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**Methods Details**

1. **Population & Sampling of Facebook Videos & Comments**

We initially searched the Facebook pages for each local broadcast news channel and the local newspaper in the videos section, focused on July 2016 posts. Usually the news organizations shared videos posted on the Facebook pages of their reporters, and so we searched for all videos posted on those reporters’ pages too. We excluded videos with fewer than 100 comments and those that documented related events like official press conferences beyond the protests. We analyzed comments from 31 videos meeting these criteria, with comment totals ranging from 105 to 39,536.

 The total number of comments across all 31 posts was 119,365. The Advocate comprised 94,438 of those. Excluding The Advocate, the total was nearly 24,927. The Advocate newspaper and its reporters posted seven videos total, with comment totals ranging between 1,988 and 39,536. WAFB had twelve videos meeting the criteria and comment totals from 218 to 2,641. WVLA had four such videos, with between 105 and 277 comments. WBRZ had eight videos with comments ranging from 164 to 4,044. WGMB had no videos meeting the criteria.

We sampled 100 comments from each video. The sampling scheme depended on the total number of comments on the video. Facebook presents comments under the videos in batches of 50 at a time. For the video with 105 total comments, we recorded the first 100 comments. As the total number increased, we recorded fewer in each batch of 50 so that we would ultimately have 100 comments spaced evenly throughout all the comments posted. Thus, for comment totals between 1000 and 1249, for example, we recorded the first five comments in every batch of 50 comments. Although the procedure is not formally random, there is no reason to suspect systematic patterns for every N comments in the thread. Thus, the result is an as-if-random sample.

For each comment, we recorded the user’s profile URL, the comment, the video time when the comment was posted, and the number of “likes” on it. Our sample includes 3,170 comments posted by 2,123 unique commenters.

1,581 commenters posted just once in our sample, with a maximum of 26 comments by one commenter. No one else commented more than 16 times, and only 61 posted more than 5 times. With a population of 119,365 comments under those 31 posts, that yields a margin of error of roughly +/- 1.7%.

1. **Facebook Profile Coding**

**FB Profile Codebook**

**Coding Steps**

1. Open the spreadsheet, copy FB profile link, paste in web browser

2. Code #1 if relevant

3. Click the “About” tab (“Overview” section)

4. Code #3-5

5. Click the “Contact and Basic Info” tab, look toward the bottom

6. Code #6-13

7. Code #14 if BR already indicated, or click “Places Lived” & “Work & Edu” tabs to check if BR connection

8. Click back to “Timeline” and code #2-14 if “Intro” box gives any additional info not coded (if present)

If using profile pic & name to code & **multiple people in pic**…

code **if you can tell** which person is the account-holder (e.g. name indicates gender)

code if all **people in pic share the same trait** (e.g. race)

Presume that pictured **children are not the account-holder**

**Profile URL (fbid)**

**1. Deactivated account? (deact)** – “The account has been deactivated”

 1 Yes

 (leave blank for “no”)

**[Click the “About” tab – should see “Overview”]**

**2.** **4-year** **College or University listed? (college)** (excludes community colleges)

 0 No, but HS or community college listed

 1 Yes

 (leave blank for no edu info listed)

**3.** “**Lives in…” (lives)**

 1 Baton Rouge, LA (BR address counts if “Lives in” is blank)

 2 Nearby (Baker, Denham Springs, Gonzales, Grosse Tete, Livonia, Livingston, Plaquemine, Prairieville, Walker, Zachary)

3 Other Louisiana town (this one if no city given)

 4 South (non-LA: Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, S. Carolina, N. Carolina, Virginia)

 5 Other state (or US with no state)

 6 International

 (leave blank for no “lives in” info listed)

**4. From…”** **(from)**

 1 Baton Rouge, LA

 2 Nearby (Baker, Denham Springs, Gonzales, Grosse Tete, Livonia, Livingston, Plaquemine, Prairieville, Walker, Zachary)

3 Other Louisiana town (this one if no city given)

 4 South (non-LA: Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, S. Carolina, N. Carolina, Virginia)

 5 Other state (or US with no state)

 6 International

 (leave blank for no “from” info listed)

**5. Married? (married)**

 0 Not married, but gives other relationship status (incl. single)

1 Yes (“married to”)

 (leave blank for no relationship info listed)

**[Click the “Contact and Basic Info” tab, look toward the bottom]**

**6. Birth Year? (birth)**

 Number entry: Year

**7. Age (if no birth year)** (**age**) – use profile picture to **estimate age** to the nearest 10 years (20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80+)

 Number entry: Age in years

 (leave blank for no profile pic, if birth year coded, or multiple pic people & name doesn’t distinguish by gender)

**8. Sex (sex)** – use “Gender” given, OR profile picture AND name in combination to make your best guess

 0 Male (or male-presenting)

 1 Female (or female-presenting)

 2 Other category explicitly given (e.g. non-binary, trans\*)

 9 Too ambiguous/Not enough info (try to code male/female if possible)

**9. Race/Ethnicity (race)** – use profile picture to make your best guess (name might help too)

 1 White (non-Hispanic)

 2 Black

 3 Latino/Hispanic

 4 Asian (East or South or Pacific)

 5 Other racial/ethnic group

 9 Too ambiguous/Not enough info

**[Toward the bottom of the page]**

**10. Religious views given? (religion)**

1 Christian (all types)

 2 Non-Christian religion

 3 Atheist/Agnostic

 (leave blank for no religious info listed)

**11. Political views given? (politics)**

 1 Republican/Conservative/Libertarian/Tea Party (or similar)

 2 Democrat/Liberal (or similar)

 3 Other

 (leave blank for no political info listed)

**[Scroll to the top]**

**12. Clear political content in profile pic or cover photo? (polpic)**

 If yes, briefly describe what support/opposition is indicated in a few words [text entry]

**13. Does any content indicate support for BLM protesters or cause, or support for police? (activist) [photos only]**

 1 Support for Black Lives Matter (or similar)

 2 Support for Blue Lives Matter/Back the Badge (or similar: Police flag, police uniforms/images)

 (leave blank for no political info listed)

**14. Has this person ever lived, worked, or gone to school in Baton Rouge? (br)**

 1 Yes [“Places Lived” = BR or “Work & Edu” = BR for workplace or Edu = LSU/Southern

 (leave blank for “no”) BR Address counts as “Yes”

 [Click back to “Timeline” and code #2-14 if “Intro” or profile/cover picture gives any additional info not already indicated – married, religion, etc.]

Additional comments beyond the description in the main text: 37% listed school information, of which 1/3 listed a four-year college they attended. Very few listed religious views—7%. Of those that did, virtually all mentioned Christianity. We also coded political expressions on profile pages, which were rare. One percent or fewer listed Republican/conservative views and the same for Democratic/liberal affiliations. The same numbers held for content supporting police or supporting racial justice.

1. **Mechanical Turk Comment Coding**

We employed Amazon’s Mechanical Turk Master workers to code comments in May 2018. We paid federal minimum wage per comment-code for the estimated time each evaluation would take, on average (10 seconds). Coders rated all unique comments (N=2,886, 91%), but codes are applied to non-unique comments, which either matched exactly, or were identical except for punctuation, capitalization, spaces, typos, etc.

Facebook comments were text only, so no other cues informed or biased their evaluations, beyond the brief context description we provided. Emoji images could not be uploaded for coding but they provide important textual context, so we typed the emoji name in brackets at their location in the comment text. To remove irrelevant comments from full coding, we first had MTurkers classify comments as relevant to the context or not. Two workers coded each message. We excluded 400 comments (14%) from substantive coding that *both* MTurkers deemed irrelevant.

 Responses indicating “unclear, can’t tell” were retained for additional coding. One third of retained comments were rated “relevant” by one coder and “not relevant” by the other. The instruction language was as follows: “Determine whether the comment is relevant to an online comment threat. This comment was posted under a live online local news video about protests against police violence after police killed an African-American man. The video shows protesters, police, and the local journalist. (Warning: some vulgar & offensive language). Is the comment relevant to the situation or not? Responses to other commenters are relevant. Comments on race, protest, policing, violence are relevant.”

Next, MTurkers coded each relevant comment on 10 dimensions and we report Cohen’s kappa levels as follows: intended to reduce conflict (67% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .32); negative about a racial group (58% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .20); insult (65% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .33); evaluating news (68% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .14 ); evaluating police (64% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .22); evaluating protesters (54% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .27); evaluating Sterling’s killing (77% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .23); whether police should use more or less force against protesters (68% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .15); whether the comment calls for violence (74% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .19), and whether the comment indicates whether the U.S. has reached racial equality, has gone too far, or more needs to be done (71% agreement, Cohen’s κ = .22). Cohen’s kappa adjusts for agreement by chance, especially for low-frequency codes. There are no objective thresholds for evaluating kappa levels. Landis and Koch (1977) consider kappas at or above 0.20 and below 0.40 to be “fair,” above that are “moderate,” and below that are slight.

For further comparison, we hired a white political communications graduate student who grew up in Baton Rouge as an expert coder. We then merged her codes with the scores provided by MTurkers and calculated level of agreement between the three coders for all ten dimensions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Category** | **% Agreement &** **Cohen’s Kappa Levels** |
| 1. Comment calls for violence (or non-violence)
 | 95% agreementCohen’s κ = .39 |
| 1. Intended to reduce conflict
 | 82% agreementCohen’s κ = .19 |
| 1. Evaluating police
 | 87% agreementCohen’s κ = .21 |
| 1. Evaluating protesters
 | 67% agreementCohen’s κ = .14 |
| 1. Insulting comment
 | 69% agreementCohen’s κ = .17 |
| 1. Negative comment about a racial group
 | 85% agreementCohen’s κ = .13 |
| 1. Police should use more/less force on protesters
 | 87% agreementCohen’s κ = -.01 |
| 1. Sterling’s killing justified or not
 | 92% agreementCohen’s κ = .07 |
| 1. Evaluating news
 | 92% agreementCohen’s κ = .08 |
| 1. Whether the U.S. has reached racial equality, has gone too far, or more needs to be done
 | 92% agreementCohen’s κ = .05 |

 In nearly all cases, however, disagreement was between a neutral category (not present or unclear) and a substantive category, indicating disagreement in whether the comment rose to the level of coding rather than disagreement in opposite substantive directions. Browsing comment categorizations shows some heterogeneous evaluations, even for similar texts, reflecting the diversity in how the public interprets racial rhetoric in America (Mendelberg & Oleske 2000). That is a strength of our measures. Analytically, mixed or ambiguous interpretations would mostly serve to reduce the chances of finding significant statistical relationships with other traits.

The representativeness of our coders matters given that racial interpretations range across groups. MTurk workers are a highly varied group, though they are not nationally representative (nor reflective of Baton Rouge). We did not collect demographic or political information from our coders, but MTurk samples generally tend to reflect a wide range of demographic and political groups (Pew 2016). On race, 77% of MTurkers were white compared to 65% of U.S. working adults (64% for our Facebook commenters), with 6% of MTurkers were Black compared to 11% of U.S. workers (21% for our Facebook commenters). This underrepresents Black interpretations in our comment coding, but educational and partisan imbalances likely push toward more balanced interpretations of racial issues. College educated whites and white Democrats are generally more similar to Blacks on racial attitudes than they are to non-college whites and to white Republicans (Pew 4-9-2019). Fifty-one percent of MTurkers have a college degree or more compared to 36% of the working public. Levay and colleagues (2016) find 46% of MTurkers are Democrats (36% nationally) and 15% are Republicans (29% nationally).

MTurk instructions for first round of coding: Relevance

Determine whether the comment is relevant to an online comment threat.

Academic Research Study:

This comment was posted under a live online local news video about protests against police violence after police killed an African-American man. The video shows protesters, police, and the local journalist. (Warning: some offensive language)

Is the comment relevant to the situation or not? Responses to other commenters are relevant. Comments on race, protest, policing, violence are relevant.

Is this comment related to the protest (or responding to other commenters)?

 1. Yes, relevant

 2. No, not relevant

 3. Unclear, can’t tell

Relevant: Comments on race, protest, policing, violence; Responses to other commenters

Not: Random comments; Incomplete comments with no content; Marco/Polo, Duck/Goose; Unrelated topics

MTurk instructions for second round of coding: Comment substance

[Note: 2 MTurkers coded each comment. Each MTurk task was 1 comment with 1 question. Many MTurkers coded a large number of comments across multiple dimensions.]

Academic Research Study:

This comment was posted under a live online local news video of protests against police violence after police killed an African-American man. The video shows protesters, police, and the local journalist. (Warning: some offensive language)

Answer based on how you think the local journalist would interpret the comment.

[Questions:]

Does the comment call for peace or seem intended to reduce the conflict?

 1. Yes

 2. No, or not clear

Does the comment seem negative about a specific racial group?

1. Yes, negative toward black folks specifically

2. Yes, negative toward white folks specifically

3. Yes, negative toward white AND black folks specifically

4. No, or not clear

Does the comment insult people or call them names?

1. Yes, insulting (including “racist”)

2. No insult

Does the comment praise or criticize news coverage, or does it not judge the news? (too much, not enough, or content of news)

1. Praises news coverage

2. Criticizes news coverage

3. No judgment, or not clear

Does the comment justify the original killing by police, or say the killing was unjustified?

 1. Killing was justified

 2. Killing was unjustified

 3. No indication

Does the comment seem to support or criticize police? (directly mentions police, otherwise “no indication”)

 1. Supports police

 2. Criticizes police

 3. No indication, not clear

Does the comment seem to support or criticize protesters? (directly references protesters, otherwise “no indication”)

 1. Supports protesters or their concerns (including “Black Lives Matter”)

 2. Criticizes protesters or their concerns (including “All Lives Matter”)

 3. No indication, not clear

Does the comment directly say police (or military) should use more force against protesters (including more arrests), or that police should use less force? If neither, choose "no indication."

 1. Want more force used

 2. Want less force used

 3. No indication, not clear

Does the comment explicitly call for physical violence (including wishing suicide), or call for non-violence? (If neither, choose “no indication”)

 1. Violence at protesters

 2. Violence at police

 3. Violence at a commenter

 4. Call for NON-violence

 5. No indication, not clear

Does the comment suggest the U.S. has reached equality for blacks and whites, or that more needs to be done, or that the country has gone too far on rights for blacks? (“No indication” if none of these.)

 1. Race equality is reached

 2. More needs to be done

 3. Gone too far on rights

 4. No indication, not clear

1. **U.S. Census Data on Louisiana and Metro Baton Rouge**

Social media commenting is not limited geographically, but we have already seen that local and state residents comprised the vast majority of commenters on these local news streams. We compare the demographics of social media commenters to local and state-level demographics from 5-year Census estimates provided in the 2015 American Community Survey. From there, we draw information on race, age, and sex for the state and for Baton Rouge.

We define local as residence in East Baton Rouge parish (“EBR”) where the shooting and protests took place, or the broader metro area in the adjacent Ascension and Livingston parishes, which include many Baton Rouge commuters. These three parishes comprise the local oversample in the statewide public opinion survey described next. These parishes differ substantially in politics and demographics, though the three together roughly match the state’s demographics and politics.

 East Baton Rouge has roughly four times the population of either of the other two. EBR is 49% white versus 73% for Ascension and 91% for Livingston. And, given that partisanship corresponds almost perfectly with race in the South, EBR voted 43% for Donald Trump in 2016 compared to 66% for Ascension and 85% for Livingston.

1. **Louisiana & Metro Baton Rouge Survey**

To compare substantive comments to state and local attitudes on race and policing, we conducted a representative survey of Louisiana adults in the first month of 2017 that included an oversample of people from three parishes in the Baton Rouge metro area. Participants were contacted by live professional interviewers via landline and cell phone random digit dialing, yielding 1,079 respondents (361 in the Baton Rouge oversample) with an AAPOR response rate #3 of 19% response rate. [REDACTED] were the survey’s principal investigators. The survey was funded by Louisiana State University. Weights cover race, education, household income, gender and age. More survey methods information is available here: <http://pprllsu.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/MSCRS-Race-vFinal.pdf>

The statewide sample has an overall margin of error of +/- 3.1 percentage points. The Metro Baton Rouge sample has an overall margin of error of +/- 5.2 percentage points. The state sample excluding Metro Baton Rouge has an overall margin of error of +/- 3.7 percentage points.

**Survey Demographics (weighted sample percentage)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **State Sample****(excl. Metro Baton Rouge)** | **Metro Baton Rouge** **(oversample)** |
| Black | 29% | 34% |
| White | 65% | 60% |
| Female | 56% | 52% |
| Age 18-39 | 35% | 44% |
|  40-64 | 45% | 41% |
|  65+ | 30% | 15% |
| College graduate | 34% | 39% |
| Household income <$35k | 37% | 33% |
|  $35k-99.9k | 44% | 42% |
|  $ 100k+ | 19% | 25% |
| *N* | 361 | 718 |

1. **Robustness Tests with Local Expert Coder**

**Equivalent of Table 2 for Random Sample 40%**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **MTurk Coders****(Both Agree)** | **Local Expert** **Coder** |
| **Killing Justified?** Justified Unjustified No indication | 2%3%95% | 2%2%96% |
| **Police view** Supports police Criticizes police No indication | 8%3%90% | 4%3%93% |
| **Protester view** Supports protesters Criticizes protesters No indication | 7%10%83% | 8%19%73% |
| **Force vs. Protesters** Wanted more force Wanted less force No indication | 2%2%96% | 3%0.4%97% |
| **Racial Equality** Equality reached More to do Gone too far No indication | 0.4%5%1%94% | 0.4%2%0.4%97% |
| **News View** Praises news Criticizes news No indication | 2%4%94% | 1%1%97% |

*Note*: *N*=1152 for both.

**Equivalent of Table 3. Racial Gaps in Digital Views & Local Public Opinion in Baton Rouge**

Not enough cases to replicate with 40% of the sample.

**Equivalent of Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Facebook Live Protest Comments – Local Expert Coder**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **All** | **Blacks** | **Whites** |  | **All** | **Blacks** | **Whites** |
| **Any Violence** | .023 | .033 | .016 | **General** **pacifying** | .092 | .113 | .082 |
| **Violence toward** **Protesters** | .016 | .000 | .014\* | **Explicit** **Non-violence** | .022 | .029 | .020 |
| **Violence toward****Police** | .004 | .017 | .001^ | **Use less force** | .003 | .004 | .003 |
| **Violence toward****Commenter** | .023 | .033 | .016 | **Sterling’s death unjust** | .021 | .063 | .009\* |
| **Insults** | .278 | .271 | .274 | **Negative toward** **either race** | .112 | .113 | .105 |
| **Use more force** | .028 | .004 | .033\* | **Negative toward****Blacks**  | .071 | .004 | .087\* |
| **Justifies Sterling’s death** | .016 | .000 | .019\* | **Negative toward****whites** | .035 | .100 | .011\* |
|  |  |  |  | **Negative toward****both races** | .006 | .008 | .006 |

*Note*: cells present proportions among relevant comments, standard deviations in parentheses. “Any violence” is the sum of the next three categories, as is “negative toward either race.” All *N*=1152. Blacks *N*=. Whites *N*=. White proportions are statistically distinct from Black proportions when indicated by \* (*p*<.05) or ^ (*p*<.10).

**Expert Equivalent of Table 5. OLS Models Predicting Aggressive Comments by Commenter & Comment Traits – Local Expert Coder**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Black Comments** |
|  | Any Violence | ViolenceagainstProtesters | ViolenceagainstPolice | ViolenceagainstCommenter | Insults | UseMoreForce | JustifyKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -3.54 (3.01) | -- | -3.52 (2.39) | -3.54 (3.01) | 2.40 (7.24) | .20 (.24) | -- |
| College | -3.02 (2.38) | -- | -.55 (2.00) | -3.02 (2.38) | 3.02 (7.39) | 2.13 (1.88) | -- |
| Married | 1.68 (3.41) | -- | 3.79 (3.22) | 1.68 (3.41) | 1.84 (7.94) | -.62 (.70) | -- |
| Local | -.03 (2.14) | -- | .47 (1.53) | -.03 (2.14) | 11.19^ (6.29) | -.64 (.60) | -- |
| Christian | -2.29 (1.48) | -- | -.47 (1.15) | -2.29 (1.48) | -20.67\* (6.27) | 3.03 (2.72) | -- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | .62 (1.39) | .-- | -1.32 (.90) | .62 (1.39) | 8.41\* (2.95) | .12 (.17) | .-- |
| Insulting | .68 (3.50) | -- | -.06 (2.01) | .68 (3.50) |  | -.20 (.27) | -- |
| Just/Unjust Killing | 2.61 (1.83) | -- | .13 (1.04) | 2.61 (1.83) | 16.95^ (8.71) | .75 (.77) | -- |
| Derogate Blacks | -2.77 (3.68) | -- | 3.07 (2.34) | -2.77 (3.68) |  | .35 (.37) | -- |
| Derogate whites | 13.92^ (7.99) | -- | 12.47^ (6.70) | 13.92^ (7.99) |  | -.42 (.53) | -- |
| Derogate both | -2.61 (3.03) | -- | 2.26 (1.81) | -2.61 (3.03) |  | .23 (.45) | -- |
| Constant | 3.06 (4.03) | 0 | 6.94 (3.68) | 3.06 (4.03) | -4.62 (10.63) | -.55 (.68) | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .08 | -- | .12 | .08 | .09 | .05 | -- |
| *N* | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **White Comments** |
|  | Any Violence | ViolenceagainstProtesters | ViolenceagainstPolice | ViolenceagainstCommenter | Insults | UseMoreForce | JustifyKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -3.47\* (1.20) | -3.09\* (1.15) | -.38 (.37) | -3.47\* (1.20) | -14.26\* (3.53) | -1.42 (1.47) | -1.55 (.71) |
| College | 1.42 (1.84) | 1.37 (1.85) | .04 (.14) | 1.42 (1.84) | -3.59 (4.93) | .78 (2.40) | 2.52 (2.28) |
| Married | -.58 (.96) | -.36 (.93) | -.23 (.22) | -.58 (.96) | .40 (3.80) | -.30 (1.49) | -1.59^ (.95) |
| Local | -.97 (1.03) | -.73 (1.00) | -.24 (.24) | -.97 (1.03) | -5.57 (3.64) | -1.44 (1.42) | -.90 (1.07) |
| Christian | .92 (1.91) | .90 (1.91) | .02 (.11) | .92 (1.91) | -6.32 (5.88) | -1.29 (2.03) | .51 (1.92) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | .84^ (.46) | .64 (.41) | .20 (.20) | .84^ (.46) | 10.26\* (1.98) | 1.33\* (.63) | 1.35\* (.57) |
| Insulting | .70 (1.34) | .07 (1.22) | .63 (.60) | .70 (1.34) |  | 1.87 (1.84) | .66 (1.69) |
| Just/Unjust Killing | -6.31 (5.05) | -.85 (.80) | -5.47 (5.30) | -6.31 (5.05) | 14.99 (11.96) | -1.62 (1.46) |  |
| Derogate Blacks | -3.02\* (1.22) | -2.51\* (1.12) | -.51 (.51) | -3.02\* (1.22) |  | -2.36 (2.58) | 1.62 (3.15) |
| Derogate whites | -2.86^ (1.60) | -2.04 (1.41) | -.82 (.78) | -2.86^ (1.60) |  | -6.16\* (2.05) | -3.08^ (1.64) |
| Derogate both | -1.10 (.91) | -.61 (.76) | -.49 (.49) | -1.10 (.91) |  | -4.87\* (1.73) | -1.60 (1.39) |
| Constant | 1.13 (1.58) | 1.38 (1.55) | -.26 (.29) | 1.13 (1.58) | 3.66\* (5.48) | -.02 (2.18) | -1.70 (1.71) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .03 | .02 | .07 | .03 | .08 | .01 | .02 |
| *N* | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 |

*Note*: OLS coefficients, robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by Facebook ID. A 1.0 coefficient equals a 1 percentage point change in the rate of the outcome. \* *p*<.05, ^ *p*<.10 (two-sided)

**Expert Equivalent of Table 6. OLS Models Predicting Pacifying Comments by Commenter & Comment Traits – Local Expert Coder**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Black Comments** |
|  | GenerallyPacifying | ExplicitNon-Violence | Use LessForce | UnjustKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -.62 (4.78) | -3.05 (3.27) | -1.83 (1.83) | 2.58 (3.25) |
| College | 4.02 (5.22) | -3.67\* (1.51) | -.75 (.78) | -3.24 (3.80) |
| Married | -1.61 (5.41) | .43 (3.51) | -.23 (.35) | -2.11 (5.01) |
| Local | 3.80 (4.41) | .55 (2.33) | 1.50 (1.50) | 4.48 (4.02) |
| Christian | -1.64 (6.34) | -.33 (3.55) | -.14 (.31) | 4.82 (6.58) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | 5.87\* (2.14) | 2.60 (1.60) | .73 (.73) | 2.97 (1.64) |
| Insulting | -14.12\* (3.66) | -4.50\* (1.74) | -.87 (.88) | -5.11 (2.93) |
| Justifying Killing | 9.61 (8.12) | 4.96\* (2.21) |  |  |
| Derogating Blacks | 70.81\* (7.02) | -9.81\* (3.99) | -2.73\* (2.71) | -17.31\* (5.61) |
| Derogating whites | -11.60\* (3.63) | -3.13 (2.01) | -.71 (.78) | -1.91 (4.58) |
| Derogating both | -14.45\* (7.84) | -5.16 (3.54) | -.95 (.97) | -10.10\* (3.55) |
| Constant | -4.84 (5.96) | -1.37 (3.57) | -.79 (.83) | -5.34 (4.27) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .11 | .05 | .04 | .04 |
| *N* | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **White Comments** |
|  | GenerallyPacifying | ExplicitNon-Violence | Use LessForce | UnjustKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | 4.01\* (1.86) | .99 (1.04) | -.20 (.49) | -.66 (.80) |
| College | 6.73^ (3.85) | -.96 (1.35) | 1.00 (1.21) | -1.17\* (.52) |
| Married | .29 (2.24) | .10 (1.18) | 1.07 (.76) | -.42 (.66) |
| Local | -2.24 (2.06) | .32 (1.14) | .19 (.55) | .41 (.84) |
| Christian | -2.40 (3.58) | -.68 (2.01) | -.51 (.37) | -1.01\* (.50) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | 7.53\* (1.31) | 2.58\* (.79) | .24 (.17) | 1.74\* (.77) |
| Insulting | -9.53\* (1.64) | -1.40 (1.15) | -.47 (.35) | -.89 (.86) |
| Justifying Killing | -11.60^ (6.11) | -5.12 (4.84) |  |  |
| Derogating Blacks | -6.47\* (2.53) | -3.07\* (1.18) | -.14 (.15) | -1.92\* (.93) |
| Derogating whites | -10.08\* (3.17) | -4.21\* (1.82) | -.56 (.47) | -2.19^ (1.16) |
| Derogating both | 15.21 (21.68) | -3.50\* (1.57) | -.27 (.36) | -1.19\* (.85) |
| Constant | -15.85\* (3.78) | -6.30\* (2.11) | -.62 (.63) | -3.88 (1.76) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .11 | .04 | .01 | .04 |
| *N* | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 |

*Note*: OLS coefficients, robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by Facebook ID. A 1.0 coefficient equals a 1 percentage point change in the rate of the outcome. \* *p*<.05, ^ *p*<.10 (two-sided)

**Expert Equivalent of Table 7. OLS Models Predicting Racial Derogation by Commenter & Comment Traits – Local Expert Coder**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Black Comments** |
|  | Neg. AnyRace | Neg. toBlacks | Neg. toWhites | Neg. toBoth |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -2.90 (4.64) | .31 (.36) | -4.31 (4.59) | 1.10 (.81) |
| College | 4.86 (5.48) | -.76 (.78) | 6.84 (5.38) | -1.22 (.90) |
| Married | 10.74^ (6.39) | -.62 (.66) | 12.52\* (6.27) | -1.16 (.87) |
| Local | 5.21 (4.38) | 1.27 (1.26) | 3.32 (4.13) | .63 (1.38) |
| Christian | -6.47 (4.26) | -.46 (.51) | -4.85\* (4.08) | -1.16 (.86) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | 8.92\* (2.27) | .75 (.74) | 7.41\* (2.17) | .77 (.72) |
| Justifying Killing | 7.50 (6.40) | .99 (1.00) | 5.07 (6.51) | 1.44 (1.04) |
| Constant | -20.55 (6.77) | -2.46 (2.45) | -15.95\* (6.36) | -2.14 (1.87) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .11 | .03 | .09 | .02 |
| *N* | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **White Comments** |
|  | Neg. AnyRace | Neg. toBlacks | Neg. toWhites | Neg. toBoth |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | -4.19^ (2.38) | -5.17\* (2.25) | .06 (.79) | .91\* (.46) |
| College | -3.59 (3.22) | -2.80 (2.93) | -.10 (1.49) | -.69^ (.37) |
| Married | -1.15 (2.46) | -3.43 (2.20) | 1.42 (1.11) | .85 (.84) |
| Local | -2.26 (2.42) | -2.17 (2.28) | .65 (.99) | -.74\* (.38) |
| Christian | -3.01 (4.10) | -.56 (4.07) | -1.57\* (.63) | -.88^ (.47) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | 7.74\* (1.27) | 6.29\* (1.20) | 1.21\* (.53) | .23 (.26) |
| Justifying Killing | 11.82 (8.20) | 11.98 (8.12) | -.16 (.72) | .00 (.22) |
| Constant | -11.40\* (4.01) | -7.51\* (3.68) | -3.29^ (1.88) | -.60 (.91) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .07 | .06 | .02 | .01 |
| *N* | 698 | 698 | 698 | 698 |

*Note*: OLS coefficients, robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by Facebook ID. A 1.0 coefficient equals a 1 percentage point change in the rate of the outcome. \* *p*<.05, ^ *p*<.10 (two-sided)

**Expert Equivalent of Table 8: OLS Model Predicting “Likes” by Commenter & Comment Traits**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Comment Likes |
|  | All | Comments by Blacks | Comments by Whites |
| **Commenter Traits** | *b* | *Robust s.e.* | *b* | *Robust s.e.* | *b* | *Robust s.e.* |
| White | .34 | .26 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Black | -.23 | .27 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Woman | .12 | .18 | .45 | .31 | .03 | .24 |
| College | .81\* | .31 | 1.13\* | .48 | .67 | .46 |
| Married | -.23 | .19 | -.67\* | .32 | -.14 | .24 |
| Local | .31 | .22 | -.09 | .31 | .41 | .30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment Traits** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | .48\* | .10 | .56\* | .15 | .45\* | .14 |
| Violence against Protesters | 1.95 | 1.33 | -- | -- | 4.59^ | 2.58 |
| Violence against Police | -.69 | .56 | -.24 | .61 | -- | -- |
| Violence against Commenters | -.29 | .46 | -.49 | .47 | -1.75 | 1.91 |
| Insulting | -.06 | .24 | -.59^ | .32 | .18 | .32 |
| More Police Force | -.74 | .47 | -2.97\* | .54 | -1.29\* | .60 |
| Justifying Killing | -.89 | .61 | -- | -- | -.93 | .72 |
| Pacifying Rhetoric | .92^ | .50 | .00 | .65 | 1.71\* | .74 |
| Non-Violence Call | .54 | .92 | .81 | 1.32 | .33 | 1.36 |
| Less Police Force | -.83 | 1.59 | -1.66\* | .77 | .88 | 2.56 |
| Killing Unjust | .65 | .62 | .14 | .58 | 1.53 | 1.88 |
| Derogating Blacks | .06 | .44 | -1.58\* | .80 | -.13 | .46 |
| Derogating whites | .39 | .71 | .46 | .69 | .88 | 2.38 |
| Derogating both | 1.07 | 1.69 | -1.37 | .36 | -.65 | .54 |
| Constant | -.43 | .38 | -.74 | .47 | -.08 | .42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .07 | .15 | .08 |  |
| *N* | 1,082 | 239 | 1,631 |

1. **Tables 5-8 for all comments**

**Table 5 for all comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Any Violence | ViolenceagainstProtesters | ViolenceagainstPolice | ViolenceagainstCommenter | Insults | UseMoreForce | JustifyKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -.40 (.83) | -.66 (.81) | .29\* (.15) | -.03 (.05) | .31 (2.31) | .43 (.86) | -.62 (.91) |
| Black | -.24 (.90) | -1.27 (.79) | .03 (.07) | 1.00\* (.45) | 1.79 (2.72) | .09 (.88) | -1.87\* (.90) |
| Woman | -1.31\* (.47) | -.94\* (.39) | -.24 (.19) | -.13 (.19) | -5.81\* (1.66) | .17 (.59) | -.23 (.54) |
| College | .89 (.95) | .68 (.84) | .23 (.35) | -.01 (.33) | -.20 (2.46) | -.71 (.64) | .57 (.84) |
| Married | .48 (.66) | .16 (.55) | -.23\* (.12) | .56 (.36) | -4.21\* (1.83) | .86 (.77) | .18 (.64) |
| Local | -.67 (.48) | -.17 (.41) | -.20^ (.11) | -.30 (.24) | -.84 (1.86) | -.66 (.57) | -.94^ (.52) |
| Christian | 1.45 (1.03) | 1.40 (.95) | -.11^ (.06) | .16 (.43) | 2.36 (2.60) | .57 (1.08) | -.21 (.80) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | .68\* (.22) | .37\* (.18) | .21^ (.11) | .11 (.07) | 1.11 (.75) | -.13 (.22) | .36 (.24) |
| Insulting | .62 (.64) | .81 (.58) | -.23\* (.12) | .04 (.24) |  | 2.23\* (.97) | -.17 (.67) |
| Just/Unjust Killing | -1.92 (1.38) | -1.08 (.99) | -.98 (.99) | .14 (.08) | -2.22 (4.17) | 1.70 (1.42) |  |
| Derogate Blacks | .68 (1.06) | 1.01 (1.06) | -.12 (.08) | -.21^ (.11) |  | 5.10\* (2.36) | 2.81^ (1.63) |
| Derogate whites | -1.79\* (.51) | -1.23\* (.41) | -.23 (.17) | -.33 (.20) |  | -1.82\* (.56) | -1.41\* (.43) |
| Derogate both | -.97\* (.41) | -.31 (.31) | -.12 (.14) | -.54\* (.27) |  | -1.49 (.54) | 1.33\* (.45) |
| Constant | -.46 (1.00) | .35 (.93) | -.48 (.31) | -.33 (.20) | 17.99\* (3.34) | 1.07 (1.08) | 1.49 (1.27) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .02 | .01 |
| *N* | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 |

*Note*: OLS coefficients, robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by Facebook ID. A 1.0 coefficient equals a 1 percentage point change in the rate of the outcome. \* *p*<.05, ^ *p*<.10 (two-sided)

**Table 6 for all comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GenerallyPacifying | ExplicitNon-Violence | Use LessForce | UnjustKilling |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 1.35 (2.03) | .38 (.82) | .48 (.66) | -.69 (1.14) |
| Black | 1.64 (2.47) | .42 (1.08) | .59 (.81) | .89 (1.41) |
| Woman | 2.55^ (1.47) | 1.00 (.61) | .31 (.50) | -.18 (.67) |
| College | .53 (2.39) | .37 (1.02) | -1.44 (.44) | -.18 (.94) |
| Married | -.03 (1.80) | -.12 (.76) | .45 (.62) | -.96 (.63) |
| Local | -.22 (1.75) | -.61 (.70) | -.70 (.50) | -.68 (.72) |
| Christian | 5.27^ (2.88) | 2.61 (1.60) | -.32 (.84) | -.41 (1.10) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | -.09 (.64) | 1.65\* (.38) | .54\* (.24) | .77\* (.32) |
| Insulting | -12.64\* (1.27) | -1.07 (.69) | -.43 (.64) | .55 (.90) |
| Justifying Killing | -2.24 (3.43) | -.58 (2.09) |  |  |
| Derogating Blacks | -3.14 (2.61) | 1.59 (1.45) | -2.71 (2.19) | -2.56\* (.42) |
| Derogating whites | -6.24^ (3.67) | 1.25 (3.45) | .57 (1.14) | 7.18 (5.60) |
| Derogating both | 18.80 (13.20) | 5.01 (7.74) | 1.89 (3.51) | -3.19 (.70) |
| Constant | 14.35\* (2.91) | -4.15\* (1.35) | -.56 (1.04) | .42 (1.41) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .03 | .02 | .01 | .01 |
| *N* | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 |

*Note*: OLS coefficients, robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by Facebook ID. A 1.0 coefficient equals a 1 percentage point change in the rate of the outcome. \* *p*<.05, ^ *p*<.10 (two-sided)

**Table 7 for all comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Neg. AnyRace | Neg. toBlacks | Neg. toWhites | Neg. toBoth |
| **Commenter**  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -.79 (1.67) | -.18 (1.47) | -.56 (.72) | -.06 (.32) |
| Black | .98 (2.02) | -.17 (1.74) | .44 (.97) | .72 (.50) |
| Woman | -1.66 (1.16) | -1.68 (1.05) | -.56 (.51) | .57\* (.23) |
| College | -.30 (1.66) | -.40 (1.48) | .38 (.88) | -.27 (.36) |
| Married | -3.32\* (1.25) | -2.65\* (1.17) | -.87\* (.36) | .20 (.36) |
| Local | 1.16 (1.30) | 1.07 (1.20) | .21 (.53) | -.13 (.30) |
| Christian | -.15 (1.94) | .70 (1.86) | -.14 (.73) | -.72\* (.22) |
| **Comment**  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (log) | 1.11\* (.51) | .60 (.45) | .28 (.21) | .24^ (.14) |
| Justifying Killing | 5.51^ (2.91) | 7.96\* (2.42) | -2.63 (1.64) | .19^ (.11) |
| Constant | 5.91\* (2.26) | 5.74\* (2.07) | .88 (.84) | -.71 (.50) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 |
| *N* | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 | 2,528 |