Supplementary Information on Recruitment Procedure and Experimental Process for

Toxic Speech and Limited Demand for Content Moderation on Social Media

This PDF file includes:

Pre-registration

Recruitment procedure and experimental process

Pre-registration

We pre-registered our studies on AsPredicted before data collection. The anonymized preregistrations of the studies can be found here, here and here. Please note that the main focus of this paper is to report the main effects of toxic speech and also examine whether partisans exhibit any notable heterogeneity. We should note that we also preregistered analyses of the variable "Content moderation preferences II: Attitudes towards content moderation are measured with a 0-100 slider scale ranging from a preference for keeping to removing the post." that produce similar results to those we report using logit models and average marginal effects (see Table S1 below).

In our preregistrations, we also describe additional outcome variables that are not relevant for the purposes of this study as they would require a different theoretical contextualization and conceptual development. Should the reviewers require additional analyses based on any of the preregistered variables, we are happy to provide the statistical results.

Table S1: Participants' preferences for removing vs. keeping a post in response to distinct post types measured with a slider question [0,100]

	Dependent variable:				
	Preference for removing the post [Slider 0 (Keep the post) - 100 (Remove the post)]				
	Target: LGBTQ	Target: Billionaires	Target: Christians	Target: Democrats	Target: Republicans
Anti-target	21.235***	1.868	11.178***	8.242***	6.520***
	(2.142)	(1.558)	(2.209)	(1.834)	(1.679)
Uncivil post	29.733***	11.503***	22.760***	25.413***	17.564***
	(2.146)	(1.564)	(2.219)	(1.840)	(1.681)
Intolerant post	35.931***	11.238***	23.674***	25.902***	21.015***
	(2.144)	(1.547)	(2.245)	(1.840)	(1.675)
Threatening post	58.124***	20.518***	31.156***	46.102***	38.267***
	(2.146)	(1.557)	(2.209)	(1.841)	(1.671)
Constant	4.425**	4.095***	3.910*	3.512**	3.512**
	(1.515)	(1.102)	(1.568)	(1.295)	(1.181)
Observations	1,936	1,860	1,334	2,076	2,078
Adjusted R^2	0.287	0.107	0.153	0.265	0.229
Note:					*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Recruitment procedure and experimental process

We used the crowd-sourcing platform Prolific to recruit our participants. We required an equal split between males and females, while participants should be 18 years of age or older. Once participants accepted the task, they read a consent form that included the name and affiliation of the researchers, the relevant ethics approval committee contact details, and they were informed about the scope of our studies. In particular, they were told that some of the content could contain statements that may make them feel uncomfortable or cause distress. We informed them that participation

is entirely voluntary and anonymous and that they could leave the study at any moment. The cost was determined by Prolific's recommendation based on the length of our study. We offered our respondents $8.8 per hour. After the survey, respondents were debriefed about the aims of the study and the randomization process and they were again asked whether they wanted their responses to be submitted.