# Online Appendix for “Reconsidering Tolerance: Insights from Political Theory and Three Experiments”

## Appendix A: Experimental Protocols

### Study 1: Experimental Protocol

The first study that compared tolerance judgments for converts and nonconverts was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland, College Park and carried out in August 2016. All survey subjects were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk, limiting to US-based college students ages 18-30 with HIT approval rates greater than or equal to 95% and number of HITS approved greater than or equal to 100, which are restrictions consistent with general practices (e.g., Berinsky, Huber, and Lenz 2012). The survey opened with a general description of the study and an online consent form, and ended with a thank-you page that provided further details and a debriefing about the purpose of the study. It took respondents about 3 minutes to complete, and respondents were paid $0.35 through the Amazon Mechanical Turk website. The survey (via Qualtrics) was anonymous and did not collect any personally identifying information.

All respondents were randomly assigned to one of five potential scenarios of difference across well-known religious, partisan, and issue-based cleavages: members of the anti-vaccine movement, Muslims, Evangelical Christians, those who are against all churches and religion (atheists), and Republicans. These groups were selected on the basis of prior use in tolerance experiments as well as evidence that such groups are unpopular on university campuses, as discussed in the body of the paper. After random assignment to a scenario of potential difference, respondents were randomly assigned again to a convert or a nonconvert condition. Those students in the convert condition imagined a convert to the group in question, while those in the nonconvert condition imagined a nonconvert, as shown below.

### Table A.1: Study 1, Scenario Text and Question Wording

|  | **Nonconvert Condition** | **Convert Condition** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Members of the anti-vaccine movement** | Imagine that a student at your university who believes vaccines are harmful to society would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus his support of the anti-vaccine movement.  | Imagine that a student at your university has recently changed his mind and decided that vaccines are harmful to society. This student would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in support of the anti-vaccine movement.  |
| **Muslims** | Imagine that a Muslim student at your university would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Islamic causes and interests.  | Imagine that a student at your university has recently decided to convert to Islam. This student would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Islamic causes and interests.  |
| **Evangelical Christians** | Imagine that an Evangelical Christian student at your university would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Evangelical causes and interests. | Imagine that a student at your university has recently decided to convert to Evangelical Christianity. This student would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Evangelical causes and interests. |
| **Atheists** | Imagine that a student at your university who is against all churches and religion would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote atheist causes and interests. | Imagine that a student at your university has recently decided that he is against all churches and religion. This student would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote atheist causes and interests. |
| **Republicans** | Imagine that a Republican student at your university would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Republican causes and interests. | Imagine that a student at your university has recently decided to become a Republican, after having been a Democrat for many years. This student would like to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus in order to promote Republican causes and interests.  |

After receiving the prompt, respondents answered several questions about their attitudes toward the student in question. Support for rights, the conventional tolerance measure and key dependent variable, was tapped with a Likert index (Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree=5) averaged across five items: “This student should be allowed to make a speech in our community,” “This student has the right to express any opinion he or she has,” “This student should be banned from running for student government” (reverse-scored), “Newspapers should not publish op-eds by this particular student” (reverse-scored) and “Society should not have to put up with people like this” (reverse-scored). Cronbach’s alpha for this index in Study 1 was 0.84. Subjects were also asked how the student in the scenario made them feel in terms of discomfort and worry (0=not at all, 10=extremely).

The survey also probed demographics and measured group affect, after dependent variables were collected, with a standard feeling thermometer. Hence, all respondents were asked how they felt about each of the five groups noted above, regardless of what potential scenario of difference they were assigned. The question was as follows: “Now we would like to get your feelings toward some different groups. Below is a ‘feeling thermometer’ where 0 means you don’t feel favorable at all toward the group, 100 means you feel very favorable toward the group, and 50 means you’re not sure. Please mark your feeling toward each group below.”

### Studies 2 and 3: Experimental Protocol

Studies 2 and 3 were conducted during November and December 2017, and were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland, College Park. As discussed in the body of the paper, the studies drew from social identity theory with subjects branched to different scenarios based on their political ideology. Liberals and moderates were directed to an extreme right wing scenario in Study 2, and to a fundamentalist Islam scenario in Study 3. Conservatives were directed to an extreme left wing scenario in Study 2, and to a radical atheist scenario in Study 3. (Those who checked “Not sure” to the question about political ideology were directed with conservatives, but they were omitted from all analyses.)

In addition to the nonconvert and “convert to” conditions, a “convert away” (from the presumed disliked group) condition was also included in both studies as an extension to Study 1. Due to the additional outcome measures and time spent participating in the study, respondents were paid $0.60 through the Amazon Mechanical Turk website. Subjects were prohibited from participating in more than one of the three studies by assigning subjects a qualification after each study, and blocking those worker IDs from participating further.

### Table A.2: Studies 2 and 3, Scenario Text and Question Wording

|  | **Nonconvert****Condition** | **“Convert *To*”****Condition** | **“Convert *Away*” Condition** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study 2: Extreme Right Wing** | Imagine that a student at your university adheres to extreme right wing thinking.  The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his perspective. | Imagine that a student at your university used to be politically liberal. However, after much thought about the way politics is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now adheres to extreme right wing thinking. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left liberal thinking behind him and embraced the extreme right wing. | Imagine that a student at your university used to adhere to extreme right wing thinking. However, after much thought about the way politics is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now considers himself a political liberal.  The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left the extreme right wing behind him and embraced more liberal thinking.  |
| **Study 2: Extreme Left Wing** | Imagine that a student at your university adheres to extreme left wing thinking. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his perspective. | Imagine that a student at your university used to be politically conservative. However, after much thought about the way politics is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now adheres to extreme left wing thinking.  The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left conservative thinking behind him and embraced the extreme left wing. | Imagine that a student at your university used to adhere to extreme left wing thinking. However, after much thought about the way politics is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now considers himself a political conservative.  The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left the extreme left wing behind him and embraced more conservative thinking. |
| **Study 3: Fundamentalist Islam** | Imagine that a student at your university adheres to an extreme and fundamentalist form of Islam. The student believes that homosexuality is wrong, that evolution should not be taught in schools, and that women should remain in the home. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his perspective. | Imagine that a student at your university used to hold liberal views. However, after much thought about the way society is going in this country, he has come to new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He has decided to convert to an extreme and fundamentalist form of Islam. The student now believes that homosexuality is wrong, that evolution should not be taught in schools, and that women should remain in the home. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left liberal thinking behind him and embraced extreme, fundamentalist Islam. | Imagine that a student at your university used to adhere to an extreme and fundamentalist form of Islam. However, after much thought about the way society is going in this country, he has come to new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now holds liberal views. Before he believed that homosexuality is wrong, that evolution should not be taught in schools, and that women should remain in the home. Now, he does not believe any of those things anymore. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left extreme, fundamentalist Islam behind him and embraced more liberal thinking. |
| **Study 3: Radical Atheist** | Imagine that a student at your university adheres to an extreme and radical form of atheism. He does not believe in God, and thinks that religion is harmful. So he wants all references to Christianity, God, and religion removed, including on the Declaration of Independence and from American money. In addition, he wants all religious symbols removed from public places as well as dormitories. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his perspective. | Imagine that a student at your university used to hold conservative views. However, after much thought about the way society is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. He now adheres to an extreme and radical form of atheism. He no longer believes in God, and has come to believe that religion is harmful. So he wants all references to Christianity, God, and religion removed, including on the Declaration of Independence and from American money. In addition, he wants all religious symbols removed from public places as well as dormitories. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left conservative beliefs behind him and embraced extreme atheism. | Imagine that a student at your university used to adhere to an extreme and radical form of atheism. However, after much thought about the way society is going in this country, he has arrived at new conclusions about what is the best way forward. Before, he did not believe in God, and he believed that religion is harmful. So he wanted to remove all references to Christianity, God, and religion, including on the Declaration of Independence and from American money. In addition, he wanted all religious symbols removed from public places as well as dorms. Now, he does not want any of those things anymore and he believes in God. The student wants to hold a public rally and demonstration on campus to promote his new perspective, having left extreme atheism behind him and embraced more conservative beliefs.  |

After receiving the prompt, respondents answered the same questions from Study 1 about emotion and tolerance, the latter with a 7-point Likert scale (Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree=7). Cronbach’s alpha for the tolerance index in Studies 2 and 3 was 0.86.

As discussed in the body of the paper, to begin to explore additional ways of conceptualizing and measuring tolerance in empirical work, subjects were also asked to what extent they would show various behaviors toward the student in the scenarios using the same Likert scale. The items drew from recent political theory and were grouped into “minimally” tolerant (“avoid them”); “moderately” tolerant (“forgive them,” “be polite and kind to them,” “do business with them,” “let them do what they want in private”) and “maximally” tolerant (“be friends with them,” “let them do what they want in public, “try to understand their differing perspective,” “allow them to speak on television,” “allow them to teach in the nation's schools,” and “allow them to occupy positions of power in society”) responses to difference.[[1]](#footnote-1) For ease of interpretation and comparison, all scores on dependent variables were converted to a 0 to 1 scale.

In addition, subjects in Studies 2 and 3 were also asked to reflect on the reasons for conversion in a sentence or two. The prompts for the “convert *to*” scenario asked specifically about why the student in the scenario would convert, and these responses were blind-coded into categories. (The prompts for the other two conditions asked either about conversion in general, for the nonconvert condition, or conversion away from the perspective, in the “convert away” condition. For this paper, however, only the responses of subjects in the “convert to” condition were coded and analyzed. See Figure E.1.)
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## Appendix B. Descriptive Statistics

The tables below show means, standard deviations, and balance tests for the demographics (age, income, education, gender, religiosity, ethnicity, political party) for each scenario and experimental condition (convert/nonconvert). Although balance tests are not strictly necessary for clean experimental data (Mutz, Pemantle, and Pham 2017), we show below that, as expected, experimental groups were balanced in nearly all cases.

Age in years was selected from a drop down. Self-reported household income was measured on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1=very low income, 2=low income, 3=lower middle income, 4=middle income, 5=upper middle income, 6=high income, 7=very high income. Religiosity was measured on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1=not religious at all, 2= not religious, 3=somewhat religious, 4=religious, and 5=very religious. Education was measured from 1 to 6, where 1=did not graduate from high school, 2=high school graduate, 3=some college but no degree (yet), 4=2 year college degree, 5=4 year college degree, and 6=postgraduate degree. Respondents who reported age greater than 30 or education as 1 or 6 were omitted as not eligible based on survey instructions. For Studies 2 and 3, respondents who reported “Not sure” for the question about political ideology were omitted from analyses.

\*\*\* = p≤.001, \*\* = p≤.01, \* = p≤05, ^ = p≤.10, and NS = not significant.
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### Study 1: Five Scenarios

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert** | **Total** |
| **Sample Sizes** | Republican | 48 | 54 | 102 |
| Muslim | 53 | 47 | 100 |
| Evangelical Christian | 52 | 53 | 105 |
| Atheist | 39 | 51 | 90 |
| Anti-Vaccine | 59 | 45 | 104 |
| **Total** | 251 | 250 | 501 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic** | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert** | **Balance Test** |
| Age | Republican | 24.8 (3.05) | 24.6 (3.18) | t(100) =0.322 NS |
| Muslim | 25.4 (3.31)

|  |
| --- |
| 25.4340 |

|  |
| --- |
| 25.4340 |

 | 25.4 (3.19) | t(98) =0.013 NS |
| Evangelical Christian | 24.8 (3.34) | 25.0 (3.30) | t(103) =-0.384 NS |
| Atheist | 24.7 (3.06) | 24.6 (2.94) | t(88) =0.154 NS |
| Anti-Vaccine | 24.7 (3.33)  | 24.8 (3.51)  | t(102) =-0.163 NS |
| Income | Republican | 3.25 (1.21) | 3.57 (0.92) | t(100) =-1.529 NS |
| Muslim | 3.36 (1.29) | 3.47 (1.06) | t(98) =-0.461 NS |
| Evangelical Christian | 3.48 (1.06) | 3.43 (1.07) | t(103) =0.226 NS |
| Atheist | 3.56 (0.72) | 3.41 (1.02) | t(88) =0.792 NS |
| Anti-Vaccine | 3.59 (1.18)  | 3.60 (1.10) | t(102)=-.030 NS |
| Religiosity | Republican | 2.13 (1.35) | 2.23 (1.25) | t(99) =-0.392 NS |
| Muslim | 2.06 (1.18) | 1.98 (1.09) | t(97) =0.345 NS |
| Evangelical Christian | 1.96 (1.19) | 2.02 (1.22) | t(103) =-0.244 NS |
| Atheist | 2.36 (1.31) | 2.16 (1.38) | t(88) =0.705 NS |
| Anti-Vaccine | 2.03 (1.19) | 2.27 (1.47) | t(102)=-.893 NS |
| Education | Republican | 3.96 (1.07) | 3.98 (1.04) | t(99) =-0.392 NS |
| Muslim | 3.96 (1.02) | 3.64 (1.07) | t(98) =1.55 NS |
| Evangelical Christian | 3.63 (1.03) | 3.75 (1.05) | t(103) =-0.59 NS |
| Atheist | 4.03 (1.01) | 3.75 (1.00) | t(88) =1.31 NS |
| Anti-Vaccine | 4.00 (1.07) | 3.69 (1.02) | t(102)=1.50 NS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender |  |  | **Male** | **Female** | **Balance Test** |
| Republican | Nonconvert | 31 | 17 | χ2 = .296 df=1 NS |
| Convert | 31 | 23 |
| Muslim | Nonconvert | 28 | 25 | χ2 = .460 df=1 NS |
| Convert | 28 | 19 |
| EvangelicalChristian | Nonconvert | 36 | 16 | χ2 = .305 df=1 NS |
| Convert | 34 | 19 |
| Atheist | Nonconvert | 33 | 6 | χ2 = 3.74 df=1 p=.053^ |
| Convert | 34 | 17 |
| Anti-Vaccine | Nonconvert | 37 | 22 | χ2 = .543 df=1 NS |
| Convert | 25 | 20 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity |  |  | **White** | **Black or African American** | **Hispanic or Latino** | **Asian or Asian American** | **Native American** | **Middle Eastern** | **Mixed Race** | **Other** | **Balance Test** |
| Republican | Nonconvert | 32 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | χ2 = 3.948 df=5 NS |
| Convert | 37 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Muslim | Nonconvert | 36 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | χ2 = 1.525 df=6 NS |
| Convert | 32 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| EvangelicalChristian | Nonconvert | 24 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | χ2 =15.669 df=5 p=.008\*\* |
| Convert | 43 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Atheist | Nonconvert | 25 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | χ2 = 1.95 df=4 NS |
| Convert | 34 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Anti-Vaccine | Nonconvert | 35 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | χ2 = 4.812 df=5 NS |
| Convert | 31 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PoliticalParty |  |  | **Democrat** | **Republican** | **Independent** | **Other** | **Not Sure** | **Balance Test** |
| Republican | Nonconvert | 17 | 5 | 21 | 2 | 3 | χ2 = 3.591 df=4 NS |
| Convert | 22 | 6 | 24 | 2 | 0 |
| Muslim | Nonconvert | 24 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 2 | χ2 = 5.338 df=4 NS |
| Convert | 16 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 2 |
| EvangelicalChristian | Nonconvert | 19 | 7 | 20 | 2 | 4 | χ2 = 2.961 df=4 NS |
| Convert | 17 | 6 | 26 | 0 | 4 |
| Atheist | Nonconvert | 17 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 0 | χ2 = 2.973 df=3 NS |
| Convert | 26 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 0 |
| Anti-Vaccine | Nonconvert | 25 | 4 | 28 | 0 | 2 | χ2 = 6.0356 df=4 NS |
| Convert | 21 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 1 |

### Study 2: Extreme Right Wing and Extreme Left Wing Scenarios

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert To** | **Convert Away** | **Total** |
| **Sample Sizes** | Extreme Right Wing | 143 | 137 | 134 | 414 |
| Extreme Left Wing | 31 | 33 | 36 | 100 |
| Total | 174 | 170 | 170 | 514 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic** | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert To** | **Convert Away** | **Balance Test** |
| Age | Extreme Right Wing | 24.8 (3.22) | 25.0 (3.43) | 25.3 (3.11) | F(2,411)=.754 NS |
| Extreme Left Wing | 25.8 (2.72) | 27.0 (2.79) | 26.3 (2.77) | F(2,97)=1.53 NS |
| Income | Extreme Right Wing | 3.50 (1.13) | 3.52 (1.16) | 3.45 (1.01) | F(2,411)= .154 NS |
| Extreme Left Wing | 3.52 (1.23) | 3.48 (1.09) | 3.61 (1.18) | F(2,97)=0.11 NS |
| Religiosity | Extreme Right Wing | 2.27 (1.15) | 2.27 (1.26) | 2.28 (1.35) | F(2,411)=.004 NS |
| Extreme Left Wing | 2.84 (1.21) | 2.76 (1.5) | 2.86 (1.29) | F(2,97)=0.06 NS |
| Education | Extreme Right Wing | 3.7 (0.99) | 3.82 (0.99) | 3.82 (0.94) | F(2,411)=.709 NS |
| Extreme Left Wing | 3.84 (1.07) | 3.79 (0.89) | 3.97 (1.03) | F(2,97)=0.32 NS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender |  |  | **Male** | **Female** | **Balance Test** |
| Extreme Right Wing | Nonconvert | 81 | 62 | χ2 = 1.90 df=2 NS |
| Convert To | 79 | 58 |
| Convert Away | 67 | 67 |
| Extreme Left Wing | Nonconvert | 20 | 11 | χ2 = .006 df=2 NS |
| Convert | 21 | 12 |
| Convert Away | 23 | 13 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity |  |  | **White** | **Black or African American** | **Hispanic or Latino** | **Asian or Asian American** | **Native American** | **Middle Eastern** | **Mixed Race** | **Other** | **Balance Test** |
| Extreme Right Wing | Nonconvert | 95 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | χ2 = 12.587 df=12 NS |
| Convert To | 88 | 22 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Convert Away | 75 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Extreme Left Wing | Nonconvert | 24 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | χ2 = 9.677 df=12 NS |
| Convert To | 28 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Convert Away | 29 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PoliticalParty |  |  | **Democrat** | **Republican** | **Independent** | **Other** | **Not Sure** | **Balance Test** |
| Extreme Right Wing | Nonconvert | 85 | 8 | 45 | 5 | 0 | χ2 = 7.461 df=8 NS |
| Convert To | 73 | 7 | 47 | 8 | 2 |
| Convert Away | 75 | 11 | 45 | 2 | 1 |
| Extreme Left Wing | Nonconvert | 3 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 0 | χ2 = 7.943 df=6 NS |
| Convert To | 3 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Convert Away | 2 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 |

### Study 3: Fundamentalist Islam and Radical Atheist Scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert To** | **Convert Away** | **Total** |
| **Sample Sizes** | Fundamentalist Islam | 76 | 59 | 62 | 197 |
| Radical Atheist | 12 | 26 | 14 | 52 |
| Total | 88 | 85 | 76 | 249 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic** | **Scenario** | **Nonconvert****(****(** | **Convert To** | **Convert Away** | **Balance Test** |
| Age | Fundamentalist Islam | 25.6 (3.14) | 24.6 (3.29) | 24.7 (3.62) | F(2,194)=1.96 NS |
| Radical Atheist | 25.4 (2.61) | 25.1 (2.72) | 26.2 (3.56) | F(2,49)=0.64 NS |
| Income | Fundamentalist Islam | 3.5 (1.25) | 3.66 (1.08) | 3.47 (0.95) | F(2,194)=0.53 NS |
| Radical Atheist | 3.83 (1.27) | 3.77 (0.91) | 3.86 (1.23) | F(2,49)=0.03 NS |
| Religiosity | Fundamentalist Islam | 2.22 (1.14) | 2.10 (1.27) | 2.16 (1.2) | F(2,194)=0.17 NS |
| Radical Atheist | 3.81 (1.07) | 2.17 (1.03) | 3.19 (1.23) | F(2,49)=2.77 NS |
| Education | Fundamentalist Islam | 3.79 (0.91) | 3.90 (1.06) | 3.42 (0.9) | F(2,194)=4.27 \* |
| Radical Atheist | 2.93 (1.44) | 2.88 (1.29) | 3.83 (1.03) | F(2,49)=0.26 NS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender |  |  | **Male** | **Female** | **Balance Test** |
| Fundamen-talist Islam  | Nonconvert | 43 | 33 | χ2 = 1.303 df=2 NS |
| Convert To | 38 | 21 |
| Convert Away | 34 | 28 |
| Radical Atheist | Nonconvert | 9 | 3 | χ2 = 1.196 df=2 NS  |
| Convert | 15 | 11 |
| Convert Away | 8 | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity |  |  | **White** | **Black or African American** | **Hispanic or Latino** | **Asian or Asian American** | **Native American** | **Middle Eastern** | **Mixed Race** | **Other** | **Balance Test** |
| Fundamen-talist Islam | Nonconvert | 50 | 5 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | χ2 = 21.916 df=10 \* |
| Convert To | 40 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Convert Away | 48 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Radical Atheist | Nonconvert | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | χ2 = 11.40 df=10 NS |
| Convert To | 21 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Convert Away | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PoliticalParty |  |  | **Democrat** | **Republican** | **Independent** | **Other** | **Not Sure** | **Balance Test** |
| Fundamen-talist Islam | Nonconvert | 43 | 3 | 25 | 4 | 1 | χ2 = 6.507 df=8 NS |
| Convert To | 27 | 6 | 23 | 3 | 0 |
| Convert Away | 33 | 2 | 25 | 2 | 0 |
| Radical Atheist | Nonconvert | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | χ2 = 4.922 df=6 NS |
| Convert To | 1 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Convert Away | 3 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Appendix C. Study 1, Group Affect

### Figure C.1: Study 1, Group Affect



Figure shows mean scores for overall group affect in Study 1, using the “feeling thermometer” described in the body of the paper, in which subjects were asked how favorable or unfavorable (on a scale from 0=very unfavorable to 100=very favorable) they felt toward each of the five groups regardless of which scenario they had initially been assigned. A one-way within subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the ratings for each group. Mean ratings were significantly different (F=113.9(4,493), p=.000, partial eta squared = .480), and post hoc pair-wise comparisons (Bonferroni) show that the mean favorability rating for members of the anti-vaccine movement was significantly lower than the mean rating for each of the other four groups (p=.000 for all pairwise comparisons).

##  Appendix D. “Convert Away” Condition

### Table D.1: Studies 2 and 3, “Nonconvert” vs. “Convert *Away*”

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|    | Study 2: Ideology | Study 3: Religion |
| Extreme Right Wing | Extreme Left Wing | Fundamentalist Islam | Radical Atheism |
| *n=268* | *n=65* | *n=138* | *n=26* |
| *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* |
| **Tolerance Index** | *Nonconvert* | 0.74 (0.17) | -0.05 (0.02) p=.011\* | 0.75 (0.17) | -0.05 (0.04) p=.316 | 0.71 (0.18) | -0.08 (0.03) p=.013\* | 0.81 (0.15) | 0.04 (0.06) p=.574 |
| *Convert Away* | 0.80 (0.17) | 0.80 (0.19) | 0.78 (0.19) | 0.77 (0.17) |
| **Worried** | *Nonconvert* | 0.47 (0.29) | 0.14 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.38 (0.25) | 0.17 (0.06) p=.004\*\* | 0.56 (0.29) | 0.21 (0.05) p= .000\*\*\* | 0.39 (0.31) | 0.13 (0.12) p=.302 |
| *Convert Away* | 0.34 (0.26) | 0.21 (0.21) | 0.36 (0.27) | 0.27 (0.3) |
| **Uncomfort-able** | *Nonconvert* | 0.43 (0.29) | 0.10 (0.03) p=.002\*\* | 0.4 (0.24) | 0.19 (0.06) p=.001\*\*\* | 0.6 (0.27) | 0.27 (0.04) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.3 (0.28) | -0.02 (0.12) p=.853 |
| *Convert Away* | 0.33 (0.26) | 0.21 (0.23) | 0.33 (0.25) | 0.32 (0.3) |
| **Minimal** | *Nonconvert* | 0.65 (0.27) | 0.17 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.6 (0.24) | 0.16 (0.06) p=.007\*\* | 0.67 (0.27) | 0.25 (0.04) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.5 (0.25) | -0.02 (0.10) p=.840 |
|
| *Convert Away* | 0.48 (0.24) | 0.43 (0.23) | 0.43 (0.24) | 0.52 (0.26) |
|
| **Moderate** | *Nonconvert* | 0.65 (0.15) | -0.09 (0.02) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.66 (0.21) | -0.10 (0.04) p=.034\* | 0.66 (0.16) | -0.07 (0.03) p=.014\* | 0.7 (0.11) | -0.06 (0.05) p=.249 |
|
| *Convert Away* | 0.74 (0.13) | 0.76 (0.15) | 0.73 (0.18) | 0.75 (0.13) |
|
| **Maximal** | *Nonconvert* | 0.57 (0.2) | -0.14 (0.02) p=.000 | 0.62 (0.24) | -0.10 (0.05) p=.058^ | 0.55 (0.2) | -0.16 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.68 (0.14) | -0.01 (0.05) p=.869 |
| *Convert Away* | 0.71 (0.17) | 0.72 (0.18) | 0.71 (0.18) | 0.69 (0.13) |
| Table shows means and standard deviations along with mean differences, standard errors, and p-values by condition in each of the four scenarios in Studies 2 and 3. \*\*\* = p≤.001, \*\* = p≤.01, \* = p≤05, and ^ = p≤.10. |

### Table D.2: Studies 2 and 3, “Convert *Away*” vs. “Convert *To*”

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|    | Study 2: Ideology | Study 3: Religion |
| Extreme Right Wing | Extreme Left Wing | Fundamentalist Islam | Radical Atheism |
| *n=266* | *n=68* | *n=121* | *n=40* |
| *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* | *Means* | *Difference* |
| **Tolerance Index** | *Convert To* | 0.69 (0.2) | -0.10 (0.02) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.67 (0.21) | -0.13 (0.05) p=.010\*\* | 0.64 (0.18) | -0.14 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.65 (0.21) | -0.12 (0.07) p=.072^ |
| *Convert Away* | 0.80 (0.17) | 0.80 (0.19) | 0.78 (0.19) | 0.77 (0.17) |
| **Worried** | *Convert To* | 0.53 (0.29) | 0.20 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.46 (0.31) | 0.25 (0.06) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.63 (0.27) | 0.28 (0.05) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.51 (0.3) | 0.24 (0.1) p=.021\* |
| *Convert Away* | 0.34 (0.26) | 0.21 (0.21) | 0.36 (0.27) | 0.27 (0.3) |
| **Uncomfort-able** | *Convert To* | 0.53 (0.3) | 0.20 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.45 (0.3) | 0.24 (0.06) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.57 (0.3) | 0.25 (0.05) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.48 (0.29) | 0.16 (0.10) p=.113 |
| *Convert Away* | 0.33 (0.26) | 0.21 (0.23) | 0.33 (0.25) | 0.32 (0.3) |
| **Minimal** | *Convert To* | 0.72 (0.23) | 0.24 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.72 (0.24) | 0.29 (0.06) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.71 (0.25) | 0.29 (0.04) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.61 (0.25) | 0.09 (0.08) p=.295 |
|
| *Convert Away* | 0.48 (0.24) | 0.43 (0.23) | 0.43 (0.24) | 0.52 (0.26) |
|
| **Moderate** | *Convert To* | 0.61 (0.16) | -0.13 (0.02) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.61 (0.16) | -0.15 (0.04) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.57 (0.14) | -0.15 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.63 (0.21) | -0.12 (0.06) p=.049\* |
|
| *Convert Away* | 0.74 (0.13) | 0.76 (0.15) | 0.73 (0.18) | 0.75 (0.13) |
|
| **Maximal** | *Convert To* | 0.53 (0.18) | -0.17 (0.02) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.57 (0.19) | -0.16 (0.04) p=0.001\*\*\* | 0.47 (0.16) | -0.25 (0.03) p=.000\*\*\* | 0.54 (0.23) | -0.15 (0.07) p=.030\* |
| *Convert Away* | 0.71 (0.17) | 0.72 (0.18) | 0.71 (0.18) | 0.69 (0.13) |
| Table shows means and standard deviations along with mean difference, standard errors, and p-values by condition in each of the four scenarios in Studies 2 and 3. \*\*\* = p≤.001, \*\* = p≤.01, \* = p≤.05, and ^ = p≤.10. |

## Appendix E: Studies 2 and 3, Reasons for Conversion

### Figure E.1: Studies 2 and 3, Reasons for Conversion by Study



Table shows percent mentions of each possible reason for conversion by subjects in “convert *to*” condition, by study. Free text entries were all entered into a separate file and blind-coded into the categories shown. Some entries identified more than one reason for conversion and thus were included as mentions in more than one category. “Don’t know” answers are omitted. Data include 236 individual subjects who provided a total of 300 codable responses. Chi square indicates significant differences in the distribution of reasons by study (χ2 = 15.8, df=7, p=.027)

1. Cronbach’s alpha was 0.75 for the four items in the “moderately” tolerant index, and 0.90 for the six items in the “maximally” tolerant index. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)