**Supporting Information**

**Study 1**

**Full Text of News Transcript.**

*Moderate Protest Condition:*

We are outside of MCC Cosmetics testing lab on this chaotic morning where a group of animal advocates calling themselves Free the Vulnerable are marching to demand that all the animals kept here for testing of cosmetic products be freed from captivity. The MCC Cosmetics public relations manager here tells me about thirty people have trespassed onto the property as they march back and forth in protest.

We’ve learned that these animal rights advocates plan to stay here until the hundreds of animals including hamsters, guinea pigs, sheep, and two chimpanzees are either released back into the wild or taken to animal refuges to live out the remainder of their days.

To gain further insight, this morning I spoke with a man named Andrew who claims to be the leader of Free the Vulnerable.  Here’s what he had to say:

“It is about time we recognize that animals do not belong to us. They are not ours to torture however we want. They deserve to have a happy, fulfilled life, free of cages and pain. Today we fight to restore justice. To make things right. Everyone should join us! FREE THE VULNERABLE!”

Back to you Tom and Linda

*Extreme Protest Condition:*

We are outside of MCC Cosmetics testing lab on this chaotic morning where last night a group of animal advocates calling themselves Free the Vulnerable snuck into the testing lab and freed all the animals from captivity. The MCC Cosmetics public relations manager here tells me their security cameras caught about thirty people trespassing onto the property, breaking open the cages, and releasing the animals.

We’ve learned that these animal rights advocates waited until all employees had gone home for the night except for a security guard. Apparently they snuck past him somehow and then they rigged open the locks of the back of the building and quietly freed the hundreds of animals including hamsters, guinea pigs, sheep, and two chimpanzees. The advocates, we’ve been told gathered all of the animals together and brought them to the woods to release some.  Others they took to undisclosed animal refuges.

To gain further insight, this morning I spoke with a man named Andrew who claims to be the leader of Free the Vulnerable.  Here’s what he had to say:

 “It is about time we recognize that animals do not belong to us. They are not ours to torture however we want. They deserve to have a happy, fulfilled life, free of cages and pain. Today we restored justice. We made things right. Everyone should join us! FREE THE VULNERABLE!”

Back to you Tom and Linda

*Highly Extreme Protest Condition:*

We are outside of MCC Cosmetics testing lab on this chaotic morning where last night a group of animal advocates calling themselves Free the Vulnerable snuck into the testing lab and freed all the animals from captivity. The MCC Cosmetics public relations manager here tells me their security cameras caught about thirty people trespassing onto the property, breaking open the cages, and releasing the animals.

We’ve learned that these animal rights advocates waited until all employees had gone home for the night except for a security guard. Then they broke open the front door of the building and drugged the security guard so he was incapacitated while they ransacked the place and spray painted the walls of the building with the word “IMMORAL” all over, as you can see behind me. Finally, the advocates freed the hundreds of animals including hamsters, guinea pigs, sheep, and two chimpanzees. We’ve been told they gathered all of the animals together and brought them to the woods to release some.  Others they took to undisclosed animal refuges.

To gain further insight, this morning I spoke with a man named Andrew who claims to be the leader of Free the Vulnerable.  Here’s what he had to say:

“It is about time we recognize that animals do not belong to us. They are not ours to torture however we want. They deserve to have a happy, fulfilled life, free of cages and pain. Today we restored justice. We made things right. Everyone should join us! FREE THE VULNERABLE!”

Back to you Tom and Linda

**Post-Manipulation Questions**

*Extremity*

How extreme do you find the protesters’ behavior to be?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not extreme at all) to 5(Very much extreme).

*Social Identification*

How similar do you feel to these activists?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal).

*Support*

How much do you support the activists described in the news report?

How willing or unwilling would you be to join this group as a member?

Overall, how much do you support FTV’s cause (ending the use of animal testing)?

Participants responded to the first and third items on a scale from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal), and the second item on a scale ranging from 1(Not willing at all) to 5(Completely willing).

**Study 2**

**Full Text of News Article.**

*Original article excerpt used for Extreme Protest condition:*

Black Lives Matter protesters marching on the Minnesota state fair on Saturday marched to protest police violence against Blacks.

 “Pigs in a blanket, fry ’em like bacon,” activists with the St. Paul, Minn. Branch of Black Lives Matter chanted while marching behind a group of police officers down a highway just south of the state fair grounds.

Carrying signs reading “End White Supremacy” and “Stop Racism Now,” the protesters railed against racial inequality, the criminal justice system and policing. Besides issuing the chant calling cops by the pejorative “pig,” the protesters repeated the names of several blacks who have been killed by police in recent years.

*Modified article excerpt used for Moderate Protest condition:*

Black Lives Matter protesters marching on the Minnesota state fair on Saturday marched to protest police violence against Blacks.

“Black Lives Matter, Black Lives Matter” activists with the St. Paul, Minn. Branch of Black Lives Matter repeated while marching behind a group of police officers down a highway just south of the state fair grounds.

Carrying signs reading “End White Supremacy” and “Stop Racism Now,” the protesters railed against racial inequality, the criminal justice system and policing. Besides chanting “Black Lives Matter,” the protesters repeated the names of several blacks who have been killed by police in recent years.

**Full Text of Post Manipulation Questions.**

*Extremity*

How extreme do you find the protesters’ behavior to be?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not extreme at all) to 5(Very much extreme).

*Social Identification*

How similar do you feel to these activists?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal).

*Support*

How much do you support the activists described in the news report?

How willing or unwilling would you be to join this group as a member?

How much do you support the protesters’ cause (combatting racism and discrimination towards black people)?

Participants responded to the first and third items on a scale from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal), and the second item on a scale ranging from 1(Not willing at all) to 5(Completely willing).

**Figure S1.** Graph of the marginally significant interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *join movement*.

**Study 3**

**Full Text of Post Manipulation Questions.**

*Extremity*

How extreme do you find the protesters’ behavior to be?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not extreme at all) to 5(Very much extreme).

*Social Identification*

How similar do you feel to these activists?

How much do you identify with these activists?

Participants answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal).

*Support*

How much do you support the activists described in the news report?

How willing or unwilling would you be to join this group as a member?

How much do you support the protesters’ cause?

Participants responded to the first and third items on a scale from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal), and the second item on a scale ranging from 1(Not willing at all) to 5(Completely willing).

**Table S1.** Means, Standard Deviations, and effects of experimental condition on support for presidential candidates (Study 3).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Neutral Condition Mean (SD) | F-statisticp-value | Moderate Protest Mean (SD) | F-statisticp-value | Extreme Protest Mean (SD) | F-statisticp-value |
|  | Time 1 | Time 2 |  | Time 1 | Time 2 |  | Time 1 | Time 2 |  |
| Donald Trump | 1.93(1.29) | 1.931.29) | *F* = 0.00*p* = 1.00 | 2.04 (1.46) | 2.03 (1.50) | *F* = .07*p* = .798 | 1.76 (1.25) | 1.85 (1.31) | *F* = 5.80*p* = .018 |
| Hillary Clinton | 2.46(1.41) | 2.54 (1.43) | *F* = 1.00*p* = .320 | 2.12 (1.31) | 2.15 (1.32) | *F* = .60*p* = .441 | 2.27 (1.41) | 2.28 (1.40) | *F* = .33*p* = .566 |
| Bernie Sanders | 3.22 (1.53) | 3.25 (1.50) | *F* = .82*p* = .368 | 3.28 (1.61) | 3.26 (1.64) | *F* = 1.14*p* = .287 | 3.33 (1.59) | 3.34 (1.57) | *F* = .06*p* = .810 |
| Ted Cruz | 1.63 (.98) | 1.61 (.94) | *F* = 1.00*p* = .320 | 1.69 (1.07) | 1.75 (1.16) | *F* = 3.34*p* = .071 | 1.62 (1.09) | 1.60 (1.09) | *F* = .69*p* = .408 |
| John Kasich | 1.84(1.02) | 1.88 (1.00) | *F* = 2.02*p* = .158 | 2.04 (1.10) | 2.04 (1.11) | *F* = .00*p* = 1.00 | 1.85 (1.15) | 1.88 (1.14) | *F* = .69*p* = .408 |

**Study 4**

The text for the two conditions were identical to the Moderate and Highly Extreme Protest conditions used in Study 1. Likewise, we asked all the same items as those measured in Study 1, with the addition of the following:

*Disruptive*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was disruptive?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all disruptive) to 5 (very disruptive).

*Harmful*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was harmful?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all harmful) to 5 (very harmful).

*Immoral*

How immoral do you find the protesters’ behavior?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all immoral) to 5 (very immoral).

*Emotional Connection*

When thinking about the protesters, how much do you feel each of the following emotions?

…Compassion

…Sympathy

Participants answered on a scale from 1 (none at all) to 5 (a great deal).

**Figure S2.** Graph of the interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *support cause*.

**Study 5**

*Moderate Protest Condition:*

Today the EMW Women’s Surgical Center here in Louisville, Kentucky was the site of an anti-abortion protest. Dozens of protesters peacefully gathered in front of the center, holding signs and conducting group prayers as employees’ and patients’ entered the building.

Video footage shows protesters standing near the entrance of the abortion clinic. They were also heard praying and singing throughout the day. I spoke to one protester who identified as a “rescuer” and said that he and his fellow protesters represent the anti-abortion group Operation Save America.

Because of recent legal challenges, EMW is now the only abortion provider in the state of Kentucky. Protesters I spoke with vowed to peacefully assemble at EMW again this Spring. They hope their protests can help make Kentucky the first surgically abortion-free state in the United States of America

*Extreme Protest Condition:*

**Today the EMW Women’s Surgical Center here in Louisville, Kentucky was the site of an anti-abortion protest. Dozens of protesters blocked the front doors of the center, effectively bringing the work of the center to a halt by obstructing employees’ and patients’ access to the building.**

**Video footage shows the protesters sitting in front of the doors of the abortion clinic, blocking them with their bodies so that people could not get into the building. I spoke to one protester who identified as a “rescuer” and said that he and his fellow protesters represent the anti-abortion group Operation Save America.**

**Because of recent legal challenges, EMW is now the only abortion provider in the state of Kentucky. Protesters I spoke with vowed to return to EMW this Spring to again block access to the center. They hope their protests can help make Kentucky the first surgically abortion-free state in the United States of America.**

**Full Text of Post Manipulation Questions.**

*Extremity*

How extreme do you find the protesters’ behavior to be?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not extreme at all) to 5(Very much extreme).

*Disruptive*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was disruptive?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all disruptive) to 5 (very disruptive).

*Harmful*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was harmful?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all harmful) to 5 (very harmful).

*Social Identification*

How similar do you feel to these activists?

How much do you identify with these activists?

Participants answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal).

*Support*

How much do you support the activists described in the news report?

How willing or unwilling would you be to join this group as a member?

How much do you support the protesters’ cause?

Participants responded to the first and third items on a scale from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal), and the second item on a scale ranging from 1(Not willing at all) to 5(Completely willing).

*Immoral*

How immoral do you find the protesters’ behavior?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all immoral) to 5 (very immoral).

*Emotional Connection*

When thinking about the protesters, how much do you feel each of the following emotions?

…Compassion

…Sympathy

Participants answered on a scale from 1 (none at all) to 5 (a great deal).

**Figure S3.** Graph of the interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *perceived extremity*.

**Figure S4.** Graph of the interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *disruptive-harmful*.

**Figure S5.** Graph of the marginally significant interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *support protesters*.

**Figure S6.** Graph of the marginally significant interaction between extremity condition and political ideology predicting *join movement*.

**Study 6**

*Extreme protest + pro-gun ban condition:*

**DES MOINES, IA- The area around the Iowa State Capitol building was the epicenter of the nation’s gun-control debate yesterday afternoon. Hundreds of protesters gathered in the streets around the Capitol to demand the legislature pass a bill that would ban all semi-automatic and assault style weapons state-wide. The protesters formed a set of human blockades on the streets surrounding the Capitol building, halting traffic near the capitol for more than two hours. Several protesters climbed on the hoods of abandoned cars, chanting slogans.**

**Video footage of the event showed a group of protesters locked arm in arm and atop gridlocked cars screaming “Gun control now, or else!” One protester said that he and his fellow protesters represent the anti-gun group *Enough is Enough*. He explained that the group will do whatever it takes to stop the proliferation of guns in America. They are demanding that state lawmakers enact the state-wide ban.**

*Extreme protest + anti-gun ban condition:*

**DES MOINES, IA- The area around the Iowa State Capitol building was the epicenter of the nation’s gun-control debate yesterday afternoon. Hundreds of protesters gathered in the streets around the Capitol to demand the legislature block a bill that would ban all semi-automatic and assault style weapons state-wide. The protesters formed a set of human blockades on the streets surrounding the Capitol building, halting traffic near the capitol for more than two hours. Several protesters climbed on the hoods of abandoned cars, chanting slogans.**

**Video footage of the event showed a group of protesters locked arm in arm and atop gridlocked cars screaming “Don’t mess with us, or else!” One protester said that he and his fellow protesters represent the gun rights group *United Freedom*. He explained that the group will do whatever it takes to protect their right to bear arms in America. They are demanding state lawmakers reject the state-wide ban.**

*Moderate protest + pro-gun ban condition:*

**DES MOINES, IA- The Iowa State Capitol building was the epicenter of the nation’s gun-control debate yesterday afternoon. Hundreds of protesters gathered at the Capitol to support proposed legislation that would ban all semi-automatic and assault-style weapons state-wide. The protesters peacefully assembled on the front lawn of the building, holding signs and chanting slogans in support of the state-wide ban.**

**Video footage of the event showed a group of protesters sitting on the lawn of the capitol building arm in arm chanting “Save our lives” and occasionally breaking into song. One protester said that he and his fellow protesters represent the anti-gun group *Enough is Enough*. He explained that the group is committed to protesting the proliferation of guns in America. They hope that their movement will persuade state lawmakers to pass the state-wide ban.**

*Moderate protest + anti-gun ban condition:*

**DES MOINES, IA- The Iowa State Capitol building was the epicenter of the nation’s gun-control debate yesterday afternoon. Hundreds of protesters gathered at the Capitol to oppose proposed legislation that would ban all semi-automatic and assault style weapons state-wide. The protesters peacefully assembled on the front lawn of the building, holding signs and chanting slogans in opposition to the state-wide ban.**

**Video footage of the event showed a group of protesters sitting on the lawn of the capitol building arm in arm chanting “Freedom from tyranny” and occasionally breaking into song. One protester said that he and his fellow protesters represent the gun rights group *United Freedom*. He explained that the group is committed to fighting for their right to bear arms in America. They hope that their movement will persuade state lawmakers to reject the state-wide ban.**

**Full Text of Post Manipulation Questions.**

*Extremity*

How extreme do you find the protesters’ behavior to be?

Participants answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not extreme at all) to 5(Very much extreme).

*Disruptive*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was disruptive?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all disruptive) to 5 (very disruptive).

*Harmful*

To what extent would you say the protesters’ behavior was harmful?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all harmful) to 5 (very harmful).

*Social Identification*

How similar do you feel to these activists?

How much do you identify with these activists?

Participants answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal).

*Support*

How much do you support the activists described in the news report?

How willing or unwilling would you be to join this group as a member?

In gun ban conditions:

How much do you support the protesters’ cause (banning semi-auotmatic and assault style weapons in Iowa)?

 In block gun ban conditions:

How much do you support the protesters’ cause (stopping the proposed ban on semi-auotmatic and assault style weapons in Iowa)?

Participants responded to the first and third items on a scale from 1(Not at all) to 5(A great deal), and the second item on a scale ranging from 1(Not willing at all) to 5(Completely willing).

*Immoral*

How immoral do you find the protesters’ behavior?

Participants answered on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all immoral) to 5 (very immoral).

*Emotional Connection*

When thinking about the protesters, how much do you feel each of the following emotions?

…Compassion

…Sympathy

Participants answered on a scale from 1 (none at all) to 5 (a great deal).

**Full models for three-way interactions**

**Political Ideology**

Dependent Variable: *Extreme*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =1.65, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =-.18, *SE* = .06, *p* = .005 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.08, *SE* = .13, *p* = .513 |
| Political Ideology | *b* =.09, *SE* = .02, *p* < .001 |
| Extreme Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =.02, *SE* = .04, *p* = .581 |
| Advocacy Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =.25, *SE* = .04, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x Political ideology | *b* =.11, *SE* = .07, *p* = .132 |

Dependent Variable: *Disruptive-Harmful*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =1.67, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =-.17, *SE* = .06, *p* = .002 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =.11, *SE* = .11, *p* = .342 |
| Political Ideology | *b* =.06, *SE* = .02, *p* < .001 |
| Extreme Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =.03, *SE* = .03, *p* = .414 |
| Advocacy Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =.20, *SE* = .03, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x Political ideology | *b* =.15, *SE* = .06, *p* = .024 |

Dependent Variable: *Support Protesters*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.77, *SE* = .07, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =.81, *SE* = .07, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.28, *SE* = .15, *p* = .054 |
| Political Ideology | *b* =.00, *SE* = .02, *p* = .840 |
| Extreme Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =-.05, *SE* = .04, *p* = .262 |
| Advocacy Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =-.76, *SE* = .04, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x Political ideology | *b* =.12, *SE* = .09, *p* = .168 |

Dependent Variable: *Join Movement*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.57, *SE* = .07, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =.63, *SE* = .07, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.28, *SE* = .14, *p* = .049 |
| Political Ideology | *b* =-.01, *SE* = .02, *p* = .516 |
| Extreme Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =.06, *SE* = .04, *p* = .156 |
| Advocacy Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =-.54, *SE* = .04, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x Political ideology | *b* =.27, *SE* = .08, *p* = .001 |

Dependent Variable: *Support Cause*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.28, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =1.13, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =.04, *SE* = .16, *p* = .780 |
| Political Ideology | *b* =.01, *SE* = .02, *p* = .624 |
| Extreme Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =-.05, *SE* = .05, *p* = .251 |
| Advocacy Condition x Political Ideology | *b* =-.84, *SE* = .05, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x Political ideology | *b* =.01, *SE* = .09, *p* = .927 |

**System Justification**

Dependent Variable: *Extreme*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =1.68, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =-.16, *SE* = .06, *p* = .013 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.05, *SE* = .13, *p* = .713 |
| System Justification | *b* =.10, *SE* = .03, *p* < .001 |
| Extreme Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.04, *SE* = .05, *p* = .410 |
| Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.24, *SE* = .05, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.09, *SE* = .10, *p* = .390 |

Dependent Variable: *Disruptive-Harmful*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =1.69, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =-.16, *SE* = .06, *p* = .005 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =.13, *SE* = .11, *p* = .251 |
| System Justification | *b* =.04, *SE* = .02, *p* = .066 |
| Extreme Condition x System Justification | *b* =.00, *SE* = .04, *p* = .965 |
| Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.19, *SE* = .04, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.05, *SE* = .09, *p* = .554 |

Dependent Variable: *Support Protesters*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.79, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =.82, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.32, *SE* = .16, *p* = .046 |
| System Justification | *b* =.07, *SE* = .03, *p* = .024 |
| Extreme Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.07, *SE* = .06, *p* = .269 |
| Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.53, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.23, *SE* = .13, *p* = .068 |

Dependent Variable: *Join Movement*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.57, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =.64, *SE* = .08, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =-.30, *SE* = .15, *p* = .051 |
| System Justification | *b* =.06, *SE* = .03, *p* = .050 |
| Extreme Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.03, *SE* = .06, *p* = .561 |
| Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.27, *SE* = .06, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.18, *SE* = .12, *p* = .135 |

Dependent Variable: *Support Cause*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Regression Statistics |
| Extremity Condition (0 = moderate, 1 = extreme) | *b* =-.31, *SE* = .09, *p* < .001 |
| Advocacy Condition (0 = block ban, 1 = gun ban) | *b* =1.14, *SE* = .09, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition | *b* =.00, *SE* = .18, *p* = .988 |
| System Justification | *b* =.03, *SE* = .03, *p* = .397 |
| Extreme Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.05, *SE* = .07, *p* = .456 |
| Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =-.53, *SE* = .07, *p* < .001 |
| Extremity Condition x Advocacy Condition x System Justification | *b* =.16, *SE* = .14, *p* = .251 |

**Discussion of System Justification results.** Although the above models examining system justification as a moderator do not indicate that the three-way interactions were significant, it is important to note that the interaction between advocacy condition and system justification is significant in each model. A closer examination of this result indicates that those higher on system justification experienced negative responses to the protesters (independent of whether they were engaging in extreme or moderate ways) when they were advocating for a policy that would change the status quo. However, those high on system justification reported much more positive responses to protesters who were advocating for a policy that would maintain the status quo. Although these results are beyond the primary focus of the present research, they do strongly support recent research on the important role system justifying beliefs play in responses to social movement protests (e.g., Jost et al., 2017; Osborne et al., 2019).

**Figure S7.** Graph of the significant three-way interaction between extremity condition, advocacy direction, and political ideology predicting *disruptive-harmful*. Panel A depicts the effects for conservatives. Panel B depicts the effects for liberals.

*Panel A*

*Panel B*

**Figure S8.** Graph of the significant three-way interaction between extremity condition, advocacy direction, and political ideology predicting *join movement*. Panel A depicts the effects for conservatives. Panel B depicts the effects for liberals.

*Panel A*

*Panel B*

**Mediation by Perceived Extremity in All Studies**

**Table S2.** Test of the mediating role of the manipulation check(s) in explaining the effect of experimental condition on the three dependent variables.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Direct Effect**B (SE) | **Indirect Effect** B (SE) | **Indirect Effect**Effect (SE) | **95% CI** |
| **Study 1** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.68\*\*\* (.16) | -.13 (.12) | -.50 (.11) | [-.73, -.31] |
| Join Movement | -.32\* (.15) | -.28 (.13) | -.42 (.09) | [-.63, -.25] |
| Support Cause | -.40\* (.16) | -.33 (.14) | -.41 (.09) | [-.58, -.25] |
| **Study 2** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.62 \*\*\* (.14) | -.20 (.11) | -.41 (09) | [-.60, -.23] |
| Join Movement | -.42\*\* (.14) | -.06 (.12) | -.36 (.08) | [-.53, -.21] |
| Support Cause | -.18 (.14) | .17 (.12) | -.35 (.08) | [-.51, -.20] |
| **Study 3** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.84\*\*\* (.19) | -.20 (.20) | -.64 (.14) | [-.94, -.39] |
| Join Movement | -.41\* (.17) | -.10 (.18) | -.31 (.12) | [-.58, -.10] |
| Support Cause | -.60\*\* (.20) | .06 (.21) | -.66 (.14) | [-.98, -.42] |
| **Study 4** |  |  |  |  |
| **Extreme Perceptions** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -1.00\*\*\* (.10) | -.09 (.11) | -.90 (.09) | [-1.07, -.75] |
| Join Movement | -.70\*\*\* (.10) | -.02 (.12) | -.69 (.09) | [-.86, -.51] |
| Support Cause | -.29\*\* (.10) | .19 (.12) | -.48 (.08) | [-.66, -.32] |
| **Disruptive-Harmful Composite** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -1.00\*\*\* (.10) | -.01 (.11) | -.99 (.09) | [-1.15, -.82] |
| Join Movement | -.70\*\*\* (.10) | .10 (.12) | -.81 (.09) | [-.98, -.62] |
| Support Cause | -.29\*\* (.10) | .29 (.13) | -.57 (.09) | [-.75, -.41] |
| **Study 5** |  |  |  |  |
| **Extreme Perceptions** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.47\*\*\* (.11) | .17 (.12) | -.64 (.08) | [-.81, -.50] |
| Join Movement | -.28\*\* (.09) | .01 (.10) | -.28 (.07) | [-.42, -.16] |
| Support Cause | -.21† (.12) | .35 (.13) | -.56 (.09) | [-.75, -.40] |
| **Disruptive-Harmful Composite** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.47\*\*\* (.11) | .57 (.12) | -1.04 (.10) | [-1.26, -.84] |
| Join Movement | -.28\*\* (.09) | .29 (.11) | -.56 (.08) | [-.75, -.42] |
| Support Cause | -.21† (.12) | .76 (.14) | -.98 (.10) | [-1.18, -.77] |
| **Study 6** |  |  |  |  |
| **Extreme Perceptions** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.79\*\*\* (.09) | -.03 (.10) | -.76 (.07) | [-.91, -.62] |
| Join Movement | -.58\*\*\* (.08) | -.21 (.10) | -.36 (.07) | [-.49, -.24] |
| Support Cause | -.31\*\*\* (.10) | .31 (.12) | -.62 (.08) | [-.77, -.47] |
| **Disruptive-Harmful Composite** |  |  |  |  |
| Support Protesters | -.79\*\*\* (.09) | .18 (.11) | -97 (.08) | [-1.13, -.82] |
| Join Movement | -.58\*\*\* (.08) | -.06 (.10) | -.52 (.08) | [-.66, -.38] |
| Support Cause | -.31\*\*\* (.10) | .40 (.13) | -.71 (.09) | [-.88, -.54] |

**Potential Differences in Protester Demand for Change**

To address the possibility that our manipulation of extremity had the unintended effect of participants perceiving the demands for change by protesters in the moderate and extreme protest differently, we recruited new participants to read one article from either the moderate or extreme protest stimuli used in Studies 1, 2, 4, and 5, or watch either the moderate or extreme video used in Study 3. Specifically, we recruited 207 participants for Study 1 and 4 stimuli, 215 for Study 2 stimuli, 213 for Study 3 stimuli, and 211 for Study 5 stimuli. We then asked participants “How much change would you say the protesters are demanding?”, which they answered using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal). The results of this study yielded no significant differences between the two conditions: Study 1 and 4 stimuli: *t*(205) = .83, *p* = .411; Study 2 stimuli: *t*(213) = 1.30, *p* = .194; Study 3 stimuli: *t*(211) = 1.57, *p* = .118; Study 5 stimuli: *t*(209) = .657, *p* = .512. These null results indicate that the significant differences we found in participants’ levels of support for the social movements between experimental conditions was not due to differences in how much change the protesters in each condition were demanding.

**Table S3.** Indirect effects of the hypothesized process model and three alternative process models.

**Study 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Support Protesters* | Indirect Effect |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters | -.35 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Social ID  | -.35 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Emotion | -.25 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters | -.22 |
|  |  |
| *Join Movement* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement | -.56 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Social ID  | -.31 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Emotion | -.07 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement | -.06 |
|  |  |
| *Support Cause* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause | -.27 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Social ID  | -.11 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Emotion | -.08 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause | -.20 |

**Study 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Support Protesters* | Indirect Effect |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters | -.24 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Social ID  | -.24 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Emotion | -.17 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters | -.10 |
|  |  |
| *Join Movement* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement | -.25 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Social ID  | -.17 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Emotion | -.02 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement | -.01 |
|  |  |
| *Support Cause* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause | -.27 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Social ID  | -.21 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Emotion | -.13 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause | -.09 |

**Study 6**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Support Protesters* | Indirect Effect |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters | -.18 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Social ID  | -.13 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Protesters 🡪 Emotion | -.10 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Protesters | -.11 |
|  |  |
| *Join Movement* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement | -.21 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Social ID  | -.13 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Join Movement 🡪 Emotion | -.06 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Join Movement | -.06 |
|  |  |
| *Support Cause* |  |
| Hypothesized Process Model: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause | -.18 |
| Alternative Model 1: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Social ID  | -.09 |
| Alternative Model 2: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Support Cause 🡪 Emotion | -.06 |
| Alternative Model 3: Condition 🡪 Immoral 🡪 Social ID 🡪 Emotion 🡪 Support Cause | -.11 |

*Note:* “Condition” is 0 = Moderate, 1 = Extreme.

As shown in these tables, the indirect effect for the hypothesized process model is consistently the largest effect among the different potential models, suggesting that the order of the variables in the hypothesized process model are likely the best fit.

**Table S4.** Interactions, effect sizes, simple slopes, and estimated means for liberals (represented as points on the simple slopes line at both -1 SD, “2” on the political ideology scale, as well as categorically grouping scores from 1-3 on the scale) and conservatives (represented as points on the simple slopes line at both +1 SD and “6” on the political ideology scale as well as categorically grouping scores from 5-7 on the scale) across all six studies.

**Study 2 (liberal cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives (“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |
| Extreme | *t* = -.60, *p* =.550, *d* = -.06 | *t* = -3.03, *p* = .003, *d* = -.31 | *t* = -3.89, *p* < .001,*d* = -.40 | *Mod*: 2.96*Ext*: 3.36 | *Mod*: 3.36*Ext*: 3.87 | *Mod*: 3.00*Ext*: 3.41 | *Mod*: 3.52*Ext*: 4.08 | *Mod*: 3.06 (.74)*Ext*: 3.45 (.95) | *Mod*: 3.28 (.99)*Ext*: 3.81 (1.04) |
| Support protesters | *t* = 1.35, *p* = .178, *d* = .14 | *t* = -4.74, *p* < .001, *d* = -.48 | *t* = -2.85, *p* = .005,*d* = -.29 | *Mod*: 4.19*Ext*: 3.32 | *Mod*: 2.88*Ext*: 2.36 | *Mod*: 4.06*Ext*: 3.22 | *Mod*: 2.33*Ext*: 1.95 | *Mod*: 4.00 (1.14)*Ext*: 3.17 (1.42) | *Mod*: 2.98 (1.36)*Ext*: 2.43 (1.38) |
| Join Movement | *t* = 1.77, *p* = .077, *d* = .02 | *t* = -3.90, *p* < .001, *d* = -.40 | *t* = -1.40, *p* = .161,*d* = -.14 | *Mod*: 3.18*Ext*: 2.45 | *Mod*: 1.94*Ext*: 1.67 | *Mod*: 3.06*Ext*: 2.37 | *Mod*: 1.42*Ext*: 1.35 | *Mod*: 3.02 (1.42)*Ext*: 2.30 (1.38) | *Mod*: 2.01 (1.33)*Ext*: 1.78 (1.18) |
| Support cause | *t* = .47, *p* = .642, *d* = .05 | *t* = -1.86, *p* = .063, *d* = -.19 | *t* = -1.21, *p* = .226,*d* = -.12 | *Mod*: 4.39*Ext*: 4.07 | *Mod*: 3.11*Ext*: 2.90 | *Mod*: 4.27*Ext*: 3.95 | *Mod*: 2.58*Ext*: 2.42 | *Mod*: 4.19 (1.09)*Ext*: 3.91 (1.18) | *Mod*: 3.23 (1.40)*Ext*: 2.96 (1.42) |

**Study 3 (liberal cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives (“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |  |
| Extreme | *t* = .79, *p* = .431, *d* = .11 | *t* = 5.78, *p* < .001, *d* = .80 | *t* = 6.88, *p* < .001,*d* = .95 | *Mod*: 1.76*Ext*: 2.93 | *Mod*: 2.57*Ext*: 3.97 | *Mod*: 1.83*Ext*: 3.02 | *Mod*: 2.76*Ext*: 4.21 | *Mod*: 1.86 (.86)*Ext*: 2.93 (1.08) | *Mod*: 2.86 (1.43)*Ext*: 4.03 (.95) |  |
| Support protesters | *t* = .00, *p* = .994, *d* = .00 | *t* = -3.55, *p* < .001, *d* = -.49 | *t* = -3.55, *p* < .001,*d* = -.49 | *Mod*: 3.50*Ext*: 2.61 | *Mod*: 2.37*Ext*: 1.47 | *Mod*: 3.40*Ext*: 2.51 | *Mod*: 2.10*Ext*: 1.21 | *Mod*: 3.50 (1.31)*Ext*: 2.52 (1.47) | *Mod*: 2.17 (1.23)*Ext*: 1.58 (1.15) |  |
| Join Movement | *t* = -.39, *p* = .696, *d* = -.05 | *t* = -1.63, *p* =.104, *d* = -.23 | *t* = -2.18, *p* = .030,*d* = -.30 | *Mod*: 2.43*Ext*: 2.06 | *Mod*: 1.74*Ext*: 1.24 | *Mod*: 2.37*Ext*: 1.98 | *Mod*: 1.58*Ext*: 1.05 | *Mod*: 2.38 (1.40)*Ext*: 2.02 (1.38) | *Mod*: 1.69 (1.20)*Ext*: 1.35 (.88) |  |
| Support cause | *t* = -.89, *p* = .376, *d* = .12 | *t* = -2.09, *p* = .038, *d* = -.29 | *t* = -3.34, *p* = .001,*d* = -.23 | *Mod*: 3.68*Ext*: 3.17 | *Mod*: 2.40*Ext*: 1.58 | *Mod*: 3.57*Ext*: 3.03 | *Mod*: 2.10*Ext*: 1.21 | *Mod*: 3.64 (1.27)*Ext*: 3.07 (1.39) | *Mod*: 2.21 (1.35)*Ext*: 1.48 (1.00) |  |

**Study 4 (liberal cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives (“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |
| Extreme | *t* = .16, *p* = .872, *d* = .01 | *t* = 13.39, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.09 | *t* = 13.60, *p* < .001,*d* = 1.10 | *Mod*: 2.20*Ext*: 3.84 | *Mod*: 2.70*Ext*: 4.36 | *Mod*: 2.21*Ext*: 3.85 | *Mod*: 2.81*Ext*: 4.47 | *Mod*: 2.25 (.99)*Ext*: 3.92 (1.11) | *Mod*: 2.73 (1.28)*Ext*: 4.46 (.81) |
| Disruptive-Harmful | *t* = .22, *p* = .830,*d* = .02 | *t* = 14.25, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.15 | *t* = 14.53, *p* < .001,*d* = .1.18 | *Mod*: 2.25*Ext*: 3.81 | *Mod*: 2.65*Ext*: 4.25 | *Mod*: 2.25*Ext*: 3.82 | *Mod*: 2.74*Ext*: 4.34 | *Mod*: 2.30 (.90)*Ext*: 3.89 (1.01) | *Mod*: 2.61 (1.05)*Ext*: 4.35 (.85) |
| Support protesters | *t* = -.45, *p* = .655, *d* = -.04 | *t* = -6.91, *p* < .001, *d* = -.56 | *t* = -7.53, *p* < .001,*d* = -.61 | *Mod*: 3.62*Ext*: 2.63 | *Mod*: 2.89*Ext*: 1.82 | *Mod*: 3.60*Ext*: 2.62 | *Mod*: 2.74*Ext*: 1.65 | *Mod*: 3.58 (1.21)*Ext*: 2.50 (1.31) | *Mod*: 2.91 (1.39)*Ext*: 1.65 (.88) |
| Join Movement | *t* = .00, *p* = .999, *d* = .00 | *t* = -4.89, *p* < .001, *d* = -.40 | *t* = -4.88, *p* < .001,*d* = -.40 | *Mod*: 2.68*Ext*: 1.98 | *Mod*: 2.07*Ext*: 1.37 | *Mod*: 2.67*Ext*: 1.97 | *Mod*: 1.94*Ext*: 1.25 | *Mod*: 2.59 (1.39)*Ext*: 1.89 (1.28) | *Mod*: 2.06 (1.36)*Ext*: 1.29 (.74) |
| Support cause | *t* = -2.45, *p* = .015, *d* = -.20 | *t* = -.03, *p* = .979, *d* = .002 | *t* = -3.49, *p* < .001,*d* = -.28 | *Mod*: 3.96*Ext*: 3.95 | *Mod*: 3.39*Ext*: 2.89 | *Mod*: 3.95*Ext*: 3.94 | *Mod*: 3.27*Ext*: 2.67 | *Mod*: 3.94 (1.18)*Ext*: 3.86 (1.23) | *Mod*: 3.42 (1.35)*Ext*: 2.79 (1.40) |

**Study 5 (conservative cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives(“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |
| Extreme | *t* = -2.51, *p* = .013, *d* = -.21 | *t* = 13.25, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.09 | *t* = 9.70, *p* < .001,*d* = .80 | *Mod*: 2.29*Ext*: 4.01 | *Mod*: 1.89*Ext*: 3.14 | *Mod*: 2.28*Ext*: 3.98 | *Mod*: 1.81*Ext*: 2.98 | *Mod*: 2.28 (1.15)*Ext*: 3.94 (1.08) | *Mod*: 1.80 (1.05)*Ext*: 3.03 (1.16) |
| Disruptive-Harmful | *t* = -2.11, *p* = .035, *d* = -.17 | *t* = 16.25, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.34 | *t* = 13.26, *p* < .001,*d* = 1.10 | *Mod*: 2.61*Ext*: 4.42 | *Mod*: 2.13*Ext*: 3.60 | *Mod*: 2.60*Ext*: 4.39 | *Mod*: 2.04*Ext*: 3.44 | *Mod*: 2.62 (1.01)*Ext*: 4.35 (.79) | *Mod*: 2.05 (.97)*Ext*: 3.51 (1.11) |
| Support protesters | *t* = -1.66, *p* = .098, *d* = -.14 | *t* = -2.45, *p* =.015, *d* = -.20 | *t* = -4.80, *p* < .001,*d* = -.40 | *Mod*: 1.58*Ext*: 1.24 | *Mod*: 3.28*Ext*: 2.61 | *Mod*: 1.64*Ext*: 1.29 | *Mod*: 3.61*Ext*: 2.88 | *Mod*: 1.61 (.86)*Ext*: 1.36 (1.31) | *Mod*: 3.63 (1.42)*Ext*: 2.81 (1.52) |
| Join Movement | *t* = -1.77, *p* =.077, *d* = -.15 | *t* = -.61, *p* = .540, *d* = -.05 | *t* = -3.12, *p* = .002,*d* = -.26 | *Mod*: 1.18*Ext*: 1.11 | *Mod*: 2.18*Ext*: 1.81 | *Mod*: 1.21*Ext*: 1.13 | *Mod*: 2.37*Ext*: 1.94 | *Mod*: 1.24 (.80)*Ext*: 1.20 (.75) | *Mod*: 2.41 (1.43)*Ext*: 1.91 (1.32) |
| Support cause | *t* = -.95, *p* = .345, *d* = -.08 | *t* = -.76, *p* = .450, *d* = -.06 | *t* = -2.09, *p* .037,*d* = -.17 | *Mod*: 1.37*Ext*: 1.26 | *Mod*: 3.16*Ext*: 2.86 | *Mod*: 1.43*Ext*: 1.31 | *Mod*: 3.51*Ext*: 3.17 | *Mod*: 1.42 (.93)*Ext*: 1.38 (.94) | *Mod*: 3.49 (1.57)*Ext*: 3.09 (1.62) |

**Study 6 (liberal cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives (“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |
| Extreme | *t* = 1.49, *p* = .137, *d* = .09 | *t* = 11.79, *p* < .001, *d* = .71 | *t* = 14.01, *p* < .001,*d* = .85 | *Mod*: 1.26*Ext*: 2.74 | *Mod*: 1.88*Ext*: 3.62 | *Mod*: 1.30*Ext*: 2.79 | *Mod*: 2.01*Ext*: 3.81 | *Mod*: 1.35 (.65)*Ext*: 2.80 (1.21) | *Mod*: 1.96 (1.16)*Ext*: 3.78 (1.16) |
| Disruptive-Harmful | *t* = 2.22, *p* = .027, *d* = .13 | *t* = 13.96, *p* < .001, *d* = .84 | *t* = 17.24, *p* < .001,*d* = 1.04 | *Mod*: 1.41*Ext*: 2.96 | *Mod*: 1.79*Ext*: 3.68 | *Mod*: 1.43*Ext*: 3.01 | *Mod*: 1.87*Ext*: 3.84 | *Mod*: 1.43 (.63)*Ext*: 3.00 (.99) | *Mod*: 1.82 (.90)*Ext*: 3.86 (1.02) |
| Support protesters | *t* = .191, *p* = .847, *d* = .01 | *t* = -6.32, *p* < .001, *d* = -.38 | *t* = -6.11, *p* < .001,*d* = -.37 | *Mod*: 4.32*Ext*: 3.39 | *Mod*: 2.97*Ext*: 2.08 | *Mod*: 4.24*Ext*: 3.32 | *Mod*: 2.68*Ext*: 1.80 | *Mod*: 4.26 (.97)*Ext*: 3.39 (1.36) | *Mod*: 2.75 (1.51)*Ext*: 1.99 (1.28) |
| Join Movement | *t* = 3.36, *p* < .001, *d* = .20 | *t* = -7.31, *p* < .001, *d* = -.44 | *t* = -2.66, *p* = .008,*d* = -.16 | *Mod*: 3.36*Ext*: 2.32 | *Mod*: 2.02*Ext*: 1.65 | *Mod*: 3.28*Ext*: 2.28 | *Mod*: 1.74*Ext*: 1.51 | *Mod*: 3.26 (1.40)*Ext*: 2.35 (1.37) | *Mod*: 1.95 (1.43)*Ext*: 1.69 (1.27) |
| Support cause | *t* = -.76, *p* = .447, *d* = -.05 | *t* = -1.12, *p* = .264, *d* = -.07 | *t* = -2.20, *p* = .028,*d* = -.13 | *Mod*: 4.30*Ext*: 4.12 | *Mod*: 2.97*Ext*: 2.62 | *Mod*: 4.22*Ext*: 4.03 | *Mod*: 2.68*Ext*: 2.30 | *Mod*: 4.26 (1.16)*Ext*: 1.16 (1.28) | *Mod*: 2.80 (1.55)*Ext*: 2.44 (1.41) |

**Study 6 (conservative cause)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Interaction | Simple SlopeLiberals (-1 SD) | Simple SlopeConservatives (+1 SD) | Liberals (-1 SD)Means | Conservatives (+1 SD)Means | Liberals (“2” on scale)Means | Conservatives (“6” on scale) Means | Liberals (“1-3” on scale)Means (SD) | Conservatives (“5-7” on scale) Means (SD) |
| Extreme | *t* = -.66, *p* = .511, *d* = -.04 | *t* = 13.90, *p* < .001, *d* = .84 | *t* = 12.80, *p* < .001,*d* = .77 | *Mod*: 1.72*Ext*: 3.48 | *Mod*: 1.68*Ext*: 3.31 | *Mod*: 1.72*Ext*: 3.47 | *Mod*: 1.67*Ext*: 3.28 | *Mod*: 1.77 (1.05)*Ext*: 3.52 (1.03) | *Mod*: 1.64 1.08)*Ext*: 3.36 (1.08) |
| Disruptive-Harmful | *t* = -.99, *p* = .322, *d* = -.06 | *t* = 15.21, *p* < .001, *d* = .92 | *t* = 13.62, *p* < .001,*d* = .82 | *Mod*: 1.85*Ext*: 3.55 | *Mod*: 1.80*Ext*: 3.34 | *Mod*: 1.85*Ext*: 3.54 | *Mod*: 1.78*Ext*: 3.29 | *Mod*: 1.84 (.88)*Ext*: 3.58 (.93) | *Mod*: 1.77 (.97)*Ext*: 3.41 (1.03) |
| Support protesters | *t* = -1.73, *p* = .084, *d* = -.10 | *t* = -2.99, *p* = .003, *d* = -.18 | *t* = -5.42, *p* < .001,*d* = -.33 | *Mod*: 1.95*Ext*: 1.51 | *Mod*: 3.43*Ext*: 2.62 | *Mod*: 2.04*Ext*: 1.57 | *Mod*: 3.74*Ext*: 2.86 | *Mod*: 2.06 (1.32)*Ext*: 1.61 (.91) | *Mod*: 3.62 (1.34)*Ext*: 2.72 (1.28) |
| Join Movement | *t* = -1.24, *p* = .216, *d* = -.08 | *t* = -2.10, *p* = .036, *d* = -.13 | *t* = -3.83, *p* < .001,*d* = -.23 | *Mod*: 1.41*Ext*: 1.11 | *Mod*: 2.42*Ext*: 1.87 | *Mod*: 1.47*Ext*: 1.15 | *Mod*: 2.64*Ext*: 2.03 | *Mod*: 1.48 (.93)*Ext*: 1.21 (.66) | *Mod*: 2.60 (1.51)*Ext*: 1.95 (1.32) |
| Support cause | *t* = -.86, *p* = .389, *d* = -.05 | *t* = -1.30, *p* = .193, *d* = -.08 | *t* = -2.51, *p* = .012,*d* = -.15 | *Mod*: 1.73*Ext*: 1.52 | *Mod*: 3.32*Ext*: 2.91 | *Mod*: 1.83*Ext*: 1.61 | *Mod*: 3.65*Ext*: 3.21 | *Mod*: 1.85 (1.25)*Ext*: 1.63 (1.12) | *Mod*: 3.56 (1.41)*Ext*: 3.04 (1.52) |

**Detailed Information about the Pilot Study Surveying Activists**

*Movements and Causes Participants Indicated by Category.*

Animal/Environment Movements 49 (17%)

Drugs 5 (2%)

Economic 49 (17%)

Guns 10 (3%)

Political 20 (7%)

Race 36 (12%)

Sexual/Gender Issues 85 (29%)

Other 40 (14%)

Method

*Participants*. One hundred and twenty-one (male 68, female 53) participants were recruited from a prescreened pool of participants (*n* =2,125) who had answered “yes” to the question “Would you consider yourself an activist (i.e., an active member of a social movement advocating for social change)?” and had also provided a coherent answer when asked to “Please tell us what movement(s) you consider yourself an activist for”.Participant age ranged from 19 to 65 years, with a mean of 32.37 years (SD = 9.47). The sample size for this study was determined by the number of participants we could successfully recruit from the prescreened pool of activists. We aimed to collect data from as many of these participants as possible. The final sample size reflects the number of participants we were successfully able to recruit after a month of reminders and repeated invitations.

*Procedure.* Participants were first asked to “indicate the social movement group or activist organization that you are involved with” and to provide a brief description of this social movement’s arguments, goals, and objectives. Then participants indicated the extent to which they believed their social movement’s goals involved raising widespread awareness (“Overall, how much would you say that it is a goal of your social movement/organization to raise widespread awareness about your cause?”) and garnering widespread support (“Overall, how much would you say that it is a goal of your social movement/organization to garner widespread popular support for your cause (i.e., to get people who do not currently support your movement/organization to become supporters of it)?”). In addition, participants also indicated how much they considered themselves to be an activist (“To what extent do you consider yourself an *activist* for this social cause?”). Participants responded to each of these items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1(not at all) to 5(very much).

Following this, participants responded to a 4-item *extreme behavior willingness* composite (*α* =.84) that gauged their willingness to engage in behaviors that are extreme, harmful, disruptive to everyday life, and could result in property damage. Participants who reported being at least slightly willing to engage in any of the extreme behaviors listed (*n* = 114) were then presented with a series of items assessing why they would be willing to engage in such behaviors. Specifically, the instructions stated “Why might you be willing to engage in these behaviors?” and then they read the prompt “I would be willing to engage in these behaviors *because*…” followed by a series of items providing potential reasons for such behavior. These items formed a 4-item *raise awareness* composite (*α* =.87; e.g. “It will raise awareness about the cause.”) and a 3-item *recruit support* composite (*α* =.90; e.g., “It will get more people to support the cause.”). Additionally, participants answered a 6-item *specific protest behavior willingness* scale (*α* =.76) asking how willing they would be to engage in each of the following protest behaviors: civil disobedience, public demonstrations, protest fasts and hunger strikes, protest marches, riots, strikes.

Results

Participants’ mean response indicated they generally felt the term “activist” described them well (*M* = 4.26; *SD* =.84), with a modal response of 5 (*n* =58). The mean scores on the *raise awareness* (*M* = 3.99, *SD* =.88) and *recruit support* (*M* = 3.64, *SD* = 1.13) composites indicate that activists were willing to engage in extreme protest behaviors in part because they expected these behaviors would result in increased awareness and support for their cause. Furthermore, participants’ average scores on the items gauging the extent to which raising awareness and recruiting support were important goals to them as activists were high (*M*raise awareness = 4.46, *SD* =.79); *M*recruit support = 4.33, *SD* =.93), with a modal response for each being 5 (nraise\_awareness= 74; nrecruit\_support= 70). These very high scores suggest that these two goals were indeed key goals for our activist participants.

Means, standard deviations and correlations of all variables collected (Study 4b).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean (SD) | Extreme Behavior Willingness | Specific Protest Willingness | Raise Awareness | Recruit Support |
| Extreme Behavior Willingness | 2.81 (1.09) | -- |  .49\*\*\* | .37\*\*\* |  .34\*\*\* |
| Specific Protest Willingness | 3.00 (.90) |  | -- |  .23\*  | .27\*\* |
| Raise Awareness | 3.99(.88) |  |  | -- |  .75\*\*\* |
| Recruit Support | 3.64 (1.13) |  |  |  | -- |

*\*p <* .05, *\*\*p <* .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Results when the three support measures are averaged together into a composite.**

*Study 1*

Composite α = .88

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Moderate Protest Mean (SD)** | **Extreme Protest** **Mean****(SD)** | **Highly Extreme Protest** **Mean****(SD)** | **Omnibus test** | **Moderate vs. Extreme Protest**  | **Moderate vs.** **Highly Extreme Protest**  | **Extreme vs.** **Highly Extreme Protest** | **Combined Extreme Protest** **Mean****(SD)** | **Combined Extreme** **vs.** **Moderate****Protest** |
| Support Composite | 3.07(1.21) | 2.60(1.34) | 2.62(1.32) | *F* = 5.44*p* = .005*η2* = .03 | *t* = 2.96*p* = .003*d* = .34 | *t* = 2.80*p* = .005*d* = .32 | *t* =.16*p* = .876*d* = .02 | 2.61 (1.15) | *t* = 3.30*p* = .001*d* = .38. |

*Studies 2-6*

Study 2Composite α = .89

Study 3 Composite α = .89

Study 4 Composite α = .83

Study 5 Composite α = .90

Study 6 Composite α = .88

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Moderate Protest** **Support Composite** **Mean****(SD)** | **Extreme Protest** **Support Composite****Mean****(SD)** | **t-test** |
| Study 2 | 3.24(1.28) | 2.83(1.23) | *t* = 3.20*p* = .001*d*= .32 |
| Study 3 | 2.66(1.25) | 2.05(1.20) | *t* = 3.63*p* < .001*d*=.50 |
| Study 4 | 3.12(1.18) | 2.42(1.06) | *t* = 7.70*p* < .001*d*=.62 |
| Study 5 | 2.17(1.34) | 1.78(1.14) | *t* = 3.80*p* < .001*d*=.31 |
| Study 6 | 2.85(1.39) | 2.29(1.24) | *t* = 7.05*p* < .001*d*=.42 |

**Interactions between Perceived Disruptiveness and Political Ideology Predicting Judgments of Immorality.**

Study 4:

Interaction: b = .08, S.E. = .04, p = .046

Simple Slope Liberals: b = .50, S.E. = .09, p < .001

Simple Slope Conservatives: b = .76, S.E. = .10, p < .001

In Study 5:

Interaction: b = -.11, S.E. = .04, p = .009

Simple Slope Liberals: b = .77, S.E. = .13, p < .001

Simple Slope Conservatives: b = .39, S.E. = .08, p < .001

In Study 6 (pro gun ban condition):

Interaction: b = -.13, S.E. = .03, p < .001

Simple Slope Liberals: b = .37, S.E. = .06, p < .001

Simple Slope Conservatives: b = .83, S.E. = .08, p < .001

In Study 6 (oppose gun ban condition):

Interaction: b = -.10, S.E. = .04, p = .014

Simple Slope Liberals: b = .74, S.E. = .09, p < .001

Simple Slope Conservatives: b = .43, S.E. = .09, p < .001