 0.056 |
| Constant | 1.947*** |
| N | 1652 |
| R-squared | 0.159 |
| Adj. R-squared | 0.124 |

Note. Values are OLS coefficients. Comparison group is forced control article.
Positive coefficients indicate greater tolerance. ***=p<.001 **=p<.01; *=p<.05
Source: 2017 Rights Survey