**Appendix A:**

**Sample Demographics and Weighting Scheme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table A1  *Demographic Profile of Survey Sample and Target Population* | | |
|  | Current Survey | U.S. Census Bureau:  2016 American Community Survey | |
|  | (%) | (%) | |
| Gender |  |  | |
| Male | 49.0 | 49.2 | |
| Female | 51.0 | 50.8 | |
| Age (median) | 35-44 | 37.7 | |
| Ethnicity/race |  |  | |
| White | 59.6 | 62.0 | |
| Black or African American Native | 15.9 | 12.3 | |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 1.5 | 0.7 | |
| Asian | 12.9 | 5.2 | |
| Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander | 0.2 | 0.2 | |
| Hispanic | 7.6 | 17.3 | |
| Household income (median) | US $60,000–75,000 | US $57,617 | |
| Education |  |  | |
| Less than high school graduate | 2.1 | 13.0 | |
| High school diploma or equivalent | 15.7 | 27.5 | |
| Some college or associate degree | 26.2 | 29.2 | |
| Bachelor’s degree or higher | 56.1 | 30.3 | |
| *Note*: The US Census Bureau 2016 American Community Survey is available online at http://factfinder.census.gov/ | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table A2  *Survey Weights* | |
| Income | |
| Category | Weight |
| Less than $15k | 1.02 |
| $15k to 30k | 1.00 |
| $30k to $45k | 1.00 |
| $45k to 60k | 1.00 |
| $60k to $75k | 1.00 |
| $75k to $100k | 0.86 |
| $100k to $150k | 0.95 |
| More than $150k | 0.95 |
| Education | |
| Category | Weight |
| None, or grades 1-8 | 5.75 |
| High school incomplete (grades 9-11) | 1.77 |
| High school graduate (grade 12 or GED certificate) | 1.33 |
| Some college, no 4-year degree (includes Associate’s Degree) | 0.89 |
| Technical, trade, or vocational school after high school | 0.65 |
| College graduate (Bachelor’s Degree) | 0.42 |
| Post-graduate training/professional school after college | 0.42 |
| *Note*. Income measured as annual household income. Education measured in terms of highest level completed. Final survey weights created by multiplying weights for income and education. | |

**Appendix B:**

**Lists of News Organizations Included in Network Projection**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table B1  *List of Nodes, Degree, and Frequencies Extracted from the Projection Network* | | | |
| *Rank* | Node | Degree | Frequency |
| 1 | Fox News | 35 | 650 |
| 2 | CNN | 31 | 642 |
| 3 | New York Times | 31 | 318 |
| 4 | ABC News | 24 | 306 |
| 5 | Local TV News | 23 | 292 |
| 6 | NBC News | 27 | 246 |
| 7 | CBS News | 20 | 206 |
| 8 | MSNBC | 23 | 186 |
| 9 | Local Paper | 25 | 179 |
| 10 | Aggregators | 23 | 170 |
| 11 | Social Media Sites | 18 | 159 |
| 12 | Yahoo News | 23 | 130 |
| 13 | BBC News | 20 | 110 |
| 14 | Washington Post | 25 | 106 |
| 15 | International Media | 19 | 56 |
| 16 | Wall Street Journal | 14 | 49 |
| 17 | Right-Leaning Sphere | 14 | 46 |
| 18 | NPR | 16 | 43 |
| 19 | USA Today | 16 | 42 |
| 20 | News Magazines | 15 | 41 |
| 21 | Huffington Post | 15 | 40 |
| 22 | Buzzfeed | 14 | 39 |
| 23 | Neutral Sphere | 18 | 38 |
| 24 | MSN | 9 | 34 |
| 25 | PBS | 13 | 32 |
| 26 | CNBC | 11 | 31 |
| 27 | Los Angeles Times | 8 | 21 |
| 27 | One America News | 4 | 21 |
| 29 | News Wire (Ap/Reuters) | 7 | 20 |
| 30 | Left-Leaning Sphere | 9 | 19 |
| 30 | Local News Websites | 7 | 19 |
| 30 | New York Post | 8 | 19 |
| 33 | Newsmax | 4 | 16 |
| 33 | Politico | 6 | 16 |
| 35 | Breitbart | 3 | 14 |
| 35 | Local Radio | 2 | 14 |
| 37 | Chicago Tribune | 5 | 12 |
| 38 | Univision | 5 | 11 |
| *Note.* Nodes are final list of coded open-ended responses analyzed in the network projection. Degree = number of edges (shared audience). See supplemental data set for disambiguated list. | | | |

**Appendix C:**

**Full Results for News Niches**

Figure C1

*Network Projection Based on Louvain Cluster Analysis*
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*Note.* Orange: right-leaning cable dominant; blue: left-leaning elite; green: local—aggregator

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table C1  *Organizational Niche Membership* | | | | | |
| **Niche 1** | | **Niche 2** | | **Niche 3** | |
| *Right-Leaning & Cable Dominant* | | *Left-Leaning Elite Press* | | *Local/Aggregators* | |
| ABC\*  BBC\*  Breitbart  CBS\*  CNBC\*  CNN\*  Fox News | LA Times\*  MSNBC\*  NBC\*  Newsmax  NY Post  OAN  Right Sphere  Univision\* | Huffington Post  NY Times  Washington Post  Politico  NPR\*  Buzzfeed  International Media\*  Wall Street Journal\*  New Magazines\*  PBS\*  Left Sphere |  | Aggregators  Chicago Trib.  Local Paper  Local Radio  Local TV  Local Web  MSN  Neutral Sphere  Social Agg. | USA Today  Yahoo |
| *Note.* \* Denotes organization that does not conform to theoretical expectations for fragmentation based on selective exposure theory. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table C2  *Means and Variances for Editorial Valence and Selection Valence* | | | | |
| Statistic | Local/Aggregators | Elite | Cable | Full Sample |
| **Editorial Valence** | | | | |
| Mean | -0.10 | -0.79 | 0.41 | -0.10 |
| Variance | 0.09 | 0.27 | 1.88 | 1.08 |
| *N* | 11 | 11 | 15 | 37 |
| Between-Group Variance | 4.57 | | | |
| Within-Group Variance | 0.88 | | | |
| Test Statistic | *F* (2) = 5.19, *p* = 0.011 | | | |
| **Selection Valence** | | | | |
| Mean | -0.07 | -0.73 | 0.03 | -0.10 |
| Variance | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.79 | 0.62 |
| *N* | 344 | 195 | 905 | 1,444 |
| Between-Group Variance | 41.29 | | | |
| Within-Group Variance | 0.51 | | | |
| Test Statistic | *F* (2) = 81.20, *p* < .001 | | | |
| *Note.* Outcome variable has an observed range of 5.0 (Min. = -2.0, Max. = 3.0). Data weighted by education and income. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table C3  *Pearson Correlations among Individual-Level Characteristics and Niche Membership* | | | | |
|  | Niche Membership | Right-Leaning cable | Left-Leaning Elite | Local-Aggregator |
| Age | 0.19\*\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* | -0.05\* | 0.09\*\*\* |
| Gender (1 = Female) | -0.02 | -0.04\* | 0 | 0.03 |
| Race (1 = PoC) | 0.05\* | 0.05\* | -0.02 | 0 |
| Education | -0.08\* | -0.02 | 0.09\*\*\* | -0.02 |
| Income | 0.05\* | 0.03 | 0.07\*\* | -0.04 |
| Political Interest | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.15\*\*\* | 0.05\* | -0.12\*\*\* |
| Political Ideology (Right) | -0.09\*\*\* | 0.01 | -0.17\*\*\* | 0.01 |
| Pro-attitudinal | 0.37\*\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.14\*\*\* | -0.21\*\*\* |
| Counter-attitudinal | 0.16\*\*\* | 0.29\*\*\* | -0.05\* | -0.15\*\*\* |
| Avoid other side | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.20\*\*\* | 0.06\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
| *Note.* N = 2008. Pro-, counter-attitudinal, and avoid variables were created by combining ideology and selection valence measures. | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table C4  *Performance Comparison of Alternate Detection Algorithms and Model Specifications* | | |
| Algorithm | Groups (N) | Modularity |
| *Co-exposure Projection (Theory-Driven)* |  |  |
| Louvian/Multilevel (ML) | 3 | .108 |
| Fast-Greedy | 4 | .109 |
| Walk Trap | 13 | .054 |
| Spin-Glass | 4 | .026 |
| Leading Eigenvector | 4 | .089 |
| *Bipartite Structure (Data-Driven)* |  |  |
| Louvian/ Multilevel (ML) | 13 | .442 |
| Walk Trap | 30 | .419 |
| Spin-Glass | 13 | .387 |
| Leading Eigenvector | 14 | .387 |
| *Note.* Fast-Greedy not compatible with Bipartite specification. Bipartite specification reflects data structure, while co-exposure reflects theorical structure based on previous studies. | | |

**Appendix D:**

**Cleaning and Coding of the Open-Ended Responses**

To clean and categorize open-ended responses, we employed principles and techniques of both manual and automated content analysis. Text responses in surveys are notoriously challenging to clean and code, and therefore we went through several rounds of text processing.

First, after removing incomplete/empty cells, gibberish, and non-news related responses we identified the potential universe of text content. Response rates are: 1,599 respondents offered one answer; 1,432 offered two; and 1,264 gave three complete answers. Next, we cleaned the text (lower case, remove spaces and special characters), then standardized for outlet (e.g., ‘Hannity’, ‘Sean Hannity Show’, were folded into Fox News; ‘Maddow’, ‘Rachel Maddow Show’, were folded into MSNBC etc.). At this stage (n= approx. 450 discrete responses) we applied our hierarchical coding scheme.

The coding scheme asked coders (the authors) to place news outlets into the proper category at the highest level of importance first. That is, categories were not mutually exclusive, and decisions should be made based on where the response falls in the hierarchy. Coders verified the scheme at each phase of cleaning and settled disagreement through discussion. The codebook is as follows:

1. Organizational Prominence: Well-known, established news organizations with large audiences were treated as discrete outlets. Related programs, websites, podcasts, or personalities folded into the host organization (e.g., Fox News, CNN, New York Times, BBC, NPR).
2. Sources with fewer mentions should go into one of the following broad categories where there is an obvious connection to the professional/technological mode of news production:
   1. Call letters or station name for radio and TV: local radio, local TV\*
   2. Newspaper-based organizations: Twitter following > 1 million = discrete node, otherwise local paper
   3. Newsmagazines (e.g., People, Time Magazine)
   4. International Media (from U.S. perspective, e.g., China Times)
   5. Aggregators (Google, AOL)
   6. Local Web: Local news w/out TV or paper component (Click on Detroit)
   7. Social media: Platforms in general, no influencers (Facebook, Twitter)
   8. Other broadcast and online/multiplatform shows/websites or influencers: See Step 3.
3. Coders should try to keep discrete nodes where possible at this stage. If responses do not garner large audiences (Step 1) and do not cleanly fit into broad categories (Step 2), responses will be treated as discrete outlets or folded based on audience size (n < 10) into valanced spheres (right, left, neutral) in the final step before constructing the projection network.

\*After completing Step 2, Part A, we applied the partisan valence coding scheme. Thus, all newspapers (local or national), as well as other discrete news sources were individually coded to create the ‘selection valence’ variable.

Figure D1

*Effects of Filtering of the Longtail Distribution*
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*Note. Frequency distribution of news outlets before coding for left, right, and neutral spheres (Plot A, outlets n = 102) and after (Plot B, n = 38). Network projection was based on Plot B.*