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Figure S1: Summary of Study 1 and Study 2, Part 2 Methods and Exclusions
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Figure S2: Study 1: Additional Results

(a) Potential Mechanisms

|                                | Immediately | Adjusted p-value |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Outparty Perceived as Similar  |             | \( p = .377 \) |
| Partner Perceived as Doing Deep Listening |             | \( p = .602 \) |

Notes: Points show the estimated effects of the Perfect Day condition in Study 1. Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted across all measures besides the primary outcomes, which are not adjusted as described in the text.

(b) Moderators

|                                | Immediately | Estimated Effect (In SDs) |                         |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Choose Candidate Aligned on Issues over Party |             |                          |                         |
| Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty |             |                          |                         |
| Warmth towards Outparty Voters   |             |                          |                         |

Notes: Points show the coefficient on an interaction term between the Perfect Day condition and the moderator shown in the labels at top. The labels at right show the dependent variable. Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted among all non-primary hypothesis tests.
Figure S3: Summary of Study 2, Part 1 Methods and Exclusions
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Figure S4: Study 2: Additional Results

(a) Potential Mechanisms

Notes: Points show the estimated effects of each condition in Study 2. Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted across all measures, including mechanisms, besides primary outcomes.

(b) Moderators

Notes: Points show the coefficient on an interaction term between each condition (left) and the moderator (top). Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted among all measures, including moderators, besides primary outcomes.
Figure S5: Study 2: Pooled effects of either Inparty Strength or Outparty Flaws condition

Points show the estimated effects of either the Inparty Strengths or Outparty Flaws condition (pooled) in Study 2. Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted among all post-hoc comparisons. The first coefficient shows the effects of either condition (pooled) versus the Perfect Day group. The second coefficient shows the effects of either condition (pooled) versus the Placebo group.
Figure S6: Study 2: Comparing Effects of Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws Conditions

(a) Manipulation Checks

| Condition | Estimated Effect (In SDs) | p-value |
|-----------|--------------------------|---------|
| Partner is a Member of the Outparty | |
| Talked about Perfect Day | |
| Talked about Politics | |

(b) Intergroup Attitudes

| Attitude | Estimated Effect (In SDs) | p-value |
|----------|--------------------------|---------|
| Warmth towards Outparty Voters | |
| Comfortable with Outpartisans (Social Distance) | |
| Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty | |
| Felt Respected by Partner | |
| Warmth towards Inparty Voters | |

(c) Outcomes Relevant to Democratic Accountability

| Outcome | Estimated Effect (In SDs) | p-value |
|---------|--------------------------|---------|
| Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue | |
| Behavioral Intention to Engage with Outparty | |
| Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | |
| Prioritize Norms over Partisanship | |
| Warmth towards Outparty Politicians | |
| Warmth towards Inparty Politicians | |

Notes: Points show the estimated differences between the effects of the Inparty Strengths and Outparty Flaws conditions in Study 2. Standard errors (thick lines) and 95% confidence intervals (thin lines) surround the point estimates. Adjusted p-values are adjusted across all non-primary outcomes using the procedure outlined in (30). As described in the text, p-values for primary outcomes are not adjusted.
Figure S7: Raw Means of Warthm Towards Outparty, with 95% Confidence Intervals

(a) Study 1

(b) Study 2

Notes: Note that because the data are repeated observations of the same individuals, the 95% confidence intervals shown in the Figure cannot be used to assess the strength of the statistical evidence for differences between time points or between conditions.
Table S1: Study 1: Demographic Composition of Samples

|                                | Completed Screener | Entered Conversation Room | Began Conversation (Used in Analyses) | Started Follow-Up Survey (Used in Follow-Up Survey Analyses) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                | N                 | N                         | All, Placebo, Perfect Day              | All, Placebo, Perfect Day                                    |
| Education: College or post-graduate | 7,904             | 986                       | 62.13%, 59.17%, 64.62%               | 62.77%, 60.87%, 64.26%                                      |
| Education: High school or less   | -                 | 61.26%                    | 8.79%, 11.47%, 6.54%                 | 8.11%, 9.78%, 6.81%                                         |
| Education: Some college          | -                 | 9.43%                     | 29.08%, 29.36%, 28.85%               | 29.12%, 29.35%, 28.94%                                      |
| Race/Ethnicity: African American | -                 | 13.79%                    | 10.04%, 9.17%, 10.77%                | 7.88%, 7.61%, 8.09%                                         |
| Race/Ethnicity: Asian            | -                 | 7.81%                     | 7.11%, 9.63%, 5%                     | 6.92%, 9.78%, 4.68%                                         |
| Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino  | -                 | 4.06%                     | 4.18%, 3.21%, 5%                     | 4.3%, 2.72%, 5.53%                                          |
| Race/Ethnicity: Multiple Selected| -                 | 5.38%                     | 5.44%, 5.5%, 5.38%                   | 5.49%, 4.89%, 5.96%                                         |
| Race/Ethnicity: Native American  | -                 | 0.3%                      | 0%                                    | 0%                                                          |
| Race/Ethnicity: Other            | -                 | 0.71%                     | 0.42%, 0%, 0.77%                     | 0.48%, 0%, 0.85%                                            |
| Race/Ethnicity: Pacific Islander | -                 | 0.2%                      | 0.21%, 0%, 0.38%                     | 0.24%, 0%, 0.43%                                            |
| Race/Ethnicity: White            | -                 | 67.75%                    | 72.59%, 72.48%, 72.69%               | 74.7%, 75%, 74.47%                                           |
| Gender: Female                   | -                 | 49.29%                    | 50.63%, 57.8%, 44.62%                | 51.79%, 61.41%, 44.26%                                      |
| Gender: Male                     | -                 | 49.59%                    | 48.12%, 41.28%, 53.85%               | 47.26%, 38.04%, 54.47%                                      |
| Gender: Prefer to self describe  | -                 | 1.12%                     | 1.26%, 0.92%, 1.54%                  | 0.95%, 0.54%, 1.28%                                         |
| Age (mean), in years             | -                 | 38.68                     | 39.99, 39.39, 40.33                  | 40.95, 40.88, 41.00                                         |
| Party identification: Closer to Democratic Party | 13.27%          | 13.08%                    | 11.3%, 14.22%, 8.85%                 | 10.98%, 13.59%, 8.94%                                       |
| Party identification: Closer to Republican Party | 6.24%           | 9.63%                     | 12.34%, 11.93%, 12.69%               | 11.46%, 9.78%, 12.77%                                       |
| Party identification: Not very strong Democrat | 18.27%          | 18.46%                    | 14.85%, 15.6%, 14.23%                | 15.27%, 15.22%, 15.32%                                      |
| Party identification: Not very strong Republican | 9.03%           | 13.59%                    | 18.41%, 20.18%, 16.92%               | 18.85%, 20.65%, 17.45%                                      |
| Party identification: Strong Democrat | 30.69%          | 26.88%                    | 23.85%, 20.64%, 26.54%               | 23.63%, 21.2%, 25.53%                                       |
| Party identification: Strong Republican | 11.75%          | 18.26%                    | 19.25%, 17.43%, 20.77%               | 19.81%, 19.57%, 20%                                         |
| Party identification: Neither     | 10.74%           | 0%                        | 0%, 0%, 0%                            | 0%, 0%, 0%                                                  |
| Party identification: Not Listed  | 0.03%            | 0.1%                      | 0%, 0%, 0%                            | 0%, 0%, 0%                                                  |

Notes: This Table shows the composition of the sample at every step across selected covariates. Some covariates (e.g., education) are not available for the screener because these demographics were only asked about at the beginning of the conversation survey and were not asked on the screener.

†: A joint test for differences between conditions on demographics in the table was just past the threshold for significance (p = 0.05) due to the difference in gender across the conditions discussed in the text. As discussed in the text, men were slightly over-represented in the Perfect Day condition, perhaps indicating that men were especially interested in having the Perfect Day conversation; however, gender is not a significant predictor of our outcomes and we find similar effect estimates for men and women on the items where we did find effects. Removing gender, the test is no longer significant (p = 0.24).

‡: Similar to the data from the main conversation survey, we found slight differences between conditions on gender, although a joint test for differences between conditions fell just short of significance (p = 0.05). Removing gender, the test is no longer significant.
### Table S2: Study 2: Demographic Composition of Samples

|                                      | Completed Screener and Provided Email | Clicked Page Containing Link to Conversation | Began Conversation (Used in Analyses)† |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                                      | N                                     | All                                        | Placebo | Perfect Day | Inparty Strengths | Outparty Flaws |
| Education: College or post-graduate  | 2,541                                 | 338                                        | 100     | 74          | 83                | 81             |
| Education: High school or less       | 8.42%                                 | 63.72%                                     | 70.68%  | 72.19%      | 66.43%            | 71.6%          |
| Education: Some college              | 27.86%                                | 22.08%                                     | 21.6%   | 20%         | 21.62%            | 24.1%          |
| Race/Ethnicity: African American     | 3.74%                                 | 2.64%                                      | 2.66%   | 6%          | 2.7%              | 0%             |
| Race/Ethnicity: Asian                | 5.94%                                 | 7.91%                                      | 7.99%   | 7%          | 8.11%             | 8.43%          |
| Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino      | 3.19%                                 | 3.13%                                      | 2.96%   | 3%          | 2.7%              | 2.41%          |
| Race/Ethnicity: Multiple Selected    | 6.77%                                 | 7.74%                                      | 7.1%    | 5%          | 5.41%             | 13.25%         |
| Race/Ethnicity: Native American      | 0.35%                                 | 0.16%                                      | 0.3%    | 0%          | 0%                | 0%             |
| Race/Ethnicity: Not listed           | 0.04%                                 | 0%                                         | 0%      | 0%          | 0%                | 0%             |
| Race/Ethnicity: Other               | 1.65%                                 | 1.98%                                      | 1.78%   | 1%          | 2.7%              | 3.61%          |
| Race/Ethnicity: Pacific Islander     | 0.16%                                 | 0%                                         | 0%      | 0%          | 0%                | 0%             |
| Race/Ethnicity: White               | 78.16%                                | 76.44%                                     | 77.22%  | 78%         | 78.38%            | 71.08%         |
| Gender: Female                       | 56.67%                                | 51.73%                                     | 48.52%  | 44%         | 45.95%            | 50.6%          |
| Gender: Male                         | 42.07%                                | 47.45%                                     | 51.18%  | 56%         | 54.05%            | 48.19%         |
| Gender: Not listed                   | 0.12%                                 | 0%                                         | 0%      | 0%          | 0%                | 0%             |
| Gender: Prefer to self describe      | 1.14%                                 | 0.82%                                      | 0.3%    | 0%          | 0%                | 1.2%           |
| Age (mean), years                    | 45.47                                 | 44.55                                      | 43.63   | 44.15       | 41.93             | 42.81          |
| Party identification: Closer to Democratic Party | 17.24%                           | 14.66%                                     | 13.31%  | 12%         | 16.22%            | 19.28%         |
| Party identification: Closer to Republican Party | 9.09%                             | 12.69%                                     | 15.38%  | 12%         | 18.92%            | 14.46%         |
| Party identification: Not very strong Democrat | 13.7%                              | 10.21%                                     | 9.17%   | 10%         | 5.41%             | 8.43%          |
| Party identification: Not very strong Republican | 8.5%                               | 12.69%                                     | 15.38%  | 14%         | 14.86%            | 15.66%         |
| Party identification: Strong Democrat | 38.17%                             | 32.78%                                     | 28.99%  | 28%         | 29.73%            | 25.3%          |
| Party identification: Strong Republican | 13.3%                              | 16.97%                                     | 17.75%  | 24%         | 14.86%            | 16.87%         |

Notes: This Table shows the composition of the sample at every step across selected covariates. †: A joint test for differences between conditions on demographics in the table is insignificant (p = 0.44).
| Category           | Measure Name                                      | Time Period      | DV Type          | Estimate |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|
| Democratic         | Choose Candidate Aligned on Issues over Party     | Immediately      | Primary          | -0.073   |
| Democratic         | Likelihood of Talking to Outparty Neighbor about Politics | Immediately      | Secondary        | -0.048   |
| Democratic         | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | Immediately      | Secondary        | -0.019   |
| Democratic         | Prioritize Norms over Partisanship                | Immediately      | Secondary        | -0.009   |
| Democratic         | Request to Subscribe to Bipartisan Newsletter     | Immediately      | Secondary        | -0.04    |
| Democratic         | Support for Bipartisanship                       | Immediately      | Secondary        | -0.235   |
| Democratic         | Choose Candidate Aligned on Issues over Party     | 3 Months After   | Post-Hoc         | -0.093   |
| Democratic         | Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue                | 3 Months After   | Post-Hoc         | -0.068   |
| Democratic         | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | 3 Months After   | Post-Hoc         | 0.011    |
| Democratic         | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians                | 3 Months After   | Post-Hoc         | 0.116    |
| Democratic         | Warmth towards Outparty Politicians               | 3 Months After   | Post-Hoc         | 0.03     |
| Democratic         | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians                | Immediately      | Tertiary         | 0.036    |
| Category       | Measure Name                              | Time Period   | DV Type      | Estimate |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------|
| Democratic     | Warmth towards Outparty Politicians       | Immediately   | Tertiary     | 0.12     |
| Accountability |                                            |               |              |          |
| Intergroup     | Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects   | Immediately   | Primary      | 0.457    |
|                | Inparty                                   |               |              |          |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Outparty Voters            | Immediately   | Primary      | 0.34     |
| Intergroup     | Humanization of Outparty                 | Immediately   | Secondary    | -0.021   |
| Intergroup     | Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects   | 3 Months After| Post-Hoc     | 0.136    |
|                | Inparty                                   |               |              |          |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters             | 3 Months After| Post-Hoc     | 0.029    |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Outparty Voters            | 3 Months After| Post-Hoc     | -0.021   |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters             | Immediately   | Tertiary     | 0.078    |
| Manipulation Check | Partner is a Member of the Outparty | Immediately   | Manipulation Check | 0.81 |
| Manipulation Check | Talked about Perfect Day                   | Immediately   | Manipulation Check | -0.104 |
| Manipulation Check | Talked about Politics                     | Immediately   | Manipulation Check | 0.361 |
| Manipulation Check | Talked about Unrelated Topics             | Immediately   | Manipulation Check | -0.001 |
| Mechanism      | Outparty Perceived as Similar             | Immediately   | Mechanism    | 0.179    |
| Mechanism      | Partner Perceived as Doing Deep Listening | Immediately   | Mechanism    | -0.137   |
|                | Moderation of Choose Candidate           |               |              |          |
| Moderator      | Aligned on Issues over Party by Frequency Have Conversations with Outparty | Immediately   | Moderator    | 0.062    |
| Category | Measure Name                                                                 | Time Period | DV Type   | Estimate |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Moderator | Moderation of Choose Candidate                                              | Immediately | Moderator | -0.041   |
| Moderator | Aligned on Issues over Party by Political Knowledge                          | Immediately | Moderator | -0.074   |
| Moderator | Aligned on Issues over Party by Receptiveness to Others with Different Opinions | Immediately | Moderator |          |
| Moderator | Outparty Respects Inparty by Frequency Have Conversations with Outparty     | Immediately | Moderator | -0.05    |
| Moderator | Outparty Respects Inparty by Political Knowledge                             | Immediately | Moderator | -0.113   |
| Moderator | Outparty Respects Inparty by Receptiveness to Others with Different Opinions | Immediately | Moderator | 0.028    |
| Moderator | Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Frequency Have Conversations with Outparty | Immediately | Moderator | -0.067   |
| Moderator | Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Political Knowledge                        | Immediately | Moderator | -0.065   |
Table S3: Numerical Results and Variable Classification: Study 1 (Continued)

| Category          | Measure Name                                          | Time Period | DV Type | Estimate |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Moderator         | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Receptiveness to Others with Different Opinions | Immediately | Moderator | 0.103    |

Notes: All results are the estimated effect of the Perfect Day condition versus the Placebo. p-values below 0.001 are rounded to 0. As described in the text, p-values for primary outcomes are...
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| Category          | Measure Name                                      | DV Type | Condition Comparison         | Estimate | SE   | t    | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------------------|------------------|
| Democratic        | Behavioral Intention to Engage with Outparty     | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | -0.011   | 0.149| -0.071| 0.943              | 1                |
| Democratic        | Behavioral Intention to Engage with Outparty     | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo      | 0.111    | 0.154| 0.723| 0.472              | 0.831            |
| Democratic        | Behavioral Intention to Engage with Outparty     | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | 0.065    | 0.176| 0.368| 0.714              | 1                |
| Democratic        | Behavioral Intention to Engage with Outparty     | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | 0.054    | 0.163| 0.333| 0.74               | 1                |
| Democratic        | Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue               | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | 0.369    | 0.101| 3.662| 0                  | 0.005            |
| Democratic        | Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue               | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo      | -0.096   | 0.124| -0.771| 0.443              | 0.831            |
| Democratic        | Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue               | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.466   | 0.129| -3.615| 0.001              | 0.005            |
| Democratic        | Importance of Cross-Party Dialogue               | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | -0.097   | 0.11 | -0.884| 0.379              | 0.831            |
| Democratic        | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | 0.166    | 0.073| 2.26 | 0.026              | 0.172            |
| Democratic        | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo      | 0.046    | 0.075| 0.608| 0.545              | 0.858            |
Table S4: Numerical Results and Variable Classification: Study 2 (Continued)

| Category            | Measure Name                                      | DV Type | Condition Comparison                  | Estimate | SE    | t      | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|----------|-------|--------|--------------------|------------------|
| Democratic Accountability | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.201   | 0.083 | -2.424 | 0.018              | 0.134            |
| Democratic Accountability | Policy Views Consistent with Outparty (Moderate Policy Attitudes) | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | -0.035   | 0.073 | -0.476 | 0.635              | 0.982            |
| Democratic Accountability | Prioritize Norms over Partisanship | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | -0.229   | 0.124 | -1.848 | 0.068              | 0.317            |
| Democratic Accountability | Prioritize Norms over Partisanship | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo | -0.144   | 0.104 | -1.377 | 0.172              | 0.504            |
| Democratic Accountability | Prioritize Norms over Partisanship | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.036   | 0.135 | -0.267 | 0.79               | 1                |
| Democratic Accountability | Prioritize Norms over Partisanship | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | -0.265   | 0.121 | -2.196 | 0.031              | 0.189            |
| Democratic Accountability | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians | Tertiary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | 0.007    | 0.098 | 0.07   | 0.944              | 1                |
| Democratic Accountability | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians | Tertiary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo | -0.023   | 0.093 | -0.245 | 0.807              | 1                |
| Democratic Accountability | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians | Tertiary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | 0.155    | 0.109 | 1.423  | 0.159              | 0.504            |
| Democratic Accountability | Warmth towards Inparty Politicians | Tertiary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | 0.162    | 0.092 | 1.75   | 0.084              | 0.338            |
| Democratic Accountability | Warmth towards Outparty Politicians | Tertiary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | 0.024    | 0.11  | 0.223  | 0.824              | 1                |
| Category          | Measure Name                          | DV Type | Condition Comparison              | Estimate | SE  | t      | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----|--------|--------------------|------------------|
| Democratic        | Warmth towards Outparty Accountability Politicians | Tertiary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo           | 0.151    | 0.12| 1.258  | 0.212              | 0.562            |
| Democratic        | Warmth towards Outparty Accountability Politicians | Tertiary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.167   | 0.125| -1.343 | 0.183              | 0.504            |
| Democratic        | Warmth towards Outparty Accountability Politicians | Tertiary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo     | -0.143   | 0.106| -1.348 | 0.181              | 0.504            |
| Intergroup        | Warmth towards Outparty Voters         | Primary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo        | 0.148    | 0.115| 1.29   | 0.201              | 0.201            |
| Intergroup        | Warmth towards Outparty Voters         | Primary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo           | 0.406    | 0.116| 3.511  | 0.001              | 0.001            |
| Intergroup        | Warmth towards Outparty Voters         | Primary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.123   | 0.133| -0.929 | 0.355              | 0.355            |
| Intergroup        | Warmth towards Outparty Voters         | Primary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo     | 0.025    | 0.117| 0.214  | 0.831              | 0.831            |
| Intergroup        | Comfortable with Outpartisans (Social Distance) | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo       | 0.034    | 0.091| 0.377  | 0.707              | 1                |
| Intergroup        | Comfortable with Outpartisans (Social Distance) | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo           | -0.079   | 0.086| -0.912 | 0.364              | 0.831            |
| Intergroup        | Comfortable with Outpartisans (Social Distance) | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.07    | 0.113| -0.62  | 0.537              | 0.858            |
| Category       | Measure Name                                      | DV Type      | Condition Comparison                                | Estimate | SE  | t     | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|-------|--------------------|------------------|
| Intergroup     | Comfortable with Outpartisans (Social Distance)  | Secondary    | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo                       | -0.036   | 0.107 | -0.333 | 0.74               | 1                |
| Intergroup     | Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty   | Secondary    | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                          | 0.182    | 0.128 | 1.422 | 0.159              | 0.504            |
| Intergroup     | Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty   | Secondary    | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                             | 0.078    | 0.136 | 0.573 | 0.568              | 0.864            |
| Intergroup     | Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty   | Secondary    | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws                | 0.111    | 0.156 | 0.715 | 0.477              | 0.831            |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters                    | Tertiary     | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                          | 0.124    | 0.123 | 1.008 | 0.316              | 0.709            |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters                    | Tertiary     | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                             | 0.13     | 0.107 | 1.216 | 0.228              | 0.583            |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters                    | Tertiary     | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws                | 0.017    | 0.12  | 0.14  | 0.889              | 1                |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Inparty Voters                    | Tertiary     | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo                       | 0.141    | 0.103 | 1.367 | 0.175              | 0.504            |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Outparty Voters                   | Primary (Unregistered) | Either Inparty Strengths or Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | 0.092    | 0.095 | 0.962 | 0.338              | 0.398            |
| Intergroup     | Warmth towards Outparty Voters                   | Primary (Unregistered) | Either Inparty Strengths or Outparty Flaws vs. Perfect Day | -0.319   | 0.112 | -2.846 | 0.006              | 0.015            |
Table S4: Numerical Results and Variable Classification: Study 2 (Continued)

| Category        | Measure Name                      | DV Type                | Condition Comparison                        | Estimate | SE  | t      | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------|-----|--------|---------------------|------------------|
| Manipulation    | Partner is a Member of the Outparty | Manipulation Check     | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                  | 1.271    | 0.11| 11.552 | 0                   | 0.001            |
| Manipulation    | Partner is a Member of the Outparty | Manipulation Check     | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                     | 0.257    | 0.128| 2.003  | 0.049               | 0.246            |
| Manipulation    | Partner is a Member of the Outparty | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws        | -0.034   | 0.129| -0.261 | 0.795               | 1                |
| Manipulation    | Partner is a Member of the Outparty | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo               | 1.238    | 0.119| 10.42  | 0                   | 0.001            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Perfect Day          | Manipulation Check     | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                  | -1.773   | 0.087| -20.303| 0                   | 0.001            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Perfect Day          | Manipulation Check     | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                     | 0.022    | 0.058| 0.379  | 0.706               | 1                |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Perfect Day          | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws        | 0.2      | 0.123| 1.633  | 0.106               | 0.414            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Perfect Day          | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo               | -1.572   | 0.105| -14.983| 0                   | 0.001            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Politics             | Manipulation Check     | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                  | 1.767    | 0.086| 20.538 | 0                   | 0.001            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Politics             | Manipulation Check     | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                     | 0.088    | 0.124| 0.716  | 0.476               | 0.831            |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Politics             | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws        | -0.012   | 0.047| -0.26  | 0.795               | 1                |
| Manipulation    | Talked about Politics             | Manipulation Check     | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo               | 1.755    | 0.087| 20.086 | 0                   | 0.001            |
Table S4: Numerical Results and Variable Classification: Study 2 (Continued)

| Category      | Measure Name                  | DV Type   | Condition Comparison                      | Estimate | SE  | t    | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|--------------------|------------------|
| Mechanism     | Warmth towards Partner        | Secondary | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                | -0.05    | 0.141 | -0.354 | 0.724              | 1                |
| Mechanism     | Warmth towards Partner        | Secondary | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                   | -0.08    | 0.141 | -0.564 | 0.574              | 0.864            |
| Mechanism     | Warmth towards Partner        | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws     | -0.262   | 0.196 | -1.341 | 0.184              | 0.504            |
| Mechanism     | Warmth towards Partner        | Secondary | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo            | -0.312   | 0.174 | -1.79  | 0.077              | 0.338            |
| Mechanism     | Anxious During Conversation   | Mechanism | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo               | 0.17     | 0.142 | 1.195  | 0.235              | 0.583            |
| Mechanism     | Anxious During Conversation   | Mechanism | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                  | 0.026    | 0.132 | 0.195  | 0.846              | 1                |
| Mechanism     | Anxious During Conversation   | Mechanism | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws     | 0.021    | 0.168 | 0.124  | 0.902              | 1                |
| Mechanism     | Anxious During Conversation   | Mechanism | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo            | 0.19     | 0.142 | 1.342  | 0.183              | 0.504            |
| Mechanism     | Felt Listened to by Partner   | Mechanism | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo               | -0.181   | 0.151 | -1.199 | 0.234              | 0.583            |
| Mechanism     | Felt Listened to by Partner   | Mechanism | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                  | -0.08    | 0.113 | -0.705 | 0.483              | 0.831            |
| Mechanism     | Felt Listened to by Partner   | Mechanism | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo            | -0.487   | 0.207 | -2.354 | 0.021              | 0.149            |
| Mechanism     | Felt Listened to by Partner   | Mechanism | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo            | -0.668   | 0.176 | -3.793 | 0                  | 0.004            |
| Category   | Measure Name                          | DV Type       | Condition Comparison                          | Estimate | SE  | t       | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------|-----|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Mechanism  | Felt Respected by Partner             | Mechanism     | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                     | 0.019    | 0.135| 0.143   | 0.886             | 1               |
| Mechanism  | Felt Respected by Partner             | Mechanism     | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                        | -0.219   | 0.163| -1.341  | 0.184             | 0.504           |
| Mechanism  | Felt Respected by Partner             | Mechanism     | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws          | -0.364   | 0.185| -1.964  | 0.053             | 0.255           |
| Mechanism  | Felt Respected by Partner             | Mechanism     | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo                 | -0.345   | 0.169| -2.038  | 0.045             | 0.241           |
| Moderator  | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Extraversion | Moderator | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                     | -0.121   | 0.117| -1.035  | 0.304             | 0.695           |
| Moderator  | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Extraversion | Moderator | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                        | 0.01     | 0.133| 0.072   | 0.943             | 1               |
| Moderator  | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Extraversion | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws          | -0.149   | 0.131| -1.137  | 0.261             | 0.594           |
| Moderator  | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Extraversion | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo                 | -0.271   | 0.098| -2.748  | 0.008             | 0.065           |
| Category          | Measure Name                                                                 | DV Type   | Condition Comparison                        | Estimate | SE   | t    | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|----------|------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| *Moderator*       | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Frequency Have Conversations with Outparty | Moderator | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                  | -0.207   | 0.121| -1.704| 0.094             | 0.372           |
|                   |                                                                                     |           | Perfect Day vs. Placebo                     | -0.173   | 0.154| -1.123| 0.267             | 0.594           |
|                   |                                                                                     |           | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws        | 0.109    | 0.121| 0.904 | 0.371             | 0.831           |
|                   |                                                                                     |           | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo               | -0.098   | 0.119| -0.824| 0.413             | 0.831           |
|                   |                                                                                     |           | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo                  | -0.14    | 0.119| -1.175| 0.245             | 0.593           |
| Category | Measure Name | DV Type | Condition Comparison | Estimate  | SE   | t   | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|----------|--------------|---------|----------------------|-----------|------|-----|-------------------|-----------------|
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Openness | Moderator | Perfect Day vs. Placebo | 0.008 | 0.133 | 0.062 | 0.951 | 1 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Openness | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.107 | 0.142 | -0.751 | 0.456 | 0.831 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Openness | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | -0.246 | 0.14 | -1.758 | 0.084 | 0.338 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Political Knowledge | Moderator | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | -0.143 | 0.148 | -0.962 | 0.341 | 0.779 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Political Knowledge | Moderator | Perfect Day vs. Placebo | -0.229 | 0.146 | -1.574 | 0.122 | 0.465 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Political Knowledge | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | -0.111 | 0.19 | -0.582 | 0.564 | 0.864 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Political Knowledge | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo | -0.254 | 0.2 | -1.267 | 0.211 | 0.562 |
| Moderator | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Self-Monitoring | Moderator | Outparty Flaws vs. Placebo | -0.101 | 0.139 | -0.727 | 0.471 | 0.831 |
| Category               | Measure Name                                      | DV Type   | Condition Comparison           | Estimate | SE  | t     | Unadjusted p-value | Adjusted p-value |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------|-----|-------|---------------------|------------------|
| Moderator              | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Self-Monitoring | Moderator | Perfect Day vs. Placebo        | -0.078   | 0.16| -0.486| 0.629               | 0.982            |
| Moderator              | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Self-Monitoring | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Outparty Flaws | 0.143    | 0.126| 1.137| 0.261               | 0.594            |
| Moderator              | Moderation of Warmth towards Outparty Voters by Self-Monitoring | Moderator | Inparty Strengths vs. Placebo  | 0.042    | 0.124| 0.336| 0.739               | 1                |

Notes: $p$-values below 0.001 are rounded to 0. As described in the text, $p$-values for primary outcomes are not adjusted.
Table S5: Means and Standard Deviations of Primary Outcomes, by Condition and Time

(a) Study 1

| Outcome                                      | Time Measured     | Entire Sample | Placebo | Perfect Day |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|-------------|
| Warmth towards Outparty Voters               | Baseline          | 37.29         | 38.83   | 35.99       |
|                                              |                   | (25.34)       | (24.74) | (25.81)     |
|                                              | Immediately After | 47.38         | 44.29   | 49.98       |
|                                              |                   | (26.5)        | (25.9)  | (26.77)     |
|                                              | 3 Months Later    | 32.76         | 34.7    | 31.25       |
|                                              |                   | (24.36)       | (23.55) | (24.92)     |
| Meta-Perception that Outparty Respects Inparty | Baseline          | 2.15          | 2.19    | 2.13        |
|                                              |                   | (0.82)        | (0.82)  | (0.82)      |
|                                              | Immediately After | 2.62          | 2.44    | 2.78        |
|                                              |                   | (0.8)         | (0.79)  | (0.78)      |
|                                              | 3 Months Later    | 1.96          | 1.96    | 1.97        |
|                                              |                   | (0.76)        | (0.8)   | (0.72)      |

Choose Candidate Aligned on Issues over Party | Immediately After | 0.82          | 0.84    | 0.8         |
|                                              |                   | (0.38)        | (0.37)  | (0.4)       |

Notes: The Table shows the means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for the primary outcome measures at each time. The means at all time points, including baseline, only include participants who were eligible for inclusion in the analysis (e.g., started a conversation).

(b) Study 2

| Primary Outcome                  | Time Measured     | Entire Sample | Placebo | Perfect Day | Inparty Strengths | Outparty Flaws |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Warmth towards Outparty Voters   | Baseline          | 35.23         | 37.06   | 30.92       | 33.06             | 39.12         |
|                                  |                   | (22.27)       | (22.75) | (20.01)     | (21.26)           | (24.05)       |
|                                  | Immediately After | 43.53         | 41.05   | 46.55       | 40.38             | 47.04         |
|                                  |                   | (24.37)       | (24.62) | (23.37)     | (25.34)           | (23.61)       |

Notes: The Table shows the means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for the primary outcome measures at each time. The means at all time points, including baseline, only include participants who were eligible for inclusion in the analysis (e.g., started a conversation).
B Additional recruitment details

B.1 Study 1

After the screener survey, we screened out prospective participants who were not interested in having a conversation or had a suspicious IP address; had bot-like free response questions (as determined by the first author); started the survey more than once (using their participant identification number and their IP address) or did not finish the survey; failed two or more attention checks and identified as a Democrat, or failed one attention check and identified as a Republican; identified as an Independent or did not provide their party identification; or identified as a Democrat and (during some periods when we had a surplus of Democratic participants) did not have a compatible system. Due to an error in the coding, for several waves, we mistakenly invited some Democrat participants who should not have qualified (e.g., because they failed an attention check). We kept these participants.

Among qualifying participants, we assigned participants to time windows when they said they were available (and for those who were not available at any times, we assigned them a random time to give them the option of taking the study); due to an excess of interested Democratic participants, we randomly dropped Democrats when there was a large excess of them available at that time, prioritizing those who were free at that time and had a compatible system.

We sent participants a message through the recruiting platform indicating the day and time the full study would take place, and another reminder right before the study was to take place. (Several days usually elapsed between when participants completed the screener survey and their assigned day for the main conversation survey.)
B.2 Study 2

After the screener survey, we screened out those who were not interested in having a conversation or did not say they were available; identified as an Independent; were Democrats who failed an IP validation logic and failed the compatibility check; or, were Republicans and were not on their phones, had a duplicate IP address or email address, or had an invalid email address. Of these, we assigned participants to a time window they were available. We sent participants an email and text indicating the day and time the conversation survey would take place, and reminded them the day of.
C Relevant previous literature

Given space constraints in the main text, we previous previous research relevant to our study in more detail in this section. Our research builds on other research on the impacts of cross-partisan conversations in several important ways. Most notably, our study is the first to study face-to-face (i.e., video) conversations between outpartisans outside the context of a broader intervention; our study is the first to examine the long-run effects of such contact; and our study is the first to examine a broad variety of outcomes relevant to democratic accountability.

Table S6 reviews existing studies that focus on conversations between outpartisans only, and not combined interventions that include both cross-partisan conversation and other intervention components. Beyond this paper, the only other study to do so is an important working paper by Rossiter who studies text-based conversations between copartisan strangers (28). Our study builds on Rossiter’s work in several ways: we measure effects on outcomes relevant to democratic accountability, we measure attitudinal polarization, and we measure long-run effects. We also examine the effects of conversations more explicitly about partisanship and—inspired by research about the differences between text- and video-based conversations (52)—which take place over video calls.

Table S7 reviews existing studies of interventions that include both conversations with outpartisans and other components. These studies are extremely valuable studies of particular interventions, but cannot speak directly to the effects of cross-partisan conversations because they manipulate both cross-partisan contact and other interventions. A representative example is from Baron and colleagues, who study a day-long depolarization event run by the non-profit Better Angles that involves reflections on intergroup stereotypes, discussions of intergroup bias, a listening exercise, and action-oriented exercises (53). The pathbreaking study by Baron and colleagues is extremely valuable, although it is not focused on cross-partisan conversation per se. Cross-partisan conversation is only one component of the intervention the authors study; the results speak to the effects
of the intervention but leave unclear the effects of just the cross-partisan conversation component. None of the studies in Table S7 study effects on outcomes relevant to democratic accountability, except for one somewhat outcome in Baron and colleagues’ work, whether individuals donate to a depolarization NGO.

Table S8 expands our scope to studies of vicarious, imagined, simulated, or reported contact between outpartisans. These are studies that pertain to the impact of cross-partisan conversations but do not randomly assign contact between real outpartisans. For example, (54) study the effects of imagined contact (Study 1) and text-based conversations with confederates (Studies 2 and 3); although (54) produce valuable insights about their research question (the effect of political inclusion in interpersonal conversations), it is unclear whether their findings would generalize to how individuals would react when conversing with an outpartisan who behaves as real people do, instead of how their confederates did. None of these studies examine long-run effects, effects on attitudinal polarization, nor effects on democratic accountability.

Finally, Table S9 provides a non-exhaustive list of examples of other studies that examine effects of various interventions related to the topics of either conversations or affective polarization, but do not concern the effects of cross-partisan conversations on affective polarization.
### Table S6: Studies of Conversations with Outpartisans

| Citation | Out partisan Conversation Treatment(s) | Research Design | Additional Components of Intervention | Conversation Format | Democratic Accountability? | Intergroup Attitudes? | Long-Run Effects? |
|----------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| This paper | Conversation with an outpartisan about perfect day; Conversation with an outpartisan about areas of disagreement | - | Video conversation with a stranger | - | Yes (e.g., Party Loyalty, Democratic Norms, Bipartisanship) | Yes | Yes, approx. three months post-intervention |
| Rossiter | Non-political conversation with an outpartisan; Conversation with an outpartisan about an issue (gun control) | - | Text-based conversation with a stranger | - | Yes | - | - |

### Table S7: Studies of Interventions that Include Both Conversations with Outpartisans and Other Components

| Citation | Out partisan Conversation Treatment(s) | Research Design | Additional Components of Intervention | Conversation Format | Democratic Accountability? | Intergroup Attitudes? | Long-Run Effects? |
|----------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| (55)     | Politically heterogenous discussion group (vs. homogenous discussion or a no-contact control) | - | Ambivalent vs univalent partisan prime; All members read about policy | In-person in groups | - | - | - |
| (15)     | Heterogeneous political discussion group about commonalities between parties (vs. homogenous political discussion group or non-political discussion group) | Heterogenous group reads article about common ground between parties; homogenous group reads article about partisan division and polarization; Non-political discussion group reads article about beach towns | In-person in groups | - | Yes | Yes, one week later |
| (56)     | Implementing door-to-door persuasion campaigns; targeted voters include outpartisans | Training and implementation of two-way narrative exchanges, perspective-getting exercises | In-person, door-to-door | - | Yes | Only measure is approx. one week later |
| (55)     | Work in heterogeneous groups to devise questions for experts and discuss political issues in five areas as part of deliberation event (vs. pure control) | Cooperation to devise questions; expert testimony; briefing materials with evidence for against/proposals; Attendance at deliberation event | In-person in groups | - | Yes | - |
| (53)     | Guided heterogeneous group discussion as part of reciprocal group reflection exercises | Depolarization workshop, including reflections on stereotypes, listening exercise, action-oriented exercises | In-person, as part of depolarization workshop | Yes (donation to a depolarization NGO) | Yes | Yes, six months |
Table S8: Vicarious, imagined, simulated or reported contact between outpartisans

| Citation | Outpartisan Conversation Treatment(s) | Research Design | Conversation Format | Measures... |
|----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
|          |                                      | Additional Components of Intervention |                      | Democratic Accountability? | Intergroup Attitudes? | Long-Run Effects? |
| [54]     | Imagined contact (Study 1); Conversations with confederates (Studies 2 and 3) | Participants excluded or included by outpartisans | Imagined contact (Study 1); Text-based conversations with confederates (Studies 2 and 3) | - | Yes | - |
| [57]     | Read about or imagine contact an outparty member (vs. inparty or control) | Contact type is positive / cooperative, negative, or neutral (studies 2 and 3) | Reported (Study 1), vicarious (Study 2) or imagined contact (Study 3) | - | Yes | - |
| [58]     | Imagined contact with outpartisans | Valence of contact (positive vs. negative) | Imagine contact | - | Yes | - |
| [23]     | Self-reported contact (not randomized; observational study) | n/a | Self-reported participation in online and face-to-face heterogenous discussions | - | Yes | - |

Table S9: Examples of other studies that do not examine effects of contact between partisan groups

| Citation | Outpartisan Conversation Treatment(s) | Research Design | Conversation Format | Measures... |
|----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
|          |                                      | Additional Components of Intervention |                      | Democratic Accountability? | Intergroup Attitudes? | Long-Run Effects? |
| [59] Study 5) | Conversation with confederate who disagrees on gun issues; no control without a conversation | Confederate shares personal experience or fact | In-person conversation with a confederate | - | - | - |
| [7]      | None | Common ingroup identity prime | n/a | - | Yes | - |
| [60]     | None | Exposure to outpartisan politicians’ messages on Twitter | n/a | - | - | - |
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