MATERIALS & DESIGN FOR STUDIES 1 & 2:
Manipulated factors in free-speech scenario & attitudes toward it

Note: Bolding indicates explanation of the materials by the contributing author.

Studies 1 & 2: Free Speech Scenario with Content Manipulation

> Menomonie, Wisconsin. Brett Sullivan, 43, pasted a poster on the front of his garage that read in large, block letters [Extreme leftwing statement:] "AMERICANS ARE THE PROBLEM."/ [Extreme rightwing statement: "ARABS ARE THE PROBLEM."] Sullivan, a native Wisconsinite who is a process improvement engineer and 20-year employee of Con Agra, defended his actions, saying, "people have to realize who the enemy is." Sullivan's neighbor disagrees, saying the poster is "offensive beyond belief" and has asked him to take it down.

The scenario above was presented in all conditions, along with a questionnaire; four factors were manipulated within this. The original study files are available on Dataverse (within attached zip file: the free-speech scenario corresponds to all files in the zip archive that begin with 'survey'); *italics* below refer to those files. Each of the four manipulations, with its number of levels, is summarized below; these manipulations were randomized across-participants:

A(2) In both studies, the speech's ideological content was manipulated to criticize either Arabs or Americans *(as indicated by the filenames' suffixes of 'amer' or 'arab')*.

B(2) In both studies, the speaker's ethnicity was implied by manipulating his first and last names, which were used throughout the questionnaire (see C for details) *(as indicated by the filenames' keyword of 'white' or 'black')*.

C(4) Within each condition of the speaker's implied race, participants were randomly assigned to read about a speaker who was identified by one of four first names and the same last name, as follows. Studies 1 & 2: White American speaker (Brad, Todd, Jay, or Brett Sullivan). Study 1: Black American speaker (Darnell, Jamal, Kareem, or Leroy Jackson). Study 2: Arab Muslim American speaker (Study 2: Abdullah, Ibrahim, Hammam, or Hashim Muhammad) *(as indicated by the filenames' numbering as 1, 2, 3, or 4)*.

D(2) The order of parallel forbid-allow items (see scales presented below) was counter-balanced across participants *(as indicated by the filenames' final suffix of 'a' or 'b')*.

Attitudes toward the free-speech scenario were assessed with 13 items measuring two constructs:

Willingness to Protect Statement Items

1.a The actions of Sullivan should be allowed.
1.b The actions of Sullivan should be prohibited.
2.a Brad Sullivan's behavior is protected by the U.S. Constitution.
2.b Brad Sullivan's behavior is prohibited by the U.S. Constitution.
3. It was a bad idea for Brad Sullivan to express his opinion in the way that he did.
4.a Sullivan should not have expressed his opinion at all.
4.b Brad Sullivan has the right to express his opinion.

5. A law should be passed to prohibit speech like Sullivan's.
6.a The right for Brad Sullivan to express his opinion on that poster should be *restricted* by the U.S. Constitution.
6.b The right for Brad Sullivan to express his opinion on that poster should be *protected* by the U.S. Constitution.
7. Some people may be harmed by Sullivan expressing his opinion.

Agreement Items

8.a I share Brad Sullivan's opinion about Americans/Arabs.
8.b I am opposed to Brad Sullivan's opinion about Americans/Arabs.