

"Framing Hate" Appendix

Figure A1. Experimental Treatments by Condition with N's

	<u>Anti-Muslim Speech</u>	<u>Flag-Burning Speech</u>
Photo included in news story (Studies 1 & 2)		
Free Speech Frame (Study 1 only)	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. Drawing pictures of the prophet Muhammad, as shown here, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=178; Democrats=102; Republicans=52</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. Burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=166; Democrats=104; Republicans=44</p>
Moral Frame (Studies 1 & 2)	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. Drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is offensive and can be emotionally harmful and intimidating to Muslim-Americans.</p> <p>Study 1: N=173; Democrats=96; Republicans=53</p> <p>Study 2: N=162; Democrats=90; Republicans=55</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. Burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is destruction of a national symbol and it betrays patriotic Americans.</p> <p>Study 1: N=180; Democrats=100; Republicans=55</p> <p>Study 2: N=164; Democrats=102; Republicans=47</p>
Party Cues w/Moral Frames "Traditional" Stances (Study 1 only)	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party criticized the event, saying that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is offensive and can be emotionally harmful and intimidating to Muslim-Americans. The Republican Party, however, disagreed and stressed that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=170; Democrats=95; Republicans=53</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Republican Party criticized the event, saying that burning the U.S. flag is destruction of a national symbol and it betrays patriotic Americans. The Democratic Party, however, disagreed and stressed that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=187; Democrats=100; Republicans=68</p>
Party Cues w/Moral Frames "Reverse" Stances (Study 1 only)	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Republican Party criticized the event, saying that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is offensive and can be emotionally harmful and intimidating to Muslim-Americans. The Democrat Party, however, disagreed and stressed that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=185; Democrats=103; Republicans=64</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party criticized the event, saying that burning the U.S. flag is destruction of a national symbol and it betrays patriotic Americans. The Republican Party, however, disagreed and stressed that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is an expression of free speech that cannot be taken away by the government.</p> <p>Study 1: N=171; Democrats=95; Republicans=57</p>

<p>Republican Party Opposition (Study 2 only)</p>	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Republican Party believes that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, should <u>not</u> be protected by the First Amendment.</p> <p>Study 2: N=182; Democrats=97; Republicans=65</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Republican Party believes that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, should <u>not</u> be protected by the First Amendment.</p> <p>Study 2: N=153; Democrats=88; Republicans=48</p>
<p>Democratic Party Opposition (Study 2 only)</p>	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party believes that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, should <u>not</u> be protected by the First Amendment.</p> <p>Study 2: N=188; Democrats=101; Republicans=51</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party believes that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, should <u>not</u> be protected by the First Amendment.</p> <p>Study 2: N=169; Democrats=98; Republicans=47</p>
<p>Republican Party Opposition w/Moral Frames (Study 2 only)</p>	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Republican Party opposed the event, saying that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is offensive and can be emotionally harmful and intimidating to Muslim-Americans.</p> <p>Study 2: N=185; Democrats=102; Republicans=58</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Republican Party opposed the event, saying that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is destruction of a national symbol and it betrays patriotic Americans.</p> <p>Study 2: N=154; Democrats=87; Republicans=46</p>
<p>Democratic Party Opposition w/Moral Frames (Study 2 only)</p>	<p>Recently, in a U.S. city, there was an event where cartoons of the prophet Muhammad were drawn by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party opposed the event, saying that drawing cartoons of the prophet Muhammad, as shown in the picture, is offensive and can be emotionally harmful and intimidating to Muslim-Americans.</p> <p>Study 2: N=177; Democrats=101; Republicans=59</p>	<p>Recently, in a large U.S. city, there was a U.S. flag-burning demonstration led by a group of protesters. The Democratic Party opposed the event, saying that burning the U.S. flag, as shown in the picture, is destruction of a national symbol and it betrays patriotic Americans.</p> <p>Study 2: N=169; Democrats=94; Republicans=52</p>
<p>Control Condition (Study 2 only)</p>		<p>Recently, Kaninhop (or bunny jumping), as shown in the picture, has become one of the more popular obscure sports in America. It's simple really – trained bunnies hopping over obstacles. It's not really a new concept as Equestrian Show Jumping has been around for years, but come on, they're bunnies.</p> <p>Study 2: N=167; Democrats=90; Republicans=55</p>

Table A1. Item Descriptions and Coding – Control Variables

Item Name	Item Description, Coding, and Descriptive Statistics
PID Strength	1=Strong Democrat/Republican, .5=Not so Strong Democrat/Republican, 0=Weak Democrat/Republican (Note: This measure excludes pure Independents; Study 1: mean=0.56, sd=0.40; Study 2: mean=0.59, sd=0.39)
Ideology	7-point ideological self-placement scale, recoded 0-1 from 0=Very Liberal to 1=Very Conservative (Study 1: mean=0.43, sd=0.29; Study 2: mean=0.43, sd=0.28)
Political Interest	<p>"Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?"</p> <p>Response Options (4): Hardly at all; Only now and then; Some of the time; Most of the time. Recoded 0-1 where higher values represent greater political interest (Study 1: mean=0.74, sd=0.27; Study 2: mean=0.72, sd=0.28).</p>
Affect Towards Muslims	<p>"How would you rate each of the following groups? Muslims"</p> <p>Responses were placed on a 101-point feeling thermometer which was anchored 0=Extremely Cold/Unfavorable and 100=Extremely Warm/Favorable, and rescaled 0-1 such that higher values represent warmer feelings towards Muslims (Study 1: mean=0.55, sd=0.31; Study 2: mean=0.58, sd=0.29).</p>
Political Correctness	<p>"There's been a lot of talk lately about "political correctness." Some people think that the way people talk needs to change with the times to be more sensitive to people from different backgrounds. Others think that this has already gone too far and many people are just too easily offended. Which is closer to your opinion?"</p> <p>0=The way people talk needs to change (Study 1: 40%, Study 2: 44%) 1=People are too easily offended (Study 1: 60%, Study 2: 56%)</p>
Loyalty/Betrayal Moral Foundation	<p>When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? (Respondents rate each statement on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all relevant" to "Extremely relevant")</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country. 2. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group. 3. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty <p>Please read the following sentences and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement. (Respondents rate each statement on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree")</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. I am proud of my country's history. 5. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong. 6. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

	<p>Responses to these 6 items were scaled together, and recoded 0-1, such that higher values represented greater loyalty morality.</p> <p>Study 1: mean=0.51, sd=0.21, alpha=0.78; Study 2: mean=0.53, sd=0.20, alpha=0.78</p>
Care/Harm Moral Foundation	<p>When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? (Respondents rate each statement on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all relevant" to "Extremely relevant")</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally. 2. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable. 3. Whether or not someone was cruel. <p>Please read the following sentences and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement. (Respondents rate each statement on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree")</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue. 5. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal. 6. It can never be right to kill a human being. <p>Responses to these 6 items were scaled together, and recoded 0-1, such that higher values represented greater care morality.</p> <p>Study 1: mean=0.71, sd=0.18, alpha=0.75 Study 2: mean=0.73, sd=0.18, alpha=0.60</p>
Race	1=White, 0=non-White
Gender	1=Female, 0=Male
Education	7-point self-placement scale of highest level of education completed, recoded 0-1 from 0=Grade school/Some High School to 1=Post-Graduate Degree
Church Attendance	5-point scale, recoded 0-1 to range from 0=Never Attend to 1=Attend Every Week
General Offensiveness of Hate Speech (Study 2 only)	<p>"The American Bar Association defines <i>hate speech</i> as "speech that offends, threatens, or insults groups, based on race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or other traits." For each type of speech listed, please rate how much you think this type of speech <u>reflects the definition of hate speech</u> provided above. To be clear, we not asking for your personal opinion, but rather whether you think <i>Americans as a whole</i> would consider each of the following hate speech based on the above definition."</p> <p>(Respondents then rated "Burning the U.S. Flag," "Drawing Anti-Muslim Cartoons," and "Participating in Bunny Jumping")</p> <p>Response Options for each type of speech (4): Definitely Not Offensive; Probably Not Offensive; Probably Offensive; Definitely Offensive. Recoded 0-1 where higher values represent greater offensiveness</p> <p>Flag Burning mean=0.55, sd=0.42; Anti-Muslim mean=0.77, sd=0.30; Bunny Jumping mean=0.27, sd=0.30</p>

Personal
Offensiveness of
Hate Speech
(Study 2 only)

"For each type of speech listed, please rate how much you are personally
offended by it."

(Respondents then rated "Burning the U.S. Flag," "Drawing Anti-Muslim
Cartoons," and "Participating in Bunny Jumping")

Response Options for each type of speech (3): Not Offended at All; Somewhat
Offended; Extremely Offended. Recoded 0-1 where higher values represent
more offended.

Flag Burning mean=0.55, sd=0.42; Anti-Muslim mean=0.42, sd=0.39; Bunny
Jumping mean=0.13, sd=0.27

Table A2. Correlation Matrix for Party Identity, Ideology, and Moral Foundations

<u>Study 1</u>				
	Party Identity	Ideology	Loyalty Morality	Care/Harm Morality
Party Identity	1.00			
Ideology	0.7233*	1.00		
Loyalty Morality	0.3039*	0.4031*	1.00	
Care/Harm Morality	-0.2530*	-0.2448*	0.1702*	1.00
<u>Study 2</u>				
	Party Identity	Ideology	Loyalty Morality	Care/Harm Morality
Party Identity	1.00			
Ideology	0.7620*	1.00		
Loyalty Morality	0.3516*	0.4390*	1.00	
Care/Harm Morality	-0.2043*	-0.2180*	0.1435*	1.00

Where * represents significance at $p < .05$

Table A3. Experimental Treatment Effects for Flag Burning (Study 1)¹

	All Respondents			Partisans Only		
Free Speech Frame	--	0.022 (0.036)	0.109** (0.036)	--	0.007 (0.041)	0.046 (0.040)
Loyalty Frame	-0.022 (0.036)	--	0.087* (0.035)	-0.007 (0.041)	--	0.039 (0.040)
Dem Party using Loyalty Frame	-0.093* (0.037)	-0.071‡ (0.036)	0.016 (0.036)	-0.055 (0.042)	-0.048 (0.042)	-0.010 (0.042)
Rep Party using Loyalty Frame	-0.109** (0.036)	-0.087* (0.035)	--	-0.046 (0.040)	-0.039 (0.040)	--
Party ID				-0.168* (0.065)	-0.229** (0.061)	-0.333** (0.052)
Free Speech Frame X Party ID				--	0.061 (0.088)	0.164* (0.081)
Loyalty Frame X Party ID				-0.061 (0.088)	--	0.104 (0.078)
Dem Party Loyalty Frame X Party ID				-0.061 (0.088)	0.000 (0.085)	0.104 (0.078)
Rep Party Loyalty Frame X Party ID				-0.164* (0.081)	-0.104 (0.078)	--
Political Interest	0.166** (0.052)	0.166** (0.052)	0.166** (0.052)	0.124* (0.055)	0.124* (0.055)	0.124* (0.055)
White	-0.071* (0.030)	-0.071* (0.030)	-0.071* (0.030)	-0.020 (0.032)	-0.020 (0.032)	-0.020 (0.032)
Gender	-0.100** (0.026)	-0.100** (0.026)	-0.100** (0.026)	-0.119** (0.026)	-0.119** (0.026)	-0.119** (0.026)
Church Attendance	-0.266** (0.039)	-0.266** (0.039)	-0.266** (0.039)	-0.150** (0.043)	-0.150** (0.043)	-0.150** (0.043)
Education	0.072 (0.054)	0.072 (0.054)	0.072 (0.054)	0.039 (0.055)	0.039 (0.055)	0.039 (0.055)
Constant	0.702** (0.057)	0.680** (0.059)	0.593** (0.057)	0.741** (0.060)	0.734** (0.062)	0.695** (0.061)
N	701	701	701	621	621	621
R ²	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.215	0.215	0.215

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where **p<0.01, *p<0.05, ‡p<0.1 on a two-tailed test. In columns 1 and 4, the "Free Speech Frame" is the excluded treatment category, in columns 2 and 5 the "Loyalty Frame" is the excluded treatment category, and in columns 3 and 6 the "Republican Party using Loyalty Frame" is the excluded treatment category. Party ID is a dichotomous variable coded 0=Democrats, and 1=Republicans. All analyses are confined to the subset of respondents who received one of the flag burning treatments (i.e. respondents viewing an anti-Muslim speech treatment are excluded from the above models).

¹ There is no evidence, based on VIF scores, of problematic multi-collinearity in this and all other multivariate regression models reported in this Appendix.

Table A4. Heterogeneous Experimental Treatment Effects for U.S. Flag Burning (Study 1)

	All Respondents		Partisans Only	
Loyalty Frame	0.028	(0.069)	0.007	(0.083)
Dem Party using Loyalty Frame	-0.032	(0.083)	-0.049	(0.090)
Rep Party using Loyalty Frame	-0.014	(0.075)	-0.044	(0.087)
Loyalty Values	-0.596**	(0.106)	-0.414**	(0.117)
<i>Loyalty Frame X Loyalty Values</i>	-0.132	(0.152)	-0.123	(0.193)
<i>Dem Party using Loyalty Frame X Loyalty Values</i>	-0.133	(0.169)	-0.053	(0.199)
<i>Rep Party using Loyalty Frame X Loyalty Values</i>	-0.167	(0.151)	-0.028	(0.185)
Party ID			0.153	(0.118)
Loyalty Frame X Party ID			-0.132	(0.178)
Dem Party using Loyalty Frame X Party ID			-0.232	(0.245)
Rep Party using Loyalty Frame X Party ID			-0.352‡	(0.210)
Party ID X Loyalty Values			-0.503*	(0.221)
<i>Loyalty Frame X Party ID X Loyalty Values</i>			0.222	(0.338)
<i>Dem Party Loyalty Frame X Party ID X Loyalty Values</i>			0.315	(0.424)
<i>Rep Party Loyalty Frame X Party ID X Loyalty Values</i>			0.348	(0.356)
Constant	0.987**	(0.049)	0.949**	(0.053)
N	702		622	
R ²	0.191		0.252	

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where **p<0.01, *p<0.05, ‡p<0.1 on a two-tailed test. The "Free Speech Frame" is the excluded treatment category. Party ID is a dichotomous variable coded 0=Democrats, and 1=Republicans. All analyses are confined to the subset of respondents who received one of the flag burning treatments (i.e. respondents viewing an anti-Muslim speech treatment are excluded from the above models).

Table A5. Experimental Treatment Effects for Anti-Muslim Speech (Study 1)

	All Respondents			Partisans Only		
Free Speech Frame	--	0.101** (0.028)	0.063* (0.027)	--	0.102** (0.038)	0.105** (0.036)
Harm Frame	-0.101** (0.028)	--	-0.038 (0.029)	-0.102** (0.038)	--	0.003 (0.039)
Dem Party using Harm Frame	-0.063* (0.027)	0.038 (0.029)	--	-0.105** (0.036)	-0.003 (0.039)	--
Rep Party using Harm Frame	-0.069** (0.025)	0.031 (0.028)	-0.006 (0.026)	-0.041 (0.035)	0.061 (0.038)	0.064‡ (0.035)
Party ID				0.045 (0.040)	0.047 (0.052)	0.107* (0.044)
Free Speech Frame X Party ID				--	-0.002 (0.063)	-0.063 (0.060)
Harm Frame X Party ID				0.002 (0.063)	--	-0.061 (0.067)
Dem Party Harm Frame X Party ID				0.063 (0.060)	0.061 (0.067)	--
Rep Party Harm Frame X Party ID				-0.085 (0.055)	-0.087 (0.063)	-0.147* (0.059)
Political Interest	0.164** (0.037)	0.164** (0.037)	0.164** (0.037)	0.177** (0.042)	0.177** (0.042)	0.177** (0.042)
White	0.078** (0.024)	0.078** (0.024)	0.078** (0.024)	0.059* (0.026)	0.059* (0.026)	0.059* (0.026)
Gender	-0.122** (0.019)	-0.122** (0.019)	-0.122** (0.019)	-0.114** (0.020)	-0.114** (0.020)	-0.114** (0.020)
Church Attendance	-0.014 (0.028)	-0.014 (0.028)	-0.014 (0.028)	-0.026 (0.033)	-0.026 (0.033)	-0.026 (0.033)
Education	0.029 (0.042)	0.029 (0.042)	0.029 (0.042)	0.044 (0.044)	0.044 (0.044)	0.044 (0.044)
Constant	0.675** (0.048)	0.575** (0.049)	0.612** (0.043)	0.657** (0.056)	0.555** (0.057)	0.552** (0.051)
N	701	701	701	613	613	613
R ²	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.127	0.127	0.127

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where **p<0.01, *p<0.05, ‡p<0.1 on a two-tailed test. In columns 1 and 4, the "Free Speech Frame" is the excluded treatment category, in columns 2 and 5 the "Harm Frame" is the excluded treatment category, and in columns 3 and 6 the "Democratic Party using Harm Frame" is the excluded treatment category. Party ID is a dichotomous variable coded 0=Democrats, and 1=Republicans. All analyses are confined to the subset of respondents who received one of the anti-Muslim speech treatments (i.e. respondents viewing a flag burning treatment are excluded from the above models).

Table A6. Heterogeneous Experimental Treatment Effects for Anti-Muslim Speech (Study 1)

	All Respondents		Partisans Only	
Harm Frame	0.122	(0.124)	0.234	(0.181)
Dem Party using Harm Frame	0.015	(0.111)	0.026	(0.175)
Rep Party using Harm Frame	-0.020	(0.115)	0.054	(0.185)
Harm Values	-0.027	(0.105)	0.042	(0.153)
<i>Harm Frame X Harm Values</i>	<i>-0.296[‡]</i>	<i>(0.172)</i>	<i>-0.434[‡]</i>	<i>(0.242)</i>
<i>Dem Party using Harm Frame X Harm Values</i>	<i>-0.114</i>	<i>(0.157)</i>	<i>-0.172</i>	<i>(0.237)</i>
<i>Rep Party using Harm Frame X Harm Values</i>	<i>-0.057</i>	<i>(0.156)</i>	<i>-0.122</i>	<i>(0.243)</i>
Party ID			0.100	(0.160)
Harm Frame X Party ID			-0.116	(0.270)
Dem Party using Harm Frame X Party ID			-0.036	(0.250)
Rep Party using Harm Frame X Party ID			-0.088	(0.250)
Party ID X Harm Values			-0.057	(0.223)
<i>Harm Frame X Party ID X Harm Values</i>			<i>0.109</i>	<i>(0.392)</i>
<i>Dem Party using Harm Frame X Party ID X Harm Values</i>			<i>0.106</i>	<i>(0.363)</i>
<i>Rep Party using Harm Frame X Party ID X Harm Values</i>			<i>0.001</i>	<i>(0.337)</i>
Constant	0.814**	(0.075)	0.748**	(0.115)
N	704		616	
R ²	0.029		0.045	

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where **p<0.01, *p<0.05, †p<0.1 on a two-tailed test. The "Free Speech Frame" is the excluded treatment category. Party ID is a dichotomous variable coded 0=Democrats, and 1=Republicans. All analyses are confined to the subset of respondents who received one of the anti-Muslim speech treatments (i.e. respondents viewing a flag burning treatment are excluded from the above models).

Table A7. Experimental Treatment Effects for Flag Burning and Anti-Muslim Speech (Study 2)

	Flag Burning Speech		Anti-Muslim Speech	
Moral Frame	-0.135** (0.041)	-0.119* (0.047)	-0.022 (0.037)	-0.057 (0.051)
Democratic Party Cues	-0.175** (0.040)	-0.194** (0.050)	-0.093* (0.039)	-0.104‡ (0.053)
Republican Party Cues	-0.188** (0.042)	-0.102* (0.048)	-0.043 (0.038)	-0.057 (0.053)
Moral Frame X Democratic Party Cues	0.138* (0.054)	0.143* (0.065)	0.089‡ (0.049)	0.077 (0.067)
Moral Frame X Republican Party Cues	0.202** (0.057)	0.146* (0.064)	0.010 (0.047)	0.022 (0.065)
Respondent's Party ID		-0.111 (0.081)		-0.051 (0.070)
Moral Frame X Party ID		-0.095 (0.100)		0.079 (0.081)
Dem Party Cues X Party ID		0.090 (0.101)		0.023 (0.091)
Rep Party Cues X Party ID		-0.240* (0.098)		0.018 (0.083)
Moral Frame X Dem Party Cues X Party ID		0.026 (0.130)		0.049 (0.111)
Moral Frame X Rep Party Cues X Party ID		0.220‡ (0.130)		-0.008 (0.103)
Political Interest	0.239** (0.042)	0.230** (0.044)	0.070* (0.033)	0.069‡ (0.038)
White	-0.049‡ (0.027)	-0.017 (0.029)	0.036 (0.023)	0.029 (0.026)
Gender	-0.084** (0.023)	-0.085** (0.023)	-0.084** (0.019)	-0.078** (0.021)
Church Attendance	-0.121** (0.033)	-0.070* (0.034)	-0.098** (0.027)	-0.110** (0.031)
Education	0.082‡ (0.046)	0.109* (0.046)	0.008 (0.037)	0.001 (0.040)
Constant	0.646** (0.054)	0.635** (0.059)	0.712** (0.045)	0.742** (0.059)
N	898	788	972	845
R ²	0.093	0.172	0.054	0.060

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, †p<0.1. Columns 1 and 3 provide estimates from a 2x3 factorial design, and columns 2 and 4 provide estimates from a 2x3x2 factorial design. In each model, Moral Frame has factor levels 1) No Moral Frame provided, and 2) Moral Frame provided; Party Cues has factor levels: 1) No Party Cues provided, 2) Democratic Party Cues provided, and 3) Republican Party Cues provided; and Party Identity has factor levels 1) Democratic identifying respondents, and 2) Republican identifying respondents. As such, coefficients reported in the "Constant" are mean levels of tolerance for speech in the pure control condition (for each type of speech), and are also Democrats in the 3-way factorial. Analyses are confined to the subset of respondents who received only that certain type of speech treatment, notated by column titles "Flag Burning Speech" and "Anti-Muslim Speech," respectively.

Table A8. Heterogeneous Experimental Treatment Effects (Flag Burning & Anti-Muslim Speech Study 2)

	Flag Burning Speech		Anti-Muslim Speech	
Moral Frame	-0.217*	-0.268*	0.212	0.330
	(0.099)	(0.117)	(0.141)	(0.233)
Dem Party Cues	-0.341**	-0.365*	-0.122	-0.108
	(0.112)	(0.147)	(0.167)	(0.246)
Rep Party Cues	-0.019	-0.064	-0.078	0.072
	(0.099)	(0.109)	(0.159)	(0.251)
Moral Frame X Dem Party Cues	0.326*	0.389*	-0.086	-0.231
	(0.157)	(0.193)	(0.197)	(0.307)
Moral Frame X Rep Party Cues	0.042	0.119	-0.205	-0.382
	(0.145)	(0.165)	(0.194)	(0.307)
Moral Values (Loyalty or Harm)	-0.559**	-0.557**	-0.095	0.084
	(0.118)	(0.152)	(0.163)	(0.254)
<i>Moral Frame X Moral Values</i>	0.210	0.304	-0.301	-0.482
	(0.189)	(0.243)	(0.190)	(0.304)
<i>Dem Party Cues X Moral Values</i>	0.368 [‡]	0.366	0.054	0.028
	(0.205)	(0.290)	(0.220)	(0.315)
<i>Rep Party Cues X Moral Values</i>	-0.229	-0.073	0.049	-0.147
	(0.183)	(0.223)	(0.211)	(0.322)
<i>Moral Frame X Dem Party Cues X Moral Values</i>	-0.432	-0.545	0.217	0.372
	(0.293)	(0.389)	(0.265)	(0.402)
<i>Moral Frame X Rep Party Cues X Moral Values</i>	0.215	0.052	0.291	0.510
	(0.267)	(0.330)	(0.261)	(0.400)
Respondent's Party ID		-0.293		0.389
		(0.231)		(0.254)
Moral Frame X Party ID		-0.199		-0.315
		(0.330)		(0.292)
Dem Party Cues X Party ID		0.111		0.245
		(0.334)		(0.386)
Rep Party Cues X Party ID		-0.012		-0.324
		(0.308)		(0.345)
Moral Frame X Dem Party Cues X Party ID		0.415		-0.057
		(0.443)		(0.445)
Moral Frame X Rep Party Cues X Party ID		0.004		0.460
		(0.434)		(0.425)
Party ID X Moral Values		0.244		-0.599 [‡]
		(0.387)		(0.326)
<i>Moral Frame X Party ID X Moral Values</i>		0.240		0.473
		(0.540)		(0.386)
<i>Dem Party Cues X Party ID X Moral Values</i>		0.003		-0.346
		(0.552)		(0.506)
<i>Rep Party Cues X Party ID X Moral Values</i>		-0.199		0.393
		(0.494)		(0.461)
<i>Moral Frame X Dem Party Cues X Party ID X Moral Values</i>		-0.642		0.213
		(0.746)		(0.597)
<i>Moral Frame X Rep Party Cues X Party ID X Moral Values</i>		0.155		-0.548
		(0.695)		(0.575)
Constant	1.008***	1.055***	0.778***	0.665***
	(0.057)	(0.065)	(0.126)	(0.199)
N	898	788	972	845
R ²	0.088	0.158	0.021	0.051

Note: OLS regression estimates with robust standard errors in parentheses; where ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, †p<0.1. Analyses are confined to respondents who received only that certain type of speech treatment, notated by column titles "Flag Burning Speech" and "Anti-Muslim Speech," respectively.