

Supplemental Material – Unreviewed

Additional Instructions for Mechanical Turk Subjects

Instructions read by Mechanical Turk (MTurk) subjects prior to beginning the experiment, about the conditions under which they should complete the experiment were as follows:

During this experiment, we ask that you comply with the following experiment requirements:

- 1) Please **maximize the size of your web browser** so that it covers your entire screen. Complete this experiment on a desktop computer, laptop computer, or large tablet, not on a mobile phone or similar device.
- 2) Please complete the experiment in a single session, and **do not leave the experiment to engage in other tasks**. So don't check your mail, look at Facebook, send or read a text message, get up for a drink, etc.
- 3) Please **do not use your web browser's back or refresh buttons** at any point during the experiment.
- 4) Because this experiment requires your close attention, we ask that you **complete the experiment in an environment that is free of noise and distraction**. Please do not speak to anyone, or have anyone near you. Ideally, you would be alone in a quiet room, or in a room where other people are quiet (such as a library).

The reason we ask you to follow these instructions is to ensure the quality of the information you give us. We know from previous research that if you do take a break, chat with others, etc, it will impair your ability to do the tasks set in this experiment.

[checkbox] I understand these instructions, and agree to comply with them for the duration of the experiment

Norming of Negative Short Stories for use in Experiments 1a and 1b

In order to choose the negative short stories, we first collected norming data from two samples: 120 introductory psychology students at Victoria University of Wellington read and answered questions about one of eight possible stories (for a total of 15 responses about each story), and 150 Mechanical Turk workers also read and answered all questions about one of ten possible stories (two of which were abridged versions of the longest of the eight stories; see below).

In these norming studies, we first asked subjects to complete the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Expanded form (PANAS-X; Watson & Clark, 1999) with regard to how they were feeling “right now.” Next, they read one short story; we timed how long they spent on this survey page. Afterwards, they completed the PANAS-X a second time; rated the story for how negative, positive, surprising, and interesting it was (from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *extremely*); listed things in the story they or others might find disturbing or upsetting, and pleasant or amusing; indicated if they thought the story had a plot twist and, if so, what and where it was; and reported if they had read the story before. MTurkers also saw several attention checks throughout, and at the end of the survey those subjects answered questions about their compliance with instructions and the conditions under which they completed the study. We excluded and replaced responses from MTurkers who failed our attention checks, reported that they did not carefully read the entire story, or had a story-reading speed (calculated by dividing the story word count by the time they spent on the story survey page) of more than 600 words per minute.

We then examined subjects’ responses to each story in each sample, focusing on: change in the degree of negative affect that subjects reported feeling, and how negatively they rated the story, how long they took to read the story, and if they had read the stories before. Based on

these data, we chose the stories “A Dark-Brown Dog” by Stephen Crane and an abridged version of “The Veldt” by Ray Bradbury for use in our experiments-proper.

More specifically, with regard to “A Dark-Brown Dog” we found that subjects in both samples rated the story as very negative (students: $M = 5.60$, 95% CI [5.10, 6.10]; MTurkers: $M = 6.27$, 95% CI [5.73, 6.80], on a 1-7 scale), and likewise degree of current negative affect increased from before to after reading the story (students: $M_{\text{diff}} = 3.87$, 95% CI_{diff} [0.81, 6.92]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{diff}} = 9.80$, 95% CI_{diff} [5.06, 14.54], although these increases are small, given a maximum possible change of 40). Further, students took approximately 10 minutes on average to read the story ($M = 573$ s, 95% CI [489, 657], Median = 620 s) and MTurkers took about the same time ($M = 610$ s, 95% CI [402, 817], Median = 596 s). Finally, none of the students or MTurkers had previously read this story.

With regard to “The Veldt” we found that student subjects rated the full-length story as very negative ($M = 5.27$, 95% CI [4.62, 5.91]) and likewise their degree of current negative affect slightly increased from before to after reading the story ($M_{\text{diff}} = 1.87$, 95% CI_{diff} [-0.64, 4.37]). Further, students took approximately 15 minutes on average to read the story ($M = 860$ s, 95% CI [782, 938], Median = 857 s), and none of them had previously read it. MTurkers gave similar responses for the abridged version that some of them saw, rating it as highly negative ($M = 5.40$, 95% CI [4.52, 6.28]), and reporting a small increase in negative affect ($M_{\text{diff}} = 2.93$, 95% CI_{diff} [0.44, 5.43]). They unsurprisingly took less time on average to read this shorter version of the story than did students who read the full version ($M = 731$ s, 95% CI [527, 934], Median = 661 s), and only one of them reported having read it before.

Norming of More- and Less Negative Film Clips for use in Experiments 2a, 2b, 3, and 4

We collected norming data about “more negative” and “less negative” film clips in a similar manner as we had for the short stories, showing a sample of introductory psychology students at Victoria University of Wellington and a sample of MTurk workers one of ten film clips (half more negative, half less negative), to obtain a total of 15 complete responses per clip from each population. We chose clips that came in pairs, taking them from public service announcement campaigns that used two different versions of the same event—one clip with a more negative or more graphic outcome than the other clip—to convey a common message. But before norming the clips we edited some of them slightly, to remove logos and verbal campaign appeals, and in some cases adding or removing footage to make the clips within each pair more equivalent to each other in length.

As for the story norming, subjects first completed the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1999) before watching a film clip. Afterwards, they completed the PANAS-X a second time; rated how negative, positive, surprising, interesting, unpleasant, distressing, and disgusting the clip was; listed disturbing and pleasant details in the clip, and summarized the storyline and message conveyed (if any); and indicated if they had seen the clip before. Given that we had edited the clips, we also checked subjects’ feelings of transportation (i.e. absorption in a narrative) and comprehension, so that we could pick pairs of more negative and less negative clips that were at least moderately transporting and comprehensible. Thus, subjects also rated nine items (adapted from Green & Brock, 2000) with regard to how transported they were while watching the clip (e.g. “I was mentally involved in the video while watching it”, where 1 = *not at all* and 7 = *very much*; items are then summed); and four items (variously adapted from Glenberg, Wilkinson, & Epstein, 1982; Johnson, Foley, Suengas, & Raye, 1988; Rubin, Schrauf, & Greenberg, 2003),

with regard to how well they understood what happened in the clip, how comprehensible the order of events was, how realistic the storyline was, and how coherent a story it was, respectively (also on 1-7 scales; we then summed these items). MTurkers also saw several attention checks during the survey, and at the end answered several other questions about their compliance with instructions and the conditions under which they completed the study. We excluded and replaced data from student subjects who were observed replaying their clip. We did the same for MTurkers who failed our attention checks, reported that they did not carefully watch the entire film clip, that they paused or replayed the clip, or that they had technical issues playing it.

In order to choose the film clips for use in our experiments to follow, we then examined responses regarding each pair of clips, in each sample. We focused on change in the degree of negative affect that subjects reported; how negative, unpleasant, disturbing, and disgusting they rated the clips as being; how transporting and comprehensible they rated the clips as being, and if subjects had seen the clips before. Based on these data we chose one pair of clips called “Pram,” from the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads, and another pair of clips called “Blind Eye,” from the Women’s Aid charity.

The results of our norming showed that, with regard to the more negative version of “Pram,” subjects in both samples rated it as very negative on the four related items: Students: $M_{\text{negative}} = 5.87$, 95% CI [5.32, 6.42]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 5.40$, 95% CI [4.26, 6.54]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 5.47$, 95% CI [4.61, 6.33]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 4.47$, 95% CI [3.38, 5.55]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{negative}} = 6.40$, 95% CI [6.05, 6.75]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 6.40$, 95% CI [5.99, 6.81]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 6.40$, 95% CI [5.94, 6.86]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 4.73$, 95% CI [3.72, 5.75]. Whereas subjects in both samples rated the less negative version of “Pram” lower on those items: Students: $M_{\text{negative}} = 3.67$, 95% CI [2.76, 4.57], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.20$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.19, 3.21]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 3.20$, 95% CI [2.11, 4.29], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.20$, 95% CI_{diff} [0.69,

3.71]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 3.53$, 95% CI [2.37, 4.70], $M_{\text{diff}} = 1.93$, 95% CI_{diff} [0.55, 3.31]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 1.93$, 95% CI [1.06, 2.81], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.53$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.20, 3.86]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{negative}} = 3.73$, 95% CI [2.97, 4.50], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.67$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.86, 3.47]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 3.80$, 95% CI [2.86, 4.74], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.60$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.62, 3.58]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 4.87$, 95% CI [4.01, 5.73], $M_{\text{diff}} = 1.53$, 95% CI_{diff} [0.60, 2.46]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 2.27$, 95% CI [1.53, 3.01], $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.47$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.27, 3.66].

Similarly, for both samples, subjects' degree of current negative affect increased from before to after watching the more negative version of "Pram": Students: $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.53$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.99, 7.08]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{diff}} = 7.87$, 95% CI_{diff} [4.02, 11.71]. These increases are somewhat bigger than those reported during the negative stories' norming, but they are still modest, considering the maximum possible change score is 40. Nonetheless, subjects' degree of current negative affect was only trivially different before versus after watching the less negative version of "Pram: Students: $M_{\text{diff}} = 1.27$, 95% CI_{diff} [-1.15, 3.68]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{diff}} = 2.07$, 95% CI_{diff} [-1.13, 5.26].

Further, subjects in both samples rated both the more negative and less negative versions of "Pram" as moderately transporting, considering the possible range of sum scores was 9-63: Students: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 39.60$, 95% CI [34.41, 44.79], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 38.67$, 95% CI [34.90, 42.43]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 46.87$, 95% CI [42.97, 50.76], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 40.73$, 95% CI [37.01, 44.46]. Subjects rated both versions of "Pram" as highly comprehensible, considering the possible range of sum scores was 4-28: Students: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 25.53$, 95% CI [24.32, 26.75], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 20.80$, 95% CI [17.83, 23.77]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 24.87$, 95% CI [23.39, 26.34], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 17.67$, 95% CI [13.96, 21.37].

Finally, none of the students or MTurkers reported having previously seen either of the "Pram" clips.

Turning now to our norming results for our other chosen pair of film clips, subjects in both samples rated the more negative version of “Blind Eye” as very negative according to four items: Students: $M_{\text{negative}} = 6.47$, 95% CI [6.06, 6.88]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 5.33$, 95% CI [4.68, 5.98]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 4.87$, 95% CI [4.09, 5.65]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 5.47$, 95% CI [4.58, 6.35]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{negative}} = 6.80$, 95% CI [6.49, 7.11]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 6.33$, 95% CI [5.79, 6.87]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 5.80$, 95% CI [5.04, 6.56]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 6.07$, 95% CI [5.33, 6.81]. Whereas subjects who saw the less negative version of “Blind Eye” rated it lower: Students: $M_{\text{negative}} = 2.07$, 95% CI [1.49, 2.64], $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.40$, 95% CI_{diff} [3.73, 5.07]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 1.93$, 95% CI [1.17, 2.70], $M_{\text{diff}} = 3.40$, 95% CI_{diff} [2.44, 4.36]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 1.87$, 95% CI [1.06, 2.67], $M_{\text{diff}} = 3.00$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.93, 4.07]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 1.40$, 95% CI [0.94, 1.86], $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.07$, 95% CI_{diff} [3.11, 5.02]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{negative}} = 1.87$, 95% CI [1.24, 2.49], $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.93$, 95% CI_{diff} [4.27, 5.60]; $M_{\text{unpleasant}} = 2.33$, 95% CI [1.50, 3.16], $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.00$, 95% CI_{diff} [3.06, 4.94]; $M_{\text{distressing}} = 2.20$, 95% CI [1.44, 2.96], $M_{\text{diff}} = 3.60$, 95% CI_{diff} [2.57, 4.63]; $M_{\text{disgusting}} = 1.73$, 95% CI [1.06, 2.41], $M_{\text{diff}} = 4.33$, 95% CI_{diff} [3.38, 5.29].

Similarly, for both samples, subjects’ degree of current negative affect increased from before to after watching the more negative version of “Blind Eye”: Students: $M_{\text{diff}} = 3.47$, 95% CI_{diff} [-0.74, 7.68]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{diff}} = 5.60$, 95% CI_{diff} [1.90, 9.30]. But subjects’ degree of current negative affect was only trivially different before versus after watching the less negative version of “Blind Eye”: Students: $M_{\text{diff}} = -1.13$, 95% CI_{diff} [-2.16, -0.11]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{diff}} = 1.40$, 95% CI_{diff} [-0.83, 3.63].

Further, subjects in both samples rated both the more negative and less negative versions of “Blind Eye” as moderately transporting: Students: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 37.07$, 95% CI [32.85, 41.29], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 36.13$, 95% CI [33.02, 39.24]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 41.60$, 95% CI [36.00, 47.20], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 36.73$, 95% CI [31.27, 42.20]. Subjects rated both versions of “Blind Eye”

as highly comprehensible: Students: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 21.60$, 95% CI [18.95, 24.25], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 20.47$, 95% CI [17.41, 23.52]; MTurkers: $M_{\text{morenegative}} = 24.87$, 95% CI [22.68, 27.05], $M_{\text{lessnegative}} = 20.53$, 95% CI [16.93, 24.14].

Finally, none of the students or MTurkers reported having previously seen either of the “Blind Eye” clips.

Descriptive Statistics for Time Spent Reading Nonfiction Articles

Subjects read a nonfiction article while noting intrusions about the negative material they had just seen. Reading times (that is, time spent on the survey page displaying the article) were as follows: Experiment 1a: $M = 229.19$ s, 95% CI [217.71, 240.66], Median = 213.13 s; Experiment 1b: $M = 206.26$ s, 95% CI [184.78, 227.74], Median = 174.64 s; Experiment 2a: $M = 234.17$ s, 95% CI [217.82, 250.53], Median = 230.91 s; Experiment 2b: $M = 187.70$ s, 95% CI [173.44, 201.95], Median = 157.19 s; Experiment 3: $M = 165.40$ s, 95% CI [151.98, 178.82], Median = 142.22 s; Experiment 4: $M = 169.13$ s, 95% CI [156.15, 182.11], Median = 151.23 s.

Story Comprehension Results from Experiments 1a and 1b

Near the end of Experiments 1a and 1b, subjects answered five four-alternative forced-choice comprehension questions about the negative short story they had read. In Experiment 1a, the proportion of questions “warning” subjects got correct was high ($M = 0.79$, 95% CI [0.74, 0.83]); performance of “no warning” subjects was similarly high ($M = 0.81$, 95% CI [0.77, 0.85]; 95% CI difference [-0.03, 0.08]). In Experiment 1b, “warning” subjects’ performance was high ($M = 0.75$, 95% CI [0.70, 0.80]), as was performance of “no warning” subjects ($M = 0.78$, 95% CI [0.72, 0.83]; 95% CI difference [-0.05, 0.10]). Subjects’ comprehension of negative short stories was trivially affected by trigger warnings.

Norming of Short Story Comprehension Questions for use in Experiments 1a and 1b

We created a pool of 20 questions about each of the two stories we had chosen. We then normed these 40 questions by giving 32 introductory psychology students one of the stories to read and then asking them all 20 questions about that story in random order, such that 16 subjects saw each story and its questions.

For each question, we examined its difficulty—that is, the proportion of subjects who answered it correctly; and its reliability—that is, the strength of the correlation between whether subjects got that question correct and the overall number of questions they answered correctly. Based on these data we chose five questions for each story that, collectively, covered a range of aspects of the story and required straightforward recall of details and a deeper understanding of the story. For both sets of five questions we chose, item difficulty ranged from 0.63-0.88; item reliability for the chosen questions about *A Dark-Brown Dog* ranged from 0.64-0.75, similarly for the chosen questions about *The Veldt* reliability ranged from 0.62-0.81.

The questions we chose for “*A Dark-Brown Dog*” (with the correct answer in **bold**; but we altered the placement of the correct response options in the experiments-proper) were:

1. The story can be interpreted as an allegory for the life awaiting newly freed slaves, symbolised by the dog. In this interpretation the father symbolises:
 - a. The Northern states of America
 - b. A progressive generation of white Americans
 - c. **The Southern states of America**
 - d. Another freed slave
2. What does the author say the dog feels when he is parted from the child at night?
 - a. Boredom

- b. Excitement
 - c. Despair**
 - d. Relief
3. How does the child probably feel at the end of the story?
- a. Gleeful
 - b. Confused
 - c. Indifferent
 - d. Distraught**
4. The author compares the relationship between the child and the dog to that between a monarch and a subject because:
- a. The child is protected by the dog
 - b. The dog lords over the child
 - c. The child fulfills the dog's wishes
 - d. The dog is devoted to the child**
5. Why does the dog become panicked while climbing the stairs?
- a. The dog can see the father at the top
 - b. The dog is afraid of heights
 - c. The child is beginning to look menacing
 - d. The child is pulling him too quickly**

The questions we chose for “The Veldt” (the abridged version) were:

1. Which of the following is NOT a piece of advice the psychologist gives George?
- a. The children should spend more time outdoors**
 - b. George should entirely demolish the nursery

- c. The children should see the psychologist daily
 - d. George should switch off everything in the house
2. Why does Peter think it would be dreadful if the whole house got turned off?
- a. He is afraid his parents will become too busy with housework to look after him
 - b. He is concerned that it would look like his family is poor
 - c. He is unwilling to do things for himself**
 - d. He is reluctant to have to interact with his sister to play games
3. Which piece of furniture apologises to George?
- a. An armchair
 - b. His bed
 - c. The dining table**
 - d. The stove
4. The psychologist says that one of the original uses of rooms like the nursery was to:
- a. See into children's minds in order to better help them**
 - b. Create a fun environment for children to play in
 - c. Reduce the need for babysitters
 - d. Encourage families to spend more time together
5. Readers can infer that at the end of the story:
- a. The parents go on vacation without their children
 - b. The parents are killed by the lions in the nursery**
 - c. The children lock themselves in the nursery
 - d. The children begin therapy with the psychologist

We followed a similar process to choose questions for use with MTurk subjects, using data from 30 MTurkers (who completed the survey, passed attention checks, and complied with instructions) to again examine item difficulty and reliability and ultimately choose five questions about each story. For the chosen questions about A Dark-Brown Dog, item difficulty ranged from 0.67- 0.93, and item reliability for those questions ranged from 0.41-0.57; for the chosen questions about The Veldt, difficulty ranged from 0.73- 0.93, and reliability ranged from 0.55- 0.85.

The questions we chose for “A Dark-Brown Dog” were:

1. The story can be interpreted as an allegory for the life awaiting newly freed slaves, symbolized by the dog. In this interpretation the father symbolizes:
 - a. The Northern states of America
 - b. A progressive generation of white Americans
 - c. The Southern states of America**
 - d. Another freed slave
2. The child first hits the dog because:
 - a. The dog wouldn't stop barking
 - b. The dog became overexcited**
 - c. The dog growled at the child
 - d. The dog looked ugly
3. How does the child probably feel at the end of the story?
 - a. Gleeful
 - b. Confused
 - c. Indifferent

d. Distraught

4. The father's decision to keep the dog exemplifies his:
 - a. Generosity
 - b. Fondness for animals
 - c. Spitefulness**
 - d. Recklessness
5. What does the author say the dog had nightmares about?
 - a. Other dogs**
 - b. His former owner
 - c. The family
 - d. The child

The questions we chose for "The Veldt" were:

1. Readers can infer that the voices Lydia and George repeatedly hear screaming in the nursery are:
 - a. The children's voices
 - b. Their own voices**
 - c. The voices of characters in the children's storybooks
 - d. None of the above
2. Which of the following is NOT stated as a side effect of the technology in the "HappyLife Home"?
 - a. The children becoming more compassionate**
 - b. The parents having fewer physical childcare duties to do
 - c. George becoming more dependent on sedatives

- d. Lydia having less housework to do
3. What evidence does Lydia present to George to suggest that the automated house is bad for him?
- a. He spends more time at work
 - b. He is grumpier with her and the children
 - c. He is avoiding the nursery
 - d. He is smoking and drinking more**
4. Which piece of furniture apologizes to George?
- a. An armchair
 - b. His bed
 - c. The dining table**
 - d. The stove
5. Readers can infer that at the end of the story:
- a. The parents go on vacation without their children
 - b. The parents are killed by the lions in the nursery**
 - c. The children lock themselves in the nursery
 - d. The children begin therapy with the psychologist

Additional Questions at the End of the Experiments and Attention Checks Throughout

Student samples. We asked student samples (Experiments 1a and 2a) a few questions at the end of the experiment [with response options]:

Experiment 1a. We asked those in Experiment 1a questions to check their understanding of and compliance with instructions, their suspicion about the purpose of the experiment, collect exploratory qualitative data about their exposure to and understanding of trigger warnings, and basic demographic data.

Briefly list specific details from the story (the first passage you read) that you found disturbing. [text entry box]

Had you read the story (the first passage) before? [Yes/No]

Had you read the article (the second passage) before? [Yes/No]

Did you see a warning before you read the first story? [Yes/No]

(if 'Yes' selected) What did the warning say? [text entry box]

We told you that the purpose of this study was to examine the factors that affect comprehension of different writing styles. Do you think it could have been looking at anything else? [text entry box]

What results do you think we are expecting to find? [text entry box]

Outside of this experiment, have you encountered "trigger warnings"? [Yes/No]

What do you think a "trigger warning" is? What do you think their purpose is? [text entry box]

Are there any other comments you would like to make about this experiment? [text entry box]

What is your age? [number entry box]

Are you: [male/female]

Have you lived in New Zealand since at least age 3? [Yes/No]

Experiment 2a. Subjects in Experiment 2a got similar questions as above, but with wording adapted where needed to refer to having seen film footage rather than having read a short story and having been given a different cover story about the purpose of the experiment. We additionally asked them:

Did you play the video more than once? [Yes/No]

Did you look away while the video was playing? [Yes/No]

We also included an exploratory measure for some subjects, just prior to asking them demographics questions (so, almost at the very end of the survey), asking subjects to make ratings in relation to thought suppression strategies (adapted from previous work). But we then decided the wording was confusing, and that we would not attempt to analyze these ratings.

MTurk samples. In the experiments using MTurk samples (Experiments 1b, 2b, 3, and 4), we included several attention checks during the experiments. We also asked additional questions at the end of the experiment about how subjects completed the study.

Experiment 1b. Subjects in Experiment 1b saw the following attention checks:

At the end of the PANAS-X ratings, visually presented as though they were part of the measure, the items “choose box 1” and “choose box 5” to rate (and the same thing, but different numbered boxes, at the end of the second PANAS-X).

At the bottom of the page with the story on it, visually presented as though it was another sentence in the story, they saw “That is the end of the story. To show that you read all the way to the end, type the random word 'grain' on the next page.” On the next page there

was a text entry box with the instruction “Please type the random word here, or if you do not know it, just proceed to the next page.”

At the end of the comprehension questions about the story and about the article, subjects saw two additional four-alternative forced-choice questions, presented in the same way as the previous questions, that had an instruction embedded in the text, for example “Near the end of the story ignore this question and simply choose option three below. Who was responsible?”

Subjects in Experiment 1b saw the same end-of-experiment questions as those in Experiment 1a, except for those asking about the purpose and results of the experiment. They answered the following additional questions:

Did you read the entire story (the first passage), from start to finish? [Yes/No]

Did you read the story (the first passage) carefully, giving it your full attention? [Yes/No]

Did you read the entire article (the second passage), from start to finish? [Yes/No]

Did you read the article (the second passage) carefully, giving it your full attention?

[Yes/No]

Did you use a search engine during the experiment to look up the story, the article, or answers to the comprehension questions? [Yes, I did use a search engine to look up the story and/or the article and/or answers to the comprehension questions / No, but I did use a search engine to look up information unrelated to the experiment / No, I did not use a search engine at any time during the experiment]

Did you maximize the size of your web browser so that it covers your entire screen?

[Yes/No]

Did you complete the experiment on a mobile phone (or a similar device with a small screen)? [Yes/No]

Did you complete the experiment in a single session, without stopping? [Yes/No]

Did you pause or leave the experiment to engage in other tasks, even if they were other computer tasks? [Yes/No]

Did you complete the experiment without anyone helping you? [Yes/No]

Did you complete the experiment in an environment that is free of noise and distraction? [Yes/No]

Did you speak with anyone at any time during the experiment? [Yes/No]

Subjects in Experiment 1b did not see the question about having lived in New Zealand, but saw the additional demographics questions:

Is English your first language? [Yes/No]

Have you ever studied psychology? [Yes/No]

What is your nationality? (i.e. which country or countries are you a citizen of) [text entry box]

Experiments 2b, 3, and 4. Subjects in Experiments 2b, 3, and 4 saw the same attention checks as those in Experiment 1b, except they did not get the “random word” question, and the comprehension test attention check items were adapted to be about the article instead of the story (e.g. “Near the start of the article ignore this question and simply choose option three below. Whom was it attributed to?”).

Subjects in Experiments 2b, 3, and 4 answered the same end-of-experiment questions as subjects in Experiments 2a and 1b (but adapted so that they all referred to having seen film

footage rather than having read a short story), and the following additional questions about the manner in which they watched the film:

Could you hear the video? [Yes/No]

Was the video image clear? [Yes/No]

Did you look away while the video was playing? [Yes/No]

Did you pause the video while it was playing? [Yes/No]

Did you play the video more than once? [Yes/No]

Did you play the video in full screen? [Yes/No]

Did you watch the video on the Youtube website (rather than in the survey window)?
[Yes/No]

Did you turn on subtitles during the video? [Yes/No]

Did you change the video quality? [No, I left it at the default quality / Yes, changed it to
240p / Yes, I changed it to 360p / Yes, I changed it to 480p]

Subjects in Experiment 4 saw one of the compliance questions worded in a slightly different way—they were asked:

Did you complete the experiment on a mobile phone (or a similar device without a
keyboard)? [Yes/No]

Subjects Who Quit the Experiments Prematurely

Experiment 1b. Eighty-five subjects began but did not complete this experiment. Of those subjects, 21 (25%) quit at some point prior to being told they would next read a story, 25 (29%) quit while on the survey page displaying the story, and 39 (46%) quit at some point after having read the story.

Breaking it down by condition, 44 subjects dropped out of the “no warning” condition (14% before told story, 34% during story, and 52% after story); similarly, 41 dropped out of the “warning” condition (37% before told story, 24% during story, and 39% after story).

Notably, no “warning” subjects quit on the “trigger warning” survey page, that is, no one decided—specifically upon reading the warning—not to proceed with the experiment.

Experiment 2b. One-hundred-and-twenty-seven subjects began but did not complete this experiment. Of those subjects, 27 (22%) quit at some point prior to being told they would next watch a film clip, 12 (10%) quit while on the survey page telling them they would next watch a film clip, 9 (7% of total) subjects quit while on the “trigger warning” survey page, 11 (9%) quit while on the survey page displaying the film clip, and 68 (54%) quit at some point after having watched the film clip.

Breaking it down by condition, 61 subjects dropped out of the “no warning” condition (13% prior to film, 2% upon told film, [0% warning; wrong condition], 12% during film, and 74% after film); similarly, 66 subjects dropped out of the “warning” condition (29% prior to film, 17% upon told film, 14% upon warning, 6% during film, and 35% after film).

Very few “warning” subjects (9 of them) quit on the “trigger warning” survey page; a similar number dropped out on the page prior, upon being told they would next watch a video (without knowing what it would be about).

Experiment 3. One-hundred-and-seventeen-subjects began but did not complete this experiment. Of those subjects, 25 (21%) quit at some point prior to being told they would next watch a film clip, 12 (10%) quit while on the survey page telling them they would next watch a film clip, 6 (5% of total) subjects quit while on the “trigger warning” survey page, 3 (3%) quit while on the survey page displaying the ratings regarding what they expected the film clip would be like, 10 (9%) quit while on the survey page displaying the film clip, and 61 (52%) quit at some point after having watched the film clip.

Breaking it down by condition, 57 subjects dropped out of the “no warning” condition (23% prior to film, 14% upon told film, [0% warning; wrong condition], 4% during pre-exposure ratings, 12% during film, and 47% after film); similarly, 60 subjects dropped out of the “warning” condition (20% prior to film, 7% upon told film, 10% upon warning, 2% during pre-exposure ratings, 5% during film, 57% after film).

Very few “warning” subjects (6 of them) quit on the “trigger warning” survey page, and a similar number dropped out on the page prior, upon being told they would next watch a film (without knowing what it would be about).

Experiment 4. One-hundred-and-fifty-two MTurk subjects began but did not complete this experiment. Of those subjects, 36 (24%) quit at some point prior to being told they would next watch a film clip, 19 (13%) quit while on the survey page telling them they would next watch a film clip, 1 (<1% of total) subjects quit while on the “trigger warning” survey page, 16 (11%) quit while on the survey page displaying the film clip, and 80 (53%) quit at some point after having watched the film clip.

Breaking it down by condition, 81 subjects dropped out of the “no warning” condition (28% prior to film, 12% upon told film, [0% upon warning; wrong condition], 7% during film,

and 52% after film); similarly, 71 subjects dropped out of the “warning” condition (18% prior to film, 13% upon told film, 1% upon warning, 14% during film, and 54% after film).

Very few “warning” subjects (1 of them) quit on the “trigger warning” survey page; many more dropped out on the page prior, upon being told they would next watch a film clip (without knowing what it would be about).

References

- Glenberg, A. M., Wilkinson, A. C., & Epstein, W. (1982). The illusion of knowing: Failure in the self-assessment of comprehension. *Memory & Cognition*, *10*, 597-602. doi:10.3758/BF03202442
- Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 701-721. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701
- Johnson, M. K., Foley, M. A., Suengas, A. G., & Raye, C. L. (1988). Phenomenal characteristics of memories for perceived and imagined autobiographical events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *117*, 371-376. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.117.4.371
- Rubin, D. C., Schrauf, R. W., & Greenberg, D. L. (2003). Belief and recollection of autobiographical memories. *Memory & Cognition*, *31*, 887-901. doi:10.3758/BF03196443
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1999). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Expanded Form*. Retrieved June 23, 2014, from University of Iowa, Department of Psychology website: http://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1011&context=psychology_pubs