

Online Appendix for: “Americans, Not Partisans:  
Can Priming American National Identity Reduce Affective Polarization?”

This Version: January 2017

Table of Contents:

Questionnaire and Treatment Stimulus, Experiment 1:	2-9
Questionnaire and Treatment Stimulus, Experiment 2:	10-12
Questionnaire and Treatment Stimulus, Experiment 3:	13-15
Supplemental Tables, Experiment 1:	16-17
Supplemental Tables, Experiment 2:	18
Supplemental Tables, Observational Analysis:	19-21
2008 Summer Olympics Analysis:	22-23
How Common Are Articles that Prime American Identity:	24-25
Party vs. Candidate Feeling Thermometers:	25
Works Cited (Not Cited in Main Paper):	26

## **Survey Items and Treatment Stimulus, Experiment 1**

In what year were you born? [pull down menu of years]

What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Which of the following best describes your race?

- c. Caucasian (White)
- d. African-American/Black
- e. Native American/American Indian
- f. Asian or Pacific Islander
- g. Other

Are you of Latino, Hispanic, or Spanish origin?

- h. Yes
- i. No

Generally speaking, I think of myself as a:

- j. Democrat
- k. Republican
- l. Independent

[IF DEMOCRAT] Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

- m. Strong Democrat
- n. Not very strong Democrat

[IF REPUBLICAN] Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

- o. Strong Republican
- p. Not very strong Republican

[IF INDEPENDENT] Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

- q. Closer to the Democratic Party
- r. Closer to the Republican Party

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

- s. Extremely liberal
- t. Liberal
- u. Slightly liberal

- v. Moderate; middle of the road
- w. Slightly conservative
- x. Conservative
- y. Extremely conservative

[IF ASSIGNED TO THE TREATMENT CONDITION]

[Instructions:]

No we'd like you to read a brief article that recently appeared in the news. Please read it carefully, and then we'll ask you a few about it.

To give you time to read the article, the 'next screen' button will not appear right away. When you are ready to begin reading the article, please click to advance to the next screen.

[Article:]

**America: What Makes It Great**

The Declaration of Independence, whose signing we celebrate every July 4th, established America as one of the first representative democracies in the world. As we begin America's 239th year, we wanted to reflect on some of the factors that continue to make America a great nation. Here are some of the top reasons we love America.

**INNOVATION** — Edison, Gates, Jobs: they and we are known for thinking outside the box. As a people, we create and innovate; we don't wait for others, then appropriate their creations. From search engines to social networks — Google, Yahoo, Twitter and Facebook — it all started here.

**TECHNOLOGY** — From cotton gin to light bulb, records to movies, rockets to Internet, the gadgets and discoveries originating from the U.S. have changed the world, and continue to do so today.

**DIVERSITY** — “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free...” So says the inscription on the Statue of Liberty in the middle of New York Harbor. We are a nation of immigrants whose spirit of hard work and desire for a better life have been a hallmark since the first settlers arrived here more than 400 years ago.

**ECONOMY** — Despite the spotlight on China and other Asian countries, the United States still possesses the world's richest economy and consumer base — larger than Japan, Germany, China and Great Britain combined. The economy of a single U.S. state--California--would be among the top 10 economies in the world if it were a country.

**INDIVIDUAL SPIRIT VS. CLASS SYSTEM** — Unlike other countries such as India,

China or much of Europe, where one's station in life is determined by a caste system, government monolith or an outdated monarchy, in America you are free to carve out your own destiny. Wealth carries huge influence, but unlike most countries, where one's fate is determined by others, in the U.S. you are free to chart your own course.

**TOLERANCE** — While other cultures in Syria, Iraq and Africa are slaughtering each other in the name of religion, in America Jews, Catholics, Sikhs, Protestants, Hindus, Muslims — and Atheists — live and work together in peace.

**ENTREPRENEURSHIP** — The U.S., by far, has more self-made millionaires and billionaires proportionally than anywhere in the world. Much has been said of late about the rapid rise of a millionaire class in China and Vietnam. But that's still — pardon the cliché — a drop in the ocean.

**INSTITUTIONS AND LAW** — We are a nation of laws and equality under the law; those laws provide stability, continuity, structure and protect against intellectual theft.

**EDUCATION** — Students from everywhere in the world come here for their education, not the opposite.

**ENTERTAINMENT** — OK, we didn't invent classical music, but we created Dixieland, ragtime, jazz, swing, big band, bluegrass, Hawaiian, pop, rock 'n' roll, hip-hop, rap and even disco; then there's radio, television, movies, video games, hula hoops, Hollywood and Disneyland.

**NATURAL BEAUTY** — From the California coast, through the Rocky Mountains to the forests of Maine and Vermont, and including our national parks, we are a nation of contrasts, with two oceans, numerous lakes and rivers, gargantuan mountains, vast plains and spacious deserts, all with their individual charm.

**GENEROSITY** — Americans are the most generous nation in terms of donating to charities, both in total dollars given and total hours. No other nation has America's generosity of spirit and willingness to help their fellow man.

**ENDURANCE** — After 238 years, we are still here in, basically, the same form. No nation in modern times has come close when it comes to longevity. And that goes for our human life span — longer than anywhere else but Okinawa.

**STANDARD OF LIVING** – The highest in the world; nothing more to be said.

[Text Prime:]

In the article you just read, the article gave a number of reasons why many people love America and think it is a great country. Now we'd like to know what you think. What do you think is the most important reason people like America and are proud to be an American?

You should try your best to be as thorough and convincing, because we want to use these answers to explain to people who have never been to America why Americans are proud of their country.

Please take your time and do not rush. To help with that, the next screen arrow will not appear for a few moments to give you time to write out your answer.  
[Text box for subject responses included here]

[IF ASSIGNED TO THE CONTROL CONDITION]

### **New Mexico Cat Library Allows Office Workers to Check Out Kittens**

If you work in an office building, you've probably wanted an escape from time to time.

The Doña Ana County Office in Las Cruces, New Mexico, has devised a genius solution to this sort of office ennui: a cat library.

Since 2012, employees have been able to check kittens out of a Kitty Kondo and then return to work with the company of a furry, mewling buddy. Document technician Martha Lopez told [the Las Cruces Sun-News](#) that the program was more than just entertainment for her and her coworkers.

"People should consider them as therapeutic help instead of just pets," Lopez said.

Speaking to [CBS News](#), which profiled the program last week, community planner Angela Roberson sang its praises.

"It definitely relieves stress," Roberson said. "I mean how can it not when you have a little fuzzy thing that you can take back to your office?"

And that's not the only purpose the Kitty Kondo serves. Since being implemented by the Doña Ana County Coalition for Pets and People, the program has resulted in the adoption of 100 cats, because all the Kondo inhabitants are rescues in need of homes.

[Text Primes:]

When you go out to restaurants, what types of restaurants do you prefer and why? Please explain briefly in the space below.

[Text box for subject response]

Think about the next place you would like to go on vacation. Where would you like to go and why?

[Text box for subject response]

[POST-TREATMENT ITEMS]:

I'd like to get your feelings toward some groups or individuals who are in the news these days. Below, you'll see the name of a group next to a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward that group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward that group. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the group. Please use the feeling thermometer to indicate your feeling toward the following groups. [respondents are shown a separate feeling thermometer for each group: The Democratic Party, the Republican Party, President Obama]

[PARTY is the opposite party (i.e., if subject is a Democrat, \$PARTY=Republican(s))]

Now we'd like to know what you think about \$PARTY. Below, we've given a list of words that some people might use to describe \$PARTY. For each item, please indicate how well you think it applies to them: extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well.

What about "American"? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about "intelligent"? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about "honest"? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about "open-minded"? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about "generous"? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about “hypocritical”? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about “selfish”? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

What about “mean”? Does that apply to \$PARTY extremely well, very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not at all well?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

Is there anything in particular you like about the \$PARTY Party? Please list as many responses as you wish, but please list each thing you like in a separate field. If there’s nothing you like about the \$PARTY Party, please proceed. [Six text boxes are provided for respondents to use]

Is there anything in particular you dislike about the \$PARTY Party? Please list as many responses as you wish, but please list each thing you dislike in a separate field. If there’s nothing you dislike about the \$PARTY Party, please proceed. [Six text boxes are provided for respondents to use]

How strongly do you identify as an American?<sup>1</sup>

- a. Extremely strongly
- b. Very strongly
- c. Somewhat strongly
- d. Not too strongly
- e. Not at all strongly

How important is being an American to you?

- a. Extremely important
- b. Very important

---

<sup>1</sup> Items 22 – 26 are the manipulation check items.



- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not too important
- e. Not at all important

How well does the term “American” describe you?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

To what extent do you see yourself as a typical American?

- a. A great deal
- b. Somewhat
- c. Not too much
- d. Not at all

When talking about Americans, how often do you say “we” instead of “they”?

- a. Always
- b. Most of the time
- c. Sometimes
- d. Not too often
- e. Never

#### Deviation from the Pre-Analysis Plan:

This study was pre-registered with EGAP as study 20150713AA. You can find the pre-registration at: <http://egap.org/registration/1241>.

There was only one small deviation from the pre-analysis plan. I included a hypothesis predicting larger effects for immigrants. Because only 7% of the sample reported being an immigrant, I simply lacked the statistical power needed to test this hypothesis. I therefore did not report this in the body of the paper (since the data cannot speak in any serious way to the validity of the hypothesis).

## **Experiment Items 2:**

In what year were you born? [pull-down menu]

What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Generally speaking, I think of myself as a:

- c. Democrat
- d. Republican
- e. Independent

[IF DEMOCRAT] Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

- f. Strong Democrat
- g. Not very strong Democrat

[IF REPUBLICAN] Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

- h. Strong Republican
- i. Not very strong Republican

[IF INDEPENDENT] Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

- j. Closer to the Democratic Party
- k. Closer to the Republican Party

[TREATMENT PRIME:]

In today's study, we want to understand why Americans like America as much as they do. What makes you proudest as an American?

You should try your best to be as thorough and convincing, because we want to use these answers to explain to people who have never been to America why Americans are proud of their country.

Please take your time and do not rush. To help with that, the next screen arrow will not appear for a few moments to give you time to write out your answer.

[Text Box Shown to Respondents]

Now we would like you to explain what you like best about American and Americans. What is it that you like best about your fellow Americans?

Again, you should try your best to be as thorough and convincing, because we want to use these answers to explain to people who have never been to America what Americans like best about their fellow citizens.

Please take your time and do not rush. To help with that, the next screen arrow will not appear for a few moments to give you time to write out your answer.  
[Text Box Shown to Respondents]

[CONTROL PRIME:]

How often do you go to the movies?

- A. Very Often
- B. Somewhat Often
- C. Not too Often
- D. Not at all

When you go to the movies, what types of movies do you like to see and why? [Text box shown to respondents]

[Post-Test Items:]

I'd like to get your feelings toward some groups or individuals who are in the news these days. Below, you'll see the name of a group next to a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward that group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward that group. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the group. Please use the feeling thermometer to indicate your feeling toward the following groups. [respondents are shown a separate feeling thermometer for each group: The Democratic Party, the Republican Party]

How strongly do you identify as an American?

- a. Extremely strongly
- b. Very strongly
- c. Somewhat strongly
- d. Not too strongly
- e. Not at all strongly

How important is being an American to you?

- a. Extremely important
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not too important
- e. Not at all important

How well does the term “American” describe you?

- a. Extremely well
- b. Very well
- c. Somewhat well
- d. Not too well
- e. Not at all well

To what extent do you see yourself as a typical American?

- a. A great deal
- b. Somewhat
- c. Not too much
- d. Not at all

When talking about Americans, how often do you say “we” instead of “they”?

- a. Always
- b. Most of the time
- c. Sometimes
- d. Not too often
- e. Never

**Experiment 3 Items:**

In what year were you born? [pull-down menu]

What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Generally speaking, I think of myself as a:

- c. Democrat
- d. Republican
- e. Independent

[IF DEMOCRAT] Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

- f. Strong Democrat
- g. Not very strong Democrat

[IF REPUBLICAN] Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

- h. Strong Republican
- i. Not very strong Republican

[IF INDEPENDENT] Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

- j. Closer to the Democratic Party
- k. Closer to the Republican Party

IF ASSIGNED TO THE TREATMENT CONDITION:

People belong to many types of groups. One of the most important and essential of these groups is the nation that you belong to. You are an American. Now we'd like to ask you some questions about being an American. Please click to the next screen to begin this section.

How strongly do you identify as an American?

- f. Extremely strongly
- g. Very strongly
- h. Somewhat strongly
- i. Not too strongly
- j. Not at all strongly

How important is being an American to you?

- f. Extremely important
- g. Very important
- h. Somewhat important
- i. Not too important
- j. Not at all important

How well does the term “American” describe you?

- f. Extremely well
- g. Very well
- h. Somewhat well
- i. Not too well
- j. Not at all well

To what extent do you see yourself as a typical American?

- e. A great deal
- f. Somewhat
- g. Not too much
- h. Not at all

When talking about Americans, how often do you say “we” instead of “they”?

- f. Always
- g. Most of the time
- h. Sometimes
- i. Not too often
- j. Never

IF ASSIGNED TO THE CONTROL CONDITION:

Now we're going to ask you a few questions about your travel and entertainment preferences. To be sure that you have enough time to think through your answers, the next screen button will be delayed for several seconds on each screen. When you're ready to begin, please click to the next screen.

Where do you think you'll next vacation? Why do you like that location?  
[Subjects are provided a text box for their response]

When you go to the movies, what types of movies do you like to see, and why? Please explain briefly in the space below.  
[Subjects are provided a text box for their response]

How often do you go out to restaurants?

- Very often
- Somewhat often
- Not too often
- Never

When you go out to restaurants, what types of restaurants do you prefer and why? Please explain briefly in the space below.

Post-Test Items:

I'd like to get your feelings toward some groups or individuals who are in the news these days. Below, you'll see the name of a group next to a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward that group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably toward that group. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the group. Please use the feeling thermometer to indicate your feeling toward the following groups.

[Respondents are shown a separate feeling thermometer for each group: The Democratic Party, the Republican Party]

**Supplemental Tables, Experiment 1**

	(1) Opposite Party FT	(2) Same Party FT	(3) Obama FT (Rep)	(4) Trait Index	(5) Opposite Party Likes	(6) Opposite Party Dislikes
Treatment	<b>6.259</b> <b>(1.411)</b>	2.275 (1.346)	<b>7.233</b> <b>(2.761)</b>	<b>0.153</b> <b>(0.0473)</b>	<b>0.130</b> <b>(0.0563)</b>	0.0810 (0.109)
Constant	24.40 (0.969)	71.32 (0.923)	21.07 (1.873)	2.621 (0.0324)	0.353 (0.0386)	1.603 (0.0749)
Observations	1,151	1,164	441	1,161	1,171	1,171
R-squared	0.017	0.002	0.015	0.009	0.005	0.000

Table A1: Effects of Treatment Prime, Excluding Partisan Leaners

*Note:* cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. Treatment effects that can be differentiated from 0 at conventional levels are given in **bold**.



	(1) Opposite Party FT	(2) Opposite Party FT	(3) Trait Index	(4) Trait Index	(5) Likes	(6) Likes	(7) Dislikes	(8) Dislikes
treatment	<b>7.282</b> <b>(1.782)</b>	<b>6.411</b> <b>(1.312)</b>	<b>0.161</b> <b>(0.0579)</b>	<b>0.188</b> <b>(0.0435)</b>	<b>0.243</b> <b>(0.0713)</b>	<b>0.143</b> <b>(0.0529)</b>	0.089 (0.139)	0.102 (0.102)
Democrat	2.185 (1.596)		-0.329 (0.0516)		0.118 (0.0639)		0.133 (0.124)	
treatment*Democrat	-2.851 (2.321)		-0.0122 (0.0752)		<b>-0.255</b> <b>(0.0929)</b>		0.012 (0.181)	
Minority		3.944 (1.806)		0.00667 (0.0593)		0.0961 (0.0718)		<b>-0.415</b> <b>(0.139)</b>
treatment*Minority		-3.183 (2.656)		-0.135 (0.0875)		<b>-0.201</b> <b>(0.106)</b>		-0.053 (0.204)
constant	24.48 (1.226)	24.78 (0.906)	2.829 (0.0398)	2.632 (0.0300)	0.321 (0.0491)	0.366 (0.0365)	1.48 (0.09)	1.67 (0.07)
observations	1,695	1,695	1,716	1,716	1,729	1,729	1,729	1,729
standard error squared	0.015	0.017	0.054	0.012	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.01

Table A2: Heterogeneous Treatment Effects by Race and Party

*Note:* cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. Treatment effects that can be differentiated from 0 at conventional levels are given in **bold**. The only differences here are for likes, which are the weakest effects in the main body of the paper (so the effects on opposite party likes are effectively 0 for Democrats and non-white respondents).

## **Supplemental Results, Experiment 2**

	Study 2A Out-Party	Study 2B Out-Party	Pooled Out-Party	Pooled Out-Party	Study 2A Same-Party	Study 2B Same-Party	Pooled Same-Party	Pooled Same-Party
Treatment	3.62 (2.34)	3.51 (3.25)	3.56 (1.96)	3.51 (2.88)	0.20 (2.34)	0.17 (3.34)	0.19 (1.99)	0.17 (2.92)
Study Fixed Effect			-0.69 (1.96)	-0.74 (2.67)			10.54 (1.99)	10.53 (2.71)
Study Fixed Effect*Treatment				0.11 (3.94)				0.03 (3.99)
Constant	29.08 (1.58)	29.81 (2.21)	29.79 (1.7)	29.81 (1.95)	65.90 (1.57)	55.37 (2.27)	55.36 (1.72)	55.37 (1.98)
N	387	337	724	724	388	338	726	726
R-Squared	0.01	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04

Table A3: Supplemental Experiment, Separated Out by Study

*Note:* In table 3, what I refer to Experiment 2 is two identical studies that are pooled together (see the discussion of table 3 in the body of the paper for more details). This table breaks out the two supplemental studies separately, to show that the results are nearly identical from just using one study or the other. Further, the data also shows no differential treatment effects by study, hence I present the pooled results in the body of the paper.

### Supplemental Tables, Observational Results

	14-Day Window	10-Day Window	7-Day Window	5-Day Window	3-Day Window	1-Day Window	Days Away from 7/4	Weeks Away from 7/4
Treatment	0.18 (0.84)	-0.13 (0.96)	-0.30 (1.21)	-0.52 (1.46)	0.28 (1.83)	5.1 (3.3)	<b>0.06</b> <b>(0.03)</b>	<b>0.45</b> <b>(0.22)</b>
Constant	61.19 (0.84)	61.56 (0.56)	61.65 (0.67)	62.77 (0.79)	62.90 (1.05)	63.71 (1.89)	59.47 (0.62)	59.66 (0.54)
N	3896	2896	1971	1394	803	248	6364	6364
R-Squared	0.00001	0.000006	0.00003	0.00009	0.00003	0.01	0.0007	0.0007

Table A4: Placebo Test: Same Party Feeling Thermometers

*Note:* cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. Treatment effects that can be differentiated from 0 at conventional levels are given in **bold**. Note that none of the window measures are statistically significant.

There is a modest effect for days/weeks away from July 4<sup>th</sup>, but it is in the wrong direction: those interviewed farther away from July 4<sup>th</sup> rate their own party more positively.

	14-Day Window	10-Day Window	7-Day Window	5-Day Window	3-Day Window	1-Day Window	Days Away from 7/4	Weeks Away from 7/4
Intercept	27.40 (3.02)	28.29 (3.46)	24.72 (4.50)	31.79 (5.18)	31.05 (7.09)	41.18 (12.89)	34.79 (2.41)	34.42 (2.40)
Treatment	<b>1.82</b> <b>(0.83)</b>	<b>1.75</b> <b>(0.94)</b>	<b>2.63</b> <b>(1.19)</b>	<b>2.78</b> <b>(1.44)</b>	<b>3.84</b> <b>(1.78)</b>	2.92 (3.07)	<b>-0.12</b> <b>(0.03)</b>	<b>-0.86</b> <b>(0.22)</b>
Female	<b>1.34</b> <b>(0.80)</b>	0.72 (0.92)	0.44 (1.13)	0.18 (1.33)	0.14 (1.70)	-2.01 (2.97)	0.09 (0.64)	0.09 (0.64)
Age	0.01 (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)	0.04 (0.04)	0.002 (0.05)	0.06 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.10)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Education	0.33 (0.26)	0.36 (0.29)	0.35 (0.36)	0.22 (0.44)	0.32 (0.56)	0.22 (0.96)	<b>0.35</b> <b>(0.20)</b>	<b>0.35</b> <b>(0.20)</b>
Income	<b>0.32</b> <b>(0.10)</b>	<b>0.27</b> <b>(0.12)</b>	<b>0.37</b> <b>(0.15)</b>	0.26 (0.18)	0.23 (0.22)	0.06 (0.37)	<b>0.26</b> <b>(0.08)</b>	<b>0.26</b> <b>(0.08)</b>
Caucasian	0.99 (1.95)	0.78 (2.24)	2.39 (2.99)	1.00 (3.42)	-2.88 (4.90)	-2.73 (9.63)	-0.13 (1.50)	-0.12 (1.50)
African- American	<b>-4.56</b> <b>(2.45)</b>	<b>-6.37</b> <b>(2.79)</b>	-4.48 (3.59)	<b>-7.53</b> <b>(4.12)</b>	<b>-10.10</b> <b>(5.66)</b>	-7.87 (10.56)	<b>-3.11</b> <b>(1.89)</b>	<b>-3.11</b> <b>(1.89)</b>
Hispanic	2.13 (2.59)	0.34 (3.03)	3.93 (3.91)	0.34 (4.57)	-4.25 (6.53)	8.54 (12.28)	0.67 (2.01)	0.70 (2.01)
Party ID	<b>-1.41</b> <b>(0.19)</b>	<b>-1.54</b> <b>(0.21)</b>	<b>-1.53</b> <b>(0.26)</b>	<b>-1.80</b> <b>(0.32)</b>	<b>-1.84</b> <b>(0.40)</b>	<b>-2.35</b> <b>(0.72)</b>	<b>-1.45</b> <b>(0.15)</b>	<b>-1.45</b> <b>(0.15)</b>
N	3845	2856	1932	1368	782	238	6296	6296
R-Squared	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02

Table A5: Out-Party Feeling Thermometers, with controls

*Note:* cell entries are OLS regression coefficients with associated standard errors in parentheses. Effects that can be differentiated from 0 at conventional levels are given in **bold**.

	14-Day Window	10-Day Window	7-Day Window	5-Day Window	3-Day Window	1-Day Window
Treatment	<b>1.64</b> <b>(0.87)</b>	<b>1.38</b> <b>(1.02)</b>	<b>2.51</b> <b>(1.30)</b>	<b>2.33</b> <b>(1.62)</b>	<b>5.36</b> <b>(2.12)</b>	-2.92 (5.8)
N Control	2290	1608	1050	671	323	46
N Treated	1223	916	530	347	211	37

Table A6: Out Party Feeling Thermometers, Matching Estimates

Note: cell entries are the ATT estimates from coarsened exact matching; entries that can be differentiated from 0 at the  $\alpha = 0.10$  level (one-tailed) are given in **bold**. Matching estimates are generated using the coarsened exact matching algorithm (Iacus, King, and Porro 2011), with matching on the covariates used in table A3.

## 2008 Summer Olympics Analysis, Annenberg Data

As I discussed in the body of the paper, in addition to July 4<sup>th</sup>, there was another event that summer that increased national identity: the 2008 Beijing Summer Olympics. Because they explicitly have individuals competing for their home countries, the Olympics increases a sense of national identity among viewers (Elling et al. 2014). This is especially true around salient events, like winning important gold medals, or a large number of medals (Van Hilvoorde et al. 2010).

The summer Olympics took place from August 8<sup>th</sup> through the 24<sup>th</sup> that year, and the Democratic National Convention started the next day, so the end of the Olympics is contaminated. But I can use earlier periods in the Olympics to look for boosts in national identity and out-party affect. In particular, I look at two periods. First, I examine the opening ceremonies, as this offers each nation, including the U.S., a chance to display their national colors.<sup>2</sup> Second, I look at the weekend of August 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup>. Over that weekend, Michael Phelps won his 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> gold medals in the Beijing games, which approached, tied and then broke Mark Spitz's record from 1972.<sup>3</sup> This historic event, widely covered in the U.S. press, should bring all Americans together around this historic achievement. Table A7 below presents the results.

	Opening Ceremony Out-Party FT	Phelps Weekend Out-Party FT	Opening Ceremony Same-Party FT	Phelps Weekend Same-Party FT
Treatment	2.57 (2.8)	<b>4.8</b> <b>(2.35)</b>	-1.08 (2.70)	0.40 (2.20)
Constant	26.52 (1.86)	26.31 (1.49)	64.72 (1.83)	62.23 (1.40)
N	300	459	298	466
R-Squared	0.004	0.01	0.0005	0.00007

Table A7: Effects of Olympic Events on Same-Party & Out-Party Feeling Thermometers

<sup>2</sup> Here, I contrast the two days following the Opening Ceremony (8/9-8/10) to the two preceding days (8/7-8/8).

<sup>3</sup> Here, I contrast that weekend with the first weekend of August (8/1-8/3), since the preceding days were during the Olympics (which might cause some minor effects of American identity).

So here, note that there is a large effect—almost a 5 point effect—of being interviewed on that record-breaking Phelps weekend (in addition to Phelps, Nastia Lukin also won gold that weekend in the women’s all-around gymnastics finals, another important win). While there is a 2.5 degree effect of being interviewed just after the opening ceremony (vs. just before), with only  $N = 300$  subjects, the effect is just too small to differentiate from 0 statistically. Note that in both cases, again consistent with my theory, neither event has an effect on same-party feeling thermometers. Overall, then, this is strong confirmation that the Olympics—much like July 4<sup>th</sup>—has a small, short-term effect on attitudes toward the other party.

## How Common Are Articles that Prime American Identity?

In the body of the paper, I argued that partisan figures were unlikely to be able to prime national identity. If a partisan actor delivers the appeal, then it will activate not only subjects' superordinate American identities, but also their subordinate partisan ones as well. The primes in the experiments in the paper were expressly designed to as apolitical as possible to avoid this complication (and instead just prime American identity). Likewise, the natural experiment surrounding July 4<sup>th</sup> (and the Olympics) is not expressly political, but rather about celebrating America. Such apolitical appeals are most likely the most effective way to use this sort of an appeal.

So, for example, one possible strategy might be to use the sort of American identity and goodwill engendered by July 4<sup>th</sup>. In the days surrounding July 4<sup>th</sup>, many newspapers publish stories on American identity and discuss American values (and often why Americans should be proud of this identity). For example, on July 4<sup>th</sup> 2016, the *Tampa Bay Times* published an article entitled “A Day to Celebrate Our Achievements,” discussing how American values are still a force for good in the world, and were why the paper was still bullish on America's future (basically, that our values made us strong). Several New Jersey papers, including the *Hackensack Record* and the *West Herald News*, covered Senator Cory Booker's address to new U.S. citizens, which emphasized how immigrants strengthened American, and though we come from different lands, we all share certain ideas as Americans. Many other stories parallel the treatment used in the experiment 1 in the paper, suggesting it is not at all atypical.

Searching Newsbank, an online database of several hundred small and medium-sized newspapers from across the U.S., I turn up several dozen such stories from the days surrounding July 4<sup>th</sup> in each of the past few years. In the first 5 days in July, I count 30 such stories in 2016, 71 such stories in 2015 (though many touch on the Iran nuclear deal, explaining the one-year bump), 19 such stories in 2014, and 20 such stories in 2013.<sup>4</sup> If we use the Lexis-Nexis search engine—which searches a broader network of papers—there are 169 such stories in 2016, 207 such stories in 2015, 269 in 2014, 218 in 2013. Clearly, this is a popular topic around July 4<sup>th</sup>.<sup>5</sup>

What's more interesting, and perhaps more relevant, is that such stories are not limited to only Independence Day. While the stories are certainly the most frequent around that holiday, they occur at other times of the year as well. For example, in June 2015, the *Idaho Statesman* of Boise, ID wrote about the Idaho Red Cross's Hometown Heroes, and discussed how many of them embodied American values.

Cuing American identity in this fashion—by reminding readers of these sorts of shared values and norms that are at the core of American identification for most people—is most likely the best way to try and replicate the experimental design in the real world. So to

---

<sup>4</sup> The search is for “American” and “Belief or Value or Creed or Identity” in the headline/lead paragraph, restricted to English-language U.S. Newspapers.

<sup>5</sup> The Lexis-Nexis algorithm is slightly different; it requires searching for the key terms within the same paragraph as one another.



me, the real-world analogue of my study is not so much politicians making these cues, but other apolitical actors, such as the media, doing it.

The article used in experiment 1 is therefore a relatively common type of article for subjects, especially near the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday. Future work can consider how long such effects last, and how other media coverage—in particular, coverage that primes partisan considerations—shapes their effectiveness, but my work establishes an important baseline.

### **Party vs. Candidate Feeling Thermometers**

In the experimental results in the paper, I focus on party feeling thermometers, as those are the most theoretically relevant construct. But in the analysis of the 2008 Annenberg data, I have to use candidate feeling thermometers, because that is all that Annenberg asked its subjects.

The question is whether this is likely to change my substantive results. I argue that it is not. To see this, I can compare the party and candidate feeling thermometers in the 2008 American National Election Study (NES). There, perhaps unsurprisingly, they are very closely related. In the 2008 NES, more than 50% of respondents rate the party's nominee and the party itself within  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a standard deviation of one another on the feeling thermometer scale. Indeed, on average, the two ratings are only a few degrees apart. Likewise, the party and candidate feeling thermometers show a similar level of affective polarization: people rate their own party 28.9 degrees more warmly, and their party's nominee 28.3 degrees more warmly. This close correspondence should not be surprising, given that the party's nominee defines the party for many ordinary Americans (Sanbonmatsu 2002, Levendusky 2009). In most cases, for ordinary Americans, the party's nominee is effectively the party.

This is not simply a function of using the 2008 NES Data. Lelkes, Sood, and Iyengar (2017) report that the correlation between party feeling thermometers and candidate feeling thermometers is 0.8 in the 2012 NES (see their footnote 5). Indeed, if I take the NES cumulative data file, the correlation across all years is 0.75 (and the correlation is higher in more recent years, as one would expect in an electorate more sharply polarized by partisanship). Party and candidate feeling thermometers are strongly related to one another, both in 2008, and more generally.

We also see some additional evidence in favor of this argument in my experimental results. In addition to rating the parties, subjects also rate President Obama on the same feeling thermometer scale. Note that the results directly parallel the results for the party feeling thermometers: treated Republicans feel more positively toward Obama, but not treated Democrats. This is exactly what the theory would predict, since it argues that only out-party feeling thermometers should be affected. All of this suggests that, empirically, party and candidate feeling thermometers are very closely linked. Given this, my use of candidate feeling thermometers in my Annenberg analysis is unlikely to affect the substantive conclusions of my research.

### **Works Cited (Not In Main Paper)**

- Elling, Agnes, Ivo Van Hilvoorde, and Remko Van Den Dool. 2014. "Creating or Awakening National Pride through Sporting Success: A Longitudinal Study on Macro Effects in the Netherlands." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 49(2): 129-51.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. *Democrats, Republicans, and the Politics of Women's Place*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Van Hilvoorde, Ivo, Agnes Elling and Ruud Stovkis. 2010. "How to influence national pride? The Olympic medal index as a unifying narrative." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(1): 87–102.