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# **SI 1: Politics vs. Entertainment Study**

## ***SI 1.1: Model Producing Results in Figure 1***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| DV: Defection in Survey | LogitFig 1 | OLS |
|  |  |  |
| Politics | ***0.620*** | ***0.057*** |
|  | ***(0.291)*** | ***(0.027)*** |
| Contentious | 0.198 | 0.015 |
|  | (0.307) | (0.026) |
| Politics $×$ Contentious | -0.195 | -0.015 |
|  | (0.402) | (0.038) |
| Constant | ***-2.485*** | ***0.077*** |
|  | ***(0.227)*** | ***(0.019)*** |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,069 | 1,069 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

## ***SI 1.2 Patterns Among Remaining Participants in Politics vs. Entertainment***

We took respondents’ answers to the contentious questions and put them into a single scale (alpha=.84). Higher values indicate more liberal responses. We see a gender difference in the politics condition but not the entertainment condition. The second figure shows the distributions by issue. In the politics condition, we see gender differences for every issue except defense spending, considering race in hiring decisions, and the death penalty. For the entertainment condition, we see gender differences only for same-sex marriage.





# **SI 2: Studies 4 and 5: Dinner Conversation Studies**

## ***SI 2.1: Dinner Conversation 1: Model Producing Results in Figure 2***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| DV: Accepting Invitation | LogitFig 2 | OLS |
|  |  |  |
| Politics | ***-0.839*** | ***-0.204*** |
|  | ***(0.148)*** | ***(0.035)*** |
| Prompt | -0.031 | -0.007 |
|  | (0.153) | (0.035) |
| Politics $×$ Prompt | 0.059 | 0.014 |
|  | (0.210) | (0.050) |
| Constant | ***0.674*** | ***0.662*** |
|  | ***(0.108)*** | ***(0.025)*** |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,531 | 1,531 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

## ***SI 2.2: Dinner Conversation 2: Conflict Avoidance Patterns***

We use an equality of proportions t-test to compare average levels of conflict avoidance among participants who said they would accept the dinner invitation in the political condition versus the movies condition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Mean Conflict Avoidance (higher = more conflict avoidant) |
| Political Dinner | 0.374 |
| Movies Dinner | 0.496 |
| Total Observations:  | 471 |

## ***SI 2.3: Dinner Conversation 2: Model Producing Results in Figure 4***

In our initial set of results, we treat the deliberation condition (our second factor) as a nuisance factor, but we do control for it. We consider the role of the second factor in the next section of this SI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| DV: Accepting Invitation | Logit(Fig 4) | OLS |
|  |  |  |
| Politics | -0.225 | -0.046 |
|  | (0.230) | (0.049) |
| ***Conflict Avoidance*** | ***-0.873*** | ***-0.199*** |
|  | ***(0.206)*** | ***(0.045)*** |
| ***Politics*** $×$ ***Conflict Avoid.*** | ***-0.711*** | ***-0.177*** |
|  | (0.297) | (0.065) |
| Deliberation  | 0.074 | 0.162 |
|  | (0.145) | (0.032) |
| ***Constant*** | ***0.967*** | ***0.724*** |
|  | ***(0.178)*** | ***(0.038)*** |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 861 | 861 |
| R2 |  | 0.109 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

## ***SI 2.4: Dinner Conversation 2: Interacting Deliberation Treatment and Politics Treatment***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| DV: Accepting Invitation | SeekingLogit | AvoidantLogit | Seeking OLS | Avoidant OLS |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Politics | ***-1.340*** | ***-1.096*** | -0.030 | ***-0.259*** |
|  | ***(0.320)*** | ***(0.277)*** | (0.067) | ***(0.063)*** |
| Deliberation | 0.211 | -0.090 | 0.041 | -0.022 |
|  | (0.329) | (0.250) | (0.066) | (0.060) |
| Politics $×$ Deliberation | -0.178 | 0.301 | -0.034 | 0.067 |
|  | (0.461) | (0.378) | (0.095) | (0.087) |
| Constant | ***0.902*** | 0.179 | ***0.711*** | ***0.545*** |
|  | ***(0.224)*** | (0.181) | ***(0.046)*** | ***(0.044)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 368 | 493 | 368 | 493 |
| R2 |  |  | 0.004 | 0.052 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

## ***SI 2.5: Dinner Conversation 2: Robustness Checks, Models With Controls***

In the next set of models, we interact the politics (vs. movies) treatment and conflict avoidance, again treating deliberation as a nuisance factor. We also account for additional measures that address potential alternative explanations for accepting or declining the politics invitation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DV: Accepting Invitation | Logit*B*(*SE*)N = 861 | Logit*B*(*SE*)N = 821 | Logit*B*(*SE*)N = 821 |
| Politics | -0.224 (0.230) | -0.219 (0.241) | ***1.643*** ***(0.727)*** |
| Conflict Avoidance | ***-0.870******(0.206)*** | ***-0.654*** ***(0.222)*** | ***-0.751*** ***(0.233)*** |
| Politics × Conflict Avoidance | ***-0.712******(0.297)*** | ***-0.686******(0.315)*** | *-0.599**(0.328)* |
| Party ID Strength |  | -0.193(0.310) | -0.060 (0.442) |
| Ideology Strength |  | ***0.568*** ***(0.282)*** | 0.506 (0.409) |
| Affective Polarization |  | ***-0.815*** ***(0.357)*** | -0.509 (0.513) |
| Political Interest |  | ***1.441*** ***(0.331)*** | *0.879* *(0.455)* |
| Movies Interest |  | ***1.584******(0.310)*** | ***2.540******(0.454)*** |
| Education |  | 0.338 (0.348) | ***1.024*** ***(0.497)*** |
| Politics × Party ID Strength |  |  | -0.310 (0.625) |
| Politics × Ideology Strength |  |  | 0.049 (0.571) |
| Politics × Affective Polarization |  |  | -0.644 (0.722) |
| Politics × Political Interest |  |  | *1.109* *(0.673)* |
| Politics × Movies Interest |  |  | ***-1.961*** ***(0.630)*** |
| Politics × Education |  |  | *-1.328**(0.707)* |
| Intercept | ***1.003******(0.164)*** | ***-1.088*** ***(0.374)*** | ***-1.951*** ***(0.499)*** |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

# **SI 3: Study 2: Survey Selection Experiment 1 - Deliberation**

## ***SI 3.1 Left Side of Figure 3 of main manuscript***

We use an equality of proportions t-test to compare average levels of conflict avoidance among participants who selected the political survey and those who did not.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Mean Conflict Avoidance (higher = more conflict avoidant) |
| Selected Political Survey | 0.396 |
| Did not Select Political Survey | 0.529 |
| Total Observations:  | 732 |

*As we state in Figure 3: Those who select “neither” are excluded, but the results are substantively similar if “neither” is categorized as non-political. The specific title of the politics survey was experimentally manipulated, but those conditions are combined for this analysis.*

## ***SI 3.2 Model producing results discussed in text, models with controls***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| DV: Accepting Survey | Logit | OLS | Logit | OLS |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Deliberative | -0.022 | -0.005 | -0.005 | -0.001 |
|  | (0.251) | (0.060) | (0.257) | (0.060) |
| Conflict Avoidance | -0.226 | -0.055 | -0.073 | -0.019 |
|  | (0.262) | (0.062) | (0.270) | (0.062) |
| Delib. $×$ Conflict Avoid. | -0.184 | -0.042 | -0.275 | -0.061 |
|  | (0.374) | (0.087) | (0.383) | (0.087) |
| Debate | -0.003 | -0.001 | 0.020 | 0.004 |
|  | (0.254) | (0.060) | (0.262) | (0.061) |
| Debate $×$ Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.789*** | *-0.162* | ***-0.954*** | ***-0.192*** |
|  | ***(0.386)*** | *(0.087)* | ***(0.399)*** | ***(0.087)*** |
| Education | --- | --- | 0.137 | 0.035 |
|  |  |  | (0.441) | (0.098) |
| Partisan Strength | --- | --- | ***0.628*** | ***0.138*** |
|  |  |  | ***(0.241)*** | ***(0.052)*** |
| Gender | --- | --- | ***-0.418*** | ***-0.093*** |
|  |  |  | ***(0.167)*** | ***(0.037)*** |
| Income | --- | --- | -0.043 | -0.010 |
|  |  |  | (0.028) | (0.006) |
| Constant | -0.261 | ***0.435*** | -0.454 | ***0.393*** |
|  | (0.176) | ***(0.042)*** | (0.312) | ***(0.070)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 732 | 732 | 717 | 717 |
| R-squared |  | 0.027 |  | 0.048 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

## ***SI 3.3 Robustness checks, model with additional controls for education***

During the review process, we considered the possibility that it is comfort with politics due to knowledge that leads conflict avoiders to opt out of political settings – rather than worries about conflict. We address this idea using education as a proxy for knowledge (as our study did not include measures of knowledge, as this was not an a priori expectation). The results below focus on this alternative explanation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
| DV: Accepting Survey | Logit | OLS |
|  |  |  |
| Deliberative | 0.008 | 0.002 |
|  | (0.525) | (0.123) |
| Conflict Avoidance | -0.221 | -0.051 |
|  | (0.262) | (0.062) |
| Delib $×$ Conflict Avoid. | -0.198 | -0.033 |
|  | (0.375) | (0.124) |
| Debate | -0.173 | -0.0007 |
|  | (0.549) | (0.0602) |
| Debate $×$ Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.820*** | *-0.162* |
|  | ***(0.390)*** | *(0.0867)* |
| Education | 0.110 | *-0.167* |
|  | (0.684) | *(0.087)* |
| Debate $×$ Education | -0.066 | -0.016 |
|  | (0.983) | (0.230) |
| Delib $×$ Education | 0.357 | 0.067 |
|  | (1.038) | (0.233) |
| Constant | -0.312 | ***0.423*** |
|  | (0.361) | ***(0.085)*** |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 730 | 730 |
| R2 |  | 0.029 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).* |

# **SI 4: Study 3: Survey Selection Experiment 2 – Dialogue**

This survey selection experiment was conducted during the review process, based on questions raised by the reviewers. It was conducted as a pre-registered replication of the survey choice study presented in the original manuscript (now in DA 4). The reason we fielded the replication is because – as the reviewers noted -- the original survey selection experiment used wording that did not clearly convey the idea of deliberation.

Specifically, in the original study, some participants saw a condition in which they were asked whether they would participate in a survey about political issues on which there is contentious debate, while others saw a condition in which participants were told that the survey would be about contentious issues on which there is agreement (a third condition just mentioned political issues). As the reviewers suggested, a better comparison to the “contentious debate” is not agreement, but a respectful discourse on political issues. In addition, the reviewers wondered whether the other survey options offered to participants were simply more interesting than politics. Therefore, during the review process we fielded an additional study that addressed these questions.

In this study, we retained the three-condition structure of the survey study in the original manuscript, but shifted the language in the third condition; we also revised the additional survey options to make them more “boring.” We pre-registered our study here: <https://aspredicted.org/QFF_LWS> . However, shortly before fielding the study, we discovered that we made a typo in the pre-registration (in the description of the third condition), therefore before running the study, we filed a second pre-registration that corrects and denotes the actual treatment: <https://aspredicted.org/59F_JCN> .[[1]](#footnote-1)

## ***SI 4.1 Right Side of Figure 3 of Manuscript***

In our pre-registration we noted the possibility of fraudulent responding via MTurk, noting that we would use Qualtrics Data Quality options. We note that due to a programming error, the Qualtrics Data Quality options did not work in our study. We did notice that in our MTurk validation screen, a respondent entered their worker ID rather than the random digit generated; moreover, the same worker ID appeared twice. We removed this case in its second appearance. We also found a set of 9 cases that appeared fraudulent. We note, however, that whether these cases are included or excluded does not change our results.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean Conflict Avoidance (higher = more conflict avoidant) [none of the above excluded] | Mean Conflict Avoidance (higher = more conflict avoidant) [none of the above included] |
| Selected Political Survey | 0.345 | 0.345 |
| Did not Select Political Survey | 0.529 | 0.530 |
| Total Observations:  | 590 | 593 |

*As we state in Figure 3: Those who select “none of the above” are excluded in the figure, but the results are substantively similar if “neither” is categorized as non-political. The description of the politics survey was experimentally manipulated, but those conditions are combined for this analysis.*

## ***SI 4.2 Model Producing Results Discussed in Text***

Although we pre-registered that conflict avoidant people would be less likely to want to participate in the political survey, we pre-registered that the “respectful dialogue” condition would lead to an increased likelihood of participation; we do not see this pattern. We present the coefficients below and the findings do not support that expectation.

This is a surprising result. One possibility is that placing emphasis on respectful dialogue may be akin to the classic example of saying, “don’t imagine a pink elephant.” By emphasizing the lack of contentiousness, we may have actually been drawing *attention* to the contentiousness.

We do see differences between the conflict seeking and conflict avoidant participants in within every condition.[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | None of the Above Included | None of the Above Excluded |
|  |  |
|   |   | Logit | OLS | Logit | OLS |
| Conflict Avoidance  |  | -0.432 | -0.102 | -0.415 | -0.098 |
|  | (0.299) | (0.068) | (0.299) | (0.068) |
| Contentious Treatment  |  | -0.136 | -0.033 | -0.136 | -0.033 |
|  | (0.284) | (0.066) | (0.284) | (0.066) |
| Respectful Treatment |  | 0.009 | 0.002 | 0.025 | 0.006 |
|  | (0.272) | (0.063) | (0.272) | (0.063) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ Contentious  |  | -0.156 | -0.028 | -0.160 | -0.030 |
|  | (0.426) | (0.095) | (0.426) | (0.095) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ Respectful |  | ***-0.954*** | *-0.173* | ***-0.987*** | *-0.181* |
|  | ***(0.459)*** | *(0.095)* | ***(0.460)*** | *(0.096)* |
| Constant |  | -0.261 | ***0.435*** | -0.261 | ***0.435*** |
|  | (0.194) | ***(0.045)*** | (0.194) | ***(0.045)*** |
| R2 |   |   | 0.041 |   | 0.042 |
| N |   | 593 | 593 | 590 | 590 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed). Dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent chose the political survey and 0 if the respondent chose another survey option – the header for each model states whether respondents who chose “None of the Above” are included or excluded.* |

## ***SI 4.3 Robustness Checks, Models with Controls***

We again considered the possibility that it is comfort with politics due to knowledge that leads to conflict avoiders opting out of political settings – rather than worries about conflict. We address this idea using education as a proxy for knowledge. Although we ran this study during the review process, we did not include political knowledge measures as we wanted to minimize any pre-treatment measures in this case.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | None of the Above Included | None of the Above Excluded |
|  | Logit | OLS | Logit | OLS |
| Conflict Avoidance  | -0.422 | -0.098 | -0.405 | -0.095 |
|  | (0.300) | (0.0677) | (0.300) | (0.068) |
| Contentious Treatment  | 0.053 | 0.015 | 0.051 | 0.015 |
|  | (0.744) | (0.163) | (0.743) | (0.164) |
| Respectful Treatment | 0.560 | 0.125 | 0.661 | 0.146 |
|  | (0.756) | (0.164) | (0.764) | (0.166) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ Contentious | -0.149 | -0.027 | -0.153 | -0.029 |
|  | (0.428) | (0.095) | (0.428) | (0.095) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ Respectful | ***-0.974*** | *-0.178* | ***-1.017*** | *-0.187* |
|  | ***(0.463)*** | *(0.0959)* | ***(0.464)*** | *(0.096)* |
| Education | 0.124 | 0.028 | 0.120 | 0.028 |
|  | (0.128) | (0.029) | (0.128) | (0.029) |
| Education $×$ Contentious | -0.054 | -0.014 | -0.054 | -0.014 |
|  | (0.185) | (0.040) | (0.184) | (0.040) |
| Education $×$ Respectful | -0.151 | -0.034 | -0.174 | -0.038 |
|  | (0.194) | (0.042) | (0.195) | (0.042) |
| Constant  | -0.712 | ***0.332*** | -0.700 | ***0.334*** |
|  | (0.508) | ***(0.113)*** | (0.508) | ***(0.114)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R2 |  | 0.044 |  | 0.044 |
| N | 593 | 593 | 590 | 590 |
| *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed). Dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent chose the political survey and 0 if the respondent chose another survey option – the header for each model states whether respondents who chose “None of the Above” are included or excluded.* |

# **SI 5: Study 6: Conversations on Topics - Pew**

This data relies on Pew’s American Trends panel. Specifically, we rely on Wave 48 of the panel. We will merge Wave 48 with Wave 10 when we consider alternative explanations.

## ***SI 5.1: Models producing results in Figure 5***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Politics | Trump | Economy | Religion | Weather | Sports | Movies |
| Conflict Avoidance | ***-2.702*** | ***-2.452*** | ***-2.058*** | ***-1.776*** | ***-1.232*** | ***-0.487*** | ***-0.512*** |
| ***(0.148)*** | ***(0.147)*** | ***(0.125)*** | ***(0.106)*** | ***(0.303)*** | ***(0.103)*** | ***(0.158)*** |
| Democrat | ***0.750*** | ***0.713*** | 0.065 | ***0.445*** | -0.882 | 0.262 | ***0.573*** |
| ***(0.263)*** | ***(0.252)*** | (0.198) | ***(0.177)*** | (0.726) | (0.172) | ***(0.250)*** |
| Republican | ***0.896*** | ***1.243*** | ***0.427*** | ***0.600*** | *-1.204* | 0.104 | 0.186 |
| ***(0.267)*** | ***(0.257)*** | ***(0.202)*** | ***(0.180)*** | *(0.733)* | (0.174) | (0.252) |
| Ideology | 0.040 | -0.017 | -0.026 | ***-0.086*** | -0.129 | ***-0.130*** | ***0.133*** |
| (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.036) | ***(0.030)*** | (0.086) | ***(0.030)*** | ***(0.048)*** |
| Income | 0.003 | 0.025 | ***0.065*** | -0.009 | ***0.165*** | ***0.067*** | ***0.062*** |
| (0.016) | (0.016) | ***(0.014)*** | (0.012) | ***(0.034)*** | ***(0.012)*** | ***(0.018)*** |
| Religious Attendance | ***-0.073*** | ***-0.054*** | ***-0.048*** | ***-0.443*** | -0.001 | -0.010 | ***0.065*** |
| ***(0.021)*** | ***(0.021)*** | ***(0.019)*** | ***(0.017)*** | (0.047) | (0.016) | ***(0.023)*** |
| Age | ***0.164*** | ***0.195*** | ***0.548*** | ***0.104*** | ***0.302*** | ***0.107*** | ***-0.164*** |
| ***(0.034)*** | ***(0.034)*** | ***(0.031)*** | ***(0.025)*** | ***(0.077)*** | ***(0.025)*** | ***(0.039)*** |
| Female | ***-0.316*** | ***-0.275*** | ***-0.602*** | ***0.131*** | ***0.777*** | ***-0.511*** | ***0.383*** |
| ***(0.066)*** | ***(0.067)*** | ***(0.062)*** | ***(0.050)*** | ***(0.151)*** | ***(0.050)*** | ***(0.077)*** |
| Education | 0.011 | -0.032 | 0.019 | 0.023 | ***0.116*** | 0.010 | ***-0.107*** |
| (0.025) | (0.026) | (0.022) | (0.019) | ***(0.054)*** | (0.019) | ***(0.029)*** |
| Black | 0.144 | 0.091 | ***0.307*** | ***0.284*** | 0.379 | ***0.344*** | 0.263 |
| (0.170) | (0.166) | ***(0.146)*** | ***(0.126)*** | (0.299) | ***(0.130)*** | (0.204) |
| Hispanic | *-0.266* | 0.149 | -0.014 | 0.100 | 0.189 | -0.113 | 0.170 |
| *(0.160)* | (0.159) | (0.132) | (0.116) | (0.261) | (0.119) | (0.189) |
| White | 0.077 | ***0.261*** | 0.070 | ***0.296*** | ***0.937*** | -0.146 | 0.107 |
| (0.129) | ***(0.129)*** | (0.109) | ***(0.094)*** | ***(0.222)*** | (0.097) | (0.145) |
| Constant | 0.211 | 0.128 | ***0.887*** | ***2.257*** | ***2.520*** | ***1.028*** | ***1.674*** |
| (0.346) | (0.342) | ***(0.280)*** | ***(0.246)*** | ***(0.867)*** | ***(0.241)*** | ***(0.361)*** |
| N | 4,534 | 4,489 | 9,024 | 9,028 | 9,028 | 9,016 | 9,029 |

*Estimation method: Logit. Dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent is comfortable talking about the topic and 0 if they are uncomfortable. N lower for politics/Trump as respondents were randomly assigned to one of the two. Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

## ***SI 5.2 Alternative Specifications, Pew Data***

**SI 5.2.1 Results with the 4-point dependent variable**

As we dichotomize the dependent variable in the main results in the manuscript, we include the models using the full range of the measure below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Politics | Trump | Economy | Religion | Weather | Sports | Movies |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-1.257*** | ***-1.222*** | ***-0.814*** | ***-0.833*** | ***-0.165*** | ***-0.288*** | ***-0.241*** |
| ***(0.055)*** | ***(0.059)*** | ***(0.032)*** | ***(0.039)*** | ***(0.023)*** | ***(0.045)*** | ***(0.032)*** |
| Democrat | ***0.271*** | ***0.349*** | 0.049 | ***0.207*** | 0.049 | ***0.175*** | ***0.194*** |
| ***(0.098)*** | ***(0.106)*** | (0.056) | ***(0.068)*** | (0.040) | ***(0.079)*** | ***(0.056)*** |
| Republican | ***0.321*** | ***0.568*** | ***0.180*** | ***0.286*** | 0.023 | 0.088 | 0.092 |
| ***(0.100)*** | ***(0.108)*** | ***(0.057)*** | ***(0.069)*** | (0.041) | (0.080) | (0.057) |
| Ideology | 0.018 | -0.013 | ***-0.022*** | ***-0.040*** | -0.006 | ***-0.062*** | ***0.024*** |
| (0.016) | (0.017) | ***(0.009)*** | ***(0.011)*** | (0.007) | ***(0.013)*** | ***(0.009)*** |
| Income | 0.003 | 0.005 | ***0.018*** | -0.006 | ***0.022*** | ***0.034*** | ***0.016*** |
| (0.006) | (0.007) | ***(0.004)*** | (0.004) | ***(0.003)*** | ***(0.005)*** | ***(0.004)*** |
| Religious | ***-0.042*** | ***-0.037*** | ***-0.013*** | ***-0.189*** | 0.002 | -0.011 | ***0.019*** |
| ***(0.008)*** | ***(0.009)*** | ***(0.005)*** | ***(0.006)*** | (0.003) | (0.007) | ***(0.005)*** |
| Age | ***0.090*** | ***0.095*** | ***0.166*** | ***0.048*** | ***0.033*** | ***0.047*** | ***-0.058*** |
| ***(0.013)*** | ***(0.015)*** | ***(0.008)*** | ***(0.009)*** | ***(0.006)*** | ***(0.011)*** | ***(0.008)*** |
| Woman | ***-0.180*** | ***-0.141*** | ***-0.192*** | *0.034* | ***0.089*** | ***-0.277*** | ***0.115*** |
| ***(0.026)*** | ***(0.029)*** | ***(0.015)*** | *(0.019)* | ***(0.011)*** | ***(0.022)*** | ***(0.015)*** |
| Education | ***0.006*** | -0.015 | 0.003 | 0.002 | ***0.015*** | 0.006 | ***-0.027*** |
| (0.010) | (0.011) | (0.006) | (0.007) | ***(0.004)*** | (0.008) | ***(0.006)*** |
| Black | 0.107 | 0.000 | ***0.135*** | ***0.143*** | 0.044 | ***0.211*** | ***0.124*** |
| (0.067) | (0.072) | ***(0.039)*** | ***(0.047)*** | (0.028) | ***(0.054)*** | ***(0.039)*** |
| Hispanic | -0.044 | 0.036 | -0.049 | 0.023 | -0.019 | -0.034 | 0.051 |
| (0.063) | (0.068) | (0.037) | (0.044) | (0.026) | (0.051) | (0.037) |
| White | 0.056 | *0.099* | -0.017 | ***0.102*** | ***0.090*** | -0.045 | 0.025 |
| (0.051) | *(0.055)* | (0.030) | ***(0.036)*** | ***(0.021)*** | (0.042) | (0.030) |
| Constant | ***2.654*** | ***2.725*** | ***2.986*** | ***3.531*** | ***3.404*** | ***3.013*** | ***3.313*** |
| ***(0.133)*** | ***(0.145)*** | ***(0.077)*** | ***(0.093)*** | ***(0.055)*** | ***(0.108)*** | ***(0.077)*** |
| Observations | 4,534 | 4,489 | 9,024 | 9,028 | 9,028 | 9,016 | 9,029 |
| R2 | 0.150 | 0.146 | 0.178 | 0.191 | 0.037 | 0.049 | 0.042 |

*Estimation method: OLS. N is lower for politics/Trump as participants were randomly assigned to one of the two*. *Dependent variable is increasing levels of comfort with discussing the topic.* *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

**SI 5.2.2 Weighted results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Politics | Trump | Economy | Religion | Weather | Sports | Movies |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.567*** | ***-0.506*** | ***-0.264*** | ***-0.372*** | ***-0.038*** | ***-0.107*** | ***-0.039*** |
| ***(0.044)*** | ***(0.043)*** | ***(0.029)*** | ***(0.031)*** | ***(0.017)*** | ***(0.032)*** | ***(0.018)*** |
| Democrat | ***0.193*** | *0.112* | -0.015 | ***0.109*** | ***-0.041*** | 0.031 | 0.034 |
| ***(0.069)*** | *(0.061)* | (0.057) | ***(0.052)*** | ***(0.017)*** | (0.054) | (0.032) |
| Republican | ***0.234*** | ***0.222*** | 0.034 | ***0.136*** | ***-0.039*** | 0.003 | -0.007 |
| ***(0.069)*** | ***(0.064)*** | (0.058) | ***(0.053)*** | ***(0.018)*** | (0.055) | (0.032) |
| Ideology | 0.003 | -0.005 | -0.004 | ***-0.033*** | -0.001 | ***-0.030*** | 0.001 |
| (0.014) | (0.013) | (0.010) | ***(0.010)*** | (0.006) | ***(0.010)*** | (0.007) |
| Income | 0.001 | ***0.011*** | ***0.008*** | 0.003 | ***0.008*** | ***0.012*** | ***0.007*** |
| (0.005) | ***(0.005)*** | ***(0.003)*** | (0.004) | ***(0.002)*** | ***(0.004)*** | ***(0.002)*** |
| Religious | ***-0.019*** | ***-0.020*** | ***-0.015*** | ***-0.081*** | -0.001 | -0.005 | ***0.009*** |
| ***(0.007)*** | ***(0.007)*** | ***(0.004)*** | ***(0.005)*** | (0.003) | (0.005) | ***(0.003)*** |
| Age | ***0.053*** | ***0.048*** | ***0.085*** | ***0.023*** | ***0.017*** | ***0.038*** | ***-0.012*** |
| ***(0.011)*** | ***(0.011)*** | ***(0.007)*** | ***(0.008)*** | ***(0.004)*** | ***(0.008)*** | ***(0.005)*** |
| Woman | ***-0.080*** | ***-0.070*** | -0.091 | -0.001 | ***0.023*** | ***-0.109*** | ***0.038*** |
| ***(0.022)*** | ***(0.022)*** | (0.014) | (0.015) | ***(0.008)*** | ***(0.015)*** | ***(0.009)*** |
| Education | -0.001 | -0.005 | 0.006 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.005 | -0.005 |
| (0.008) | (0.008) | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.002) | (0.005) | (0.004) |
| Black | 0.045 | 0.007 | 0.039 | *0.075* | 0.042 | ***0.088*** | *0.049* |
| (0.058) | (0.056) | (0.037) | *(0.040)* | (0.026) | ***(0.036)*** | *(0.029)* |
| Hispanic | -0.021 | -0.010 | 0.026 | 0.039 | 0.027 | 0.000 | 0.040 |
| (0.055) | (0.052) | (0.035) | (0.038) | (0.026) | (0.036) | (0.029) |
| White | 0.018 | 0.056 | 0.021 | *0.053* | ***0.054*** | -0.032 | ***0.049*** |
| (0.046) | (0.042) | (0.028) | *(0.031)* | ***(0.021)*** | (0.029) | ***(0.024)*** |
| Constant | ***0.502*** | ***0.547*** | ***0.703*** | ***0.950*** | ***0.872*** | ***0.725*** | ***0.815*** |
| ***(0.100)*** | ***(0.098)*** | ***(0.077)*** | ***(0.074)*** | ***(0.037)*** | ***(0.075)*** | ***(0.048)*** |
| Observations | 4,534 | 4,489 | 9,024 | 9,028 | 9,028 | 9,016 | 9,029 |
| R2 | 0.117 | 0.133 | 0.107 | 0.142 | 0.038 | 0.044 | 0.020 |

*Estimation method: OLS. N is lower for politics/Trump as participants were randomly assigned to one of the two*. *Dependent variable is increasing levels of comfort with discussing the topic.* *Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

**SI 5.2.3. Seemingly Unrelated Regression**

The politics and Trump conditions are randomly assigned; we estimate separate models for each.

Trump Condition

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Trump | Trump | Trump | Trump | Trump |
|   | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.532*** | ***0.030*** | ***-0.533*** | ***0.030*** | ***-0.536*** | ***0.030*** | ***-0.537*** | ***0.030*** | ***-0.533*** | ***0.030*** |
| Democrat | ***0.155*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.154*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.161*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.163*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.155*** | ***0.054*** |
| Republican | ***0.269*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.270*** | ***0.054*** | ***0.275*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.278*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.270*** | ***0.054*** |
| Ideology | -0.003 | 0.009 | -0.002 | 0.009 | -0.002 | 0.009 | -0.003 | 0.009 | -0.002 | 0.009 |
| Income | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.003 |
| Religious | ***-0.012*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.012*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.012*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.012*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.012*** | ***0.005*** |
| Age | ***0.042*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.043*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.042*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.042*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.043*** | ***0.007*** |
| Woman | ***-0.060*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.058*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.058*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.058*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.060*** | ***0.015*** |
| Education | -0.007 | 0.005 | -0.007 | 0.005 | -0.007 | 0.005 | -0.008 | 0.005 | -0.007 | 0.005 |
| Black | 0.022 | 0.036 | 0.023 | 0.036 | 0.022 | 0.036 | 0.025 | 0.036 | 0.023 | 0.036 |
| Hispanic | 0.032 | 0.035 | 0.033 | 0.035 | 0.030 | 0.035 | 0.032 | 0.035 | 0.033 | 0.035 |
| White | ***0.058*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.057*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.058*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.057*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.058*** | ***0.028*** |
| Constant | ***0.528*** | ***0.073*** | ***0.521*** | ***0.073*** | ***0.519*** | ***0.073*** | ***0.522*** | ***0.073*** | ***0.524*** | ***0.073*** |
| R2 | 0.116 | 0.116 | 0.117 | 0.117 | 0.116 |
|   | Economy | Religion | Weather | Sports | Movies |
|   | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.283*** | ***0.024*** | ***-0.344*** | ***0.029*** | ***-0.026*** | ***0.009*** | ***-0.126*** | ***0.029*** | -0.015 | 0.019 |
| Democrat | -0.057 | 0.042 | 0.063 | 0.051 | -0.016 | 0.017 | *0.086* | *0.052* | ***0.079*** | ***0.034*** |
| Republican | -0.011 | 0.043 | *0.099* | *0.052* | -0.026 | 0.017 | 0.042 | 0.052 | 0.044 | 0.035 |
| Ideology | 0.005 | 0.007 | -0.013 | 0.008 | -0.003 | 0.003 | ***-0.022*** | ***0.008*** | ***0.019*** | ***0.006*** |
| Income | ***0.013*** | ***0.003*** | 0.000 | 0.003 | ***0.004*** | ***0.001*** | ***0.015*** | ***0.003*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.002*** |
| Religious | ***-0.011*** | ***0.004*** | ***-0.087*** | ***0.004*** | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.005 | 0.004 | ***0.006*** | ***0.003*** |
| Age | ***0.075*** | ***0.006*** | ***0.027*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.006*** | ***0.002*** | ***0.015*** | ***0.007*** | ***-0.010*** | ***0.005*** |
| Woman | ***-0.076*** | ***0.011*** | *0.024* | *0.014* | *0.008* | *0.004* | ***-0.092*** | ***0.014*** | ***0.031*** | ***0.009*** |
| Education | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.005 | ***0.003*** | ***0.002*** | 0.008 | 0.005 | ***-0.012*** | ***0.003*** |
| Black | 0.028 | 0.028 | ***0.093*** | ***0.035*** | -0.002 | 0.011 | *0.067* | *0.035* | 0.008 | 0.023 |
| Hispanic | -0.005 | 0.027 | 0.031 | 0.033 | -0.013 | 0.011 | -0.015 | 0.033 | 0.004 | 0.022 |
| White | 0.015 | 0.022 | ***0.068*** | ***0.027*** | 0.013 | 0.009 | -0.036 | 0.027 | -0.011 | 0.018 |
| Constant | ***0.756*** | ***0.057*** | ***0.921*** | ***0.070*** | ***0.958*** | ***0.023*** | ***0.691*** | ***0.070*** | ***0.791*** | ***0.046*** |
| R2 | 0.109 | 0.146 | 0.016 | 0.036 | 0.027 |
| Observations | 4483 | 4485 | 4482 | 4476 | 4484 |

*OLS; dichotomous dependent variable – coded 1 if respondent is comfortable discussing the topics and 0 if they are uncomfortable. Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

Politics Condition

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Politics | Politics | Politics | Politics | Politics |
|   | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.606*** | ***0.031*** | ***-0.608*** | ***0.031*** | ***-0.608*** | ***0.031*** | ***-0.605*** | ***0.031*** | ***-0.607*** | ***0.031*** |
| Democrat | ***0.165*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.157*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.165*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.158*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.165*** | ***0.055*** |
| Republican | ***0.196*** | ***0.056*** | ***0.189*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.198*** | ***0.056*** | ***0.187*** | ***0.055*** | ***0.196*** | ***0.056*** |
| Ideology | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.008 | 0.009 |
| Income | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.003 |
| Religious | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** |
| Age | ***0.036*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.036*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.036*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.037*** | ***0.007*** | ***0.037*** | ***0.007*** |
| Woman | ***-0.072*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.072*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.072*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.073*** | ***0.015*** | ***-0.072*** | ***0.015*** |
| Education | 0.003 | 0.006 | 0.002 | 0.006 | 0.002 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.006 |
| Black | 0.030 | 0.038 | 0.035 | 0.038 | 0.035 | 0.037 | 0.033 | 0.038 | 0.031 | 0.038 |
| Hispanic | *-0.061* | *0.035* | *-0.061* | *0.035* | *-0.058* | *0.035* | *-0.059* | *0.035* | *-0.060* | *0.035* |
| White | 0.015 | 0.029 | 0.017 | 0.029 | 0.018 | 0.029 | 0.017 | 0.029 | 0.017 | 0.029 |
| Constant | ***0.557*** | ***0.074*** | ***0.565*** | ***0.074*** | ***0.552*** | ***0.074*** | ***0.560*** | ***0.074*** | ***0.556*** | ***0.074*** |
| R2 | 0.111 | 0.112 | 0.112 | 0.111 | 0.112 |
|   | Economy | Religion | Weather | Sports | Movies |
|   | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. | Coef. | Std.Err. |
| Conflict Avoid. | ***-0.302*** | ***0.025*** | ***-0.368*** | ***0.029*** | ***-0.032*** | ***0.010*** | ***-0.066*** | ***0.029*** | ***-0.065*** | ***0.019*** |
| Democrat | *0.077* | *0.045* | ***0.127*** | ***0.052*** | -0.017 | 0.018 | 0.037 | 0.052 | 0.026 | 0.033 |
| Republican | ***0.121*** | ***0.045*** | ***0.156*** | ***0.053*** | -0.024 | 0.018 | 0.016 | 0.053 | -0.008 | 0.034 |
| Ideology | -0.008 | 0.007 | ***-0.020*** | ***0.009*** | -0.004 | 0.003 | ***-0.030*** | ***0.009*** | 0.004 | 0.006 |
| Income | ***0.008*** | ***0.003*** | -0.002 | 0.003 | ***0.005*** | ***0.001*** | ***0.012*** | ***0.003*** | ***0.004*** | ***0.002*** |
| Religious | -0.004 | 0.004 | ***-0.089*** | ***0.004*** | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.004 | *0.005* | *0.003* |
| Age | ***0.080*** | ***0.006*** | *0.014* | *0.007* | ***0.008*** | ***0.002*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.007*** | ***-0.016*** | ***0.005*** |
| Woman | ***-0.078*** | ***0.012*** | ***0.031*** | ***0.014*** | ***0.028*** | ***0.005*** | ***-0.110*** | ***0.014*** | ***0.035*** | ***0.009*** |
| Education | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.002 | 0.002 | -0.004 | 0.005 | *-0.006* | *0.003* |
| Black | ***0.066*** | ***0.030*** | 0.032 | 0.036 | ***0.029*** | ***0.012*** | *0.059* | *0.036* | 0.033 | 0.023 |
| Hispanic | -0.012 | 0.029 | 0.020 | 0.034 | ***0.022*** | ***0.011*** | -0.029 | 0.033 | 0.023 | 0.021 |
| White | 0.006 | 0.023 | ***0.057*** | ***0.027*** | ***0.041*** | ***0.009*** | -0.022 | 0.027 | 0.028 | 0.017 |
| Constant | ***0.617*** | ***0.060*** | ***0.951*** | ***0.070*** | ***0.912*** | ***0.024*** | ***0.742*** | ***0.070*** | ***0.888*** | ***0.045*** |
| R2 | 0.109 | 0.145 | 0.023 | 0.035 | 0.018 |
| Observations | 4524 | 4524 | 4529 | 4520 | 4528 |

*OLS; dichotomous dependent variable – coded 1 if respondent is comfortable discussing the topics and 0 if they are uncomfortable. Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

# **SI 6: Study 7: Conversations on Issues**

## ***SI 6.1: Models Generating Main Results in Manuscript***

Results generating Figure 6 in the main manuscript, along with the model for the full 4-point comfort dependent variable:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| DV: Willing to discuss | Binary DV OLS | 4-Point DVOLS | Binary DVLogit (Figure 6) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Climate Change | -0.059 | -0.064 | -0.562 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.128) | (0.538) |
| Conflict Avoidance  | ***-0.466*** | ***0.748*** | ***-2.519*** |
|  | ***(0.080)*** | ***(0.141)*** | ***(0.529)*** |
| Climate $×$ Conflict Avoid | ***0.373*** | ***-0.460*** | ***1.924*** |
|  | ***(0.010)*** | ***(0.177)*** | ***(0.636)*** |
| Racial Inequality | ***-0.159*** | 0.122 | ***-1.194*** |
|  | ***(0.071)*** | (0.126) | ***(0.513)*** |
| Racial $×$ Conflict Avoid | ***0.283*** | -0.242 | ***1.693*** |
|  | ***(0.010)*** | (0.176) | ***(0.606)*** |
| Lobbying/ Government | ***-0.148*** | 0.120 | ***-1.134*** |
|  | ***(0.073)*** | (0.129) | ***(0.521)*** |
| Lobbying $×$ Conflict Avoid | 0.068 | 0.037 | 0.798 |
|  | (0.100) | (0.177) | (0.613) |
| Constant | ***0.907*** | ***1.796*** | ***2.282*** |
|  | ***(0.059)*** | ***(0.105)*** | ***(0.469)*** |
|  |  |  |  |
| R2 | 0.138 | 0.162 | NA |
| Observations | 752 | 752 | 752 |

*Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed).*

## ***SI 6.2: Robustness Checks***

As with our previous analyses, we include robustness checks as controls. We are limited again, however, to variables we included pre-treatment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | Logit (Binary) | OLS(Binary) |
|  |  |  |
| Climate Change | -0.577 | -0.061 |
|  | (0.540) | (0.072) |
| Conflict Avoidance | ***-2.519*** | ***-0.463*** |
|  | ***(0.531)*** | ***(0.080)*** |
| Climate $×$ Conflict Avoid | ***1.968*** | ***0.379*** |
|  | ***(0.639)*** | ***(0.010)*** |
| Racial Inequality | ***-1.203*** | ***-0.160*** |
|  | ***(0.514)*** | ***(0.071)*** |
| Racial $×$ Conflict Avoid | ***1.680*** | ***0.279*** |
|  | ***(0.608)*** | ***(0.010)*** |
| Lobbying/Government | ***-1.133*** | ***-0.147*** |
|  | ***(0.522)*** | ***(0.073)*** |
| Lobby $×$ Conflict Avoid | 0.780 | 0.064 |
|  | (0.615) | (0.100) |
| Ideology | -0.077 | -0.014 |
|  | (0.050) | (0.009) |
| White | -0.247 | -0.045 |
|  | (0.210) | (0.038) |
| Education | 0.004 | -0.0002 |
|  | (0.094) | (0.017) |
| Constant | ***2.764*** | ***0.993*** |
|  | ***(0.642)*** | ***(0.010)*** |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 752 | 752 |
| R2 |  | 0.143 |

*Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed). Dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent is comfortable talking about the topic and 0 if the respondent is uncomfortable.*

# **SI 7: Study 8: Engagement and Politics**

Coefficients for model to produce Figure 7. This is based on TESS data, and our original TESS proposal noted that we would also consider the results without conflict avoidance. We present those results below as well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | (1) | (2) |
|   | No CA | Figure 7 |
| Law and Policies (LP) | ***0.220*** | -0.081 |
| ***(0.078)*** | (0.217) |
| Law and Policies to Fix Problems (LPFP) | ***0.268*** | -0.122 |
| ***(0.080)*** | (0.220) |
| Debate Law and Policies (DLP) | ***-0.195*** | -0.270 |
| ***(0.079)*** | (0.209) |
| Debate Law and Policies to Fix Problems (DLPFP) | 0.007 | 0.017 |
| (0.079) | (0.214) |
| Conflict Avoidance  |  | ***-1.486*** |
|  | ***(0.265)*** |
| Conflict Avoid $×$LP |  | 0.578 |
|  | (0.385) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ LPFP |  | ***0.762*** |
|  | ***(0.386)*** |
| Conflict Avoid $×$ DLP |  | 0.167 |
|  | (0.366) |
| Conflict Avoid $×$DLPFP |  | 0.012 |
|  | (0.376) |
| Constant | ***2.820*** | ***3.705*** |
| ***(0.057)*** | ***(0.150)*** |
| N | 2005 | 1994 |
| R2 | 0.02 | 0.07 |

*OLS. Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed). The dependent variable is coded from 1 to 5 with larger values indicating greater interest.*

# **SI 8: Relationship between Demographic Characteristics and Conflict Avoidance**

In what follows, we consider the relationships between conflict orientation and various characteristics. First, we follow Sydnor (2019) and consider the characteristics which Sydnor writes previous research would suggest could be most correlated with conflict orientation: age, gender, race, education and income. We also consider whether additional characteristics associated with political marginality – being a minority religion, not having citizenship, being an immigrant – are associated with conflict avoidance.

Since this section relies on considerations of demographics, we rely on three large, national datasets – Pew (the data used in the original manuscript), NORC (new data added to the manuscript during the review process), YouGov (new data collected during the review process). Not all the datasets have measures for all the characteristics, which is why we cannot show certain patterns using some of the datasets. We note that the conflict avoidance orientation measures are on different scales, as they use different measures.

Across these three datasets, we find that the most consistent correlation is between gender and conflict orientation (and idea we address in SI 14 in greater depth). In particular, the relationships between conflict orientation and other factors seem dataset-specific and dependent on model-specification (and are not robust to even small changes in specification). This is also in line with Sydnor (2019), who tracks the same characteristics across different datasets, and also finds the most consistent relationship is between gender and conflict avoidance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pew | Pew-weighted | NORC | NORC-weighted | YouGov | YouGov - weighted |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | ***0.0969*** | ***0.0946*** | ***0.082*** | ***0.062*** | ***0.178*** | ***0.179*** |
|  | ***(0.00444)*** | ***(0.00710)*** | ***(0.009)*** | ***(0.012)*** | ***(0.0326)*** | ***(0.0381)*** |
| Latinx | ***-0.0360*** | -0.0172 | 0.014 | -0.003 | 0.0145 | -0.00335 |
|  | ***(0.00781)*** | (0.0120) | (0.012) | (0.019) | (0.0494) | (0.0700) |
| Asian | ***0.0331*** | ***0.0349*** | 0.003 | 0.021 | ***0.317*** | ***0.389*** |
|  | ***(0.0132)*** | ***(0.0174)*** | (0.032) | (0.036) | ***(0.114)*** | ***(0.0792)*** |
| Black | ***-0.0937*** | ***-0.0686*** | -0.023 | -0.023 | -0.044 | -0.0522 |
|  | ***(0.00796)*** | ***(0.0122)*** | (0.014) | (0.018) |  (0.0522) | (0.0660) |
| Education | ***0.00767*** | ***0.00661*** | -0.002 | -0.006 | ***-0.040*** | ***-0.0462*** |
|  | ***(0.00167)*** | ***(0.00250)*** | (0.005) | (0.006) | ***(0.0118)*** | ***(0.0138)*** |
| Age | 0.00164 | *0.00681* | ***0.0014*** | ***0.0016*** | ***0.0033*** | ***0.00340*** |
|  | (0.00229) | *(0.00374)* | ***(0.0002)*** | ***(0.0003)*** | ***(0.00097)*** | ***(0.00123)*** |
| Income | *-0.00190* | ***-0.00437*** | 0.001 | 0.002 | ***-0.0142*** | *-0.0108* |
|  | *(0.00108)* | ***(0.00177)*** | (0.001) | (0.002) | ***(0.00505)*** | *(0.00575)* |
| Minority | 0.00884 | 0.0138 | ***-0.058*** | ***-0.088*** | 0.0888 | 0.0416 |
| Religion | (0.00909) | (0.0144) | ***(0.022)*** | ***(0.033)*** | (0.080) | (0.0832) |
| Immigrant  | 0.00140 | -0.0362 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0619) | (0.0850) |  |  |  |  |
| Citizen  | -0.00845 | -0.0445 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0599) | (0.0821) |  |  |  |  |
| Immigrant $×$ | -0.00316 | 0.0570 |  |  |  |  |
| Citizen | (0.0624) | (0.0862) |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | ***0.404*** | ***0.446*** | ***0.416*** | ***0.431*** | ***0.489*** | ***0.473*** |
|  | ***(0.0606)*** | ***(0.0836)*** | ***(0.022)*** | ***(0.027)*** | ***(0.0734)*** | ***(0.0984)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 9,077 | 9,077 | 1,998 | 1,998 | 889 | 889 |
| R2 | 0.066 | 0.060 | 0.061 | 0.054 | 0.090 | 0.092 |

*OLS; Bold and italics p<.05; italics only p<.10 (two-tailed). Dependent variable in each model is conflict avoidance.*

# **SI 9: Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research**

The studies conducted by the researchers were approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) at their respective institutions; these studies were deemed to be of minimal risk. In this section we describe the studies following American Political Science Association’s Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research:

* **Power:** APSA guidelines specify that researchers should be aware of potential power differentials. The studies in this manuscript are not conducted with participant populations and communities that our IRBs define as vulnerable. Still, we take a number of steps in our studies to ensure that there is no coercion. In cases where we interact with participants more directly (e.g. Prolific and MTurk) participants could skip any questions they wished and would still obtain payment. In cases where studies were conducted by a survey company (e.g. ResearchNow and YouGov), we had no direct interaction with the participants, which further minimizes potential for coercion. In all studies participants were never asked for any identifying information.
* **Consent:** All studies fielded by the researchers in this manuscript included informed consent.[[3]](#footnote-3) Since all the studies in this manuscript were fielded online, the consent screen was shown to participants first. In cases where we contracted with a survey company to field the study participants not only consented to being in our study, but also consented to being part of the survey company’s standing panel.
* **Deception:** There is no deception in this research, as across our studies participants are asked questions that are hypothetical and there are no informational treatments. We note that one of the IRBs reviewing this research deems random assignment as potentially deceptive; therefore, participants were debriefed at the end of the studies and told that other participants may have been assigned to a slightly different version of the questions.
* **Harm:** Following our assessment and the evaluation of our IRBs, the potential for harm in our studies is low. Our studies are short and do not offer deceptive information; there are no social or economic harms that could result from these studies.
* **Confidentiality:** The survey software we use (Qualtrics) has confidentiality protections. Next, we do not ask any questions that could produce identifying information. Further, in the consent screen participants are informed of the steps we’ve taken to ensure confidentiality – which is in line with APSA guidelines.
* **Impact:** Per APSA guidelines: “In general, political science researchers should not com- promise the integrity of political processes for research purposes without the consent of individuals that are directly engaged by the research process.” Our designs ask unobtrusive questions participants about their preferences in participating in political studies and conversations; these questions do not offer any additional political information that the participant does not already have
* **Compensation:** Payment for studies run via Prolific and MTurk is commensurate with hourly wages in the states where the researcher located. In studies that are fielded via ResearchNow and YouGov, participants are compensated with points determined by the survey company based on the length of study. Participants can then turn these points into either gift cards or other financial rewards – this is detailed to participants upon joining the survey panel.
1. The issue was as follows. In the original pre-registration (#104657, 8/14/2022) we listed our third condition as “contentious political issues on which there is respectful dialogue” – this was, however, not correct. The correct condition was “political issues on which there is respectful dialogue.” Therefore, we noted this in the correction to the pre-registration (#105310, 8/23/2022). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. When we include the 9 flagged cases, we find very similar results. The differences in selecting the political survey by conflict avoidance within condition are as follows. None of the above excluded: Base = -0.095 (p=0.157); Contentious = -0.120 (p=0.072); Respectful = -0.286 (p<0.001). None of the above include: Base = -0.098 (p=0.140); Contentious = -0.122 (p=0.066); Respectful = -0.282 (p<0.001) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. We note that the Pew study was not initiated, designed, or fielded by the authors of this manuscript. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)