

Title: Corrections and turnout: Further inspection and a caveat appendix for “Fact-checking Trump’s election lies can improve confidence in U.S. elections: Experimental evidence“

Authors: Catie Snow Bailard (1), Ethan Porter (1), Kimberly Gross (1)

Date: December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

---

## **Appendix A: Corrections and turnout: Further inspection and a caveat**

As stated in the main document, our pre-registered analysis failed to detect a meaningful effect of the corrections on turnout, for either self-reported vote intention or the validated vote measure. (Please see Table A2 for these results.) However, our pre-registered analysis plan did not account for participants whose survey responses did not align with the behavioral data obtained from TargetSmart. As stipulated in our pre-registration plan, we excluded individuals who self-reported having already voted before participating in the experiment from the analyses of the turnout measures. The historically high levels of early voting in the 2020 election meant that we ended up excluding 677 participants from the analyses of our behavioral measures, over one-fifth of our total participants. However, comparing self-reports with the validated vote data suggests that a portion of these individuals ( $n = 70$ ) may have falsely reported having already voted, which would not be altogether surprising given the power of social desirability bias (Belli et al., 2001; Presser & Traugott, 1992). This means that we excluded individuals from the analyses of the behavioral measures who, in theory, may have been affected by the corrections.

An additional analysis, which included individuals whose claims of already voting were contradicted by the validated vote data (i.e., they self-reported having already voting, but they were matched in the TargetSmart data as non-voters) by assigning these individuals 0’s for the vote-validated measure ( $n = 19$ ), reveals a similar moderating effect of partisanship on voter turnout as revealed by our analysis of confidence in the integrity of the election. However, this effect fails to reach statistical significance ( $p = .19$ ). (Please see Table A3 for these results.) Nevertheless, this wrinkle suggests that questions relating to the effect of factual corrections of election misinformation on electoral behaviors merit further investigation that accounts for the propensity of some individuals to falsely report about their voting behavior.

**Table A1. Effects on election confidence (OLS).**

Variables	Election Confidence Index	Election Confidence Index
Fact-Checks	0.0268*** (0.00757)	0.0252*** (0.00758)
4 Year Degree and Above		-0.0173** (0.00804)
Age		0.0188* (0.0106)
Male		0.0254*** (0.00758)
Party ID		0.0261*** (0.00778)
Ideology		0.00852 (0.00964)
Nonwhite		0.0205** (0.00959)
Media Index		0.138*** (0.0204)
Battleground		0.0125 (0.00883)
Constant	0.520*** (0.00510)	0.418*** (0.0139)
Observations	2,993	2,736
R-squared	0.004	0.047

Note: Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .05$ , \* $p < .10$ .

**Table A2. Effects on voting and intention to vote.**

Variables	Verified Voter	Intention to Vote
Fact-Checks	0.00889 (0.0194)	0.0158 (0.0109)
4 Year Degree and Above	0.0454** (0.0204)	0.0579*** (0.0105)
Age	0.336*** (0.0273)	0.106*** (0.0155)
Male	-0.00899 (0.0195)	0.00824 (0.0110)
Party ID	0.0387** (0.0188)	-0.00353 (0.0102)
Ideology	-0.0241 (0.0229)	0.0143 (0.0135)
Nonwhite	-0.0682*** (0.0240)	-0.0230 (0.0141)
Media Index	0.107** (0.0498)	0.237*** (0.0295)
Battleground States	-0.00698 (0.0222)	-0.00749 (0.0124)
Constant	0.458*** (0.0359)	0.674*** (0.0236)
Observations	2,095	2,095
R-squared	0.091	0.088

*Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. This analysis excludes those who self-reported having voted prior to participating in the experiment. Verified voter column presents results for those who TargetSmart successfully matched from the sample to available turnout records, intention to vote column is based on responses to post treatment question asking respondents how likely they were to vote in the November election. \*\*\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .05$ , \* $p < .10$ .*

**Table A3.** Turnout by partisanship: Accounting for individuals who falsely reported voting early.

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Fact-Checks	0.00591 (0.0200)	0.00859 (0.0194)
Party ID	-0.0193 (0.0180)	0.0223 (0.0222)
Fact-Checks x Party ID	0.0338 (0.0259)	0.0226 (0.0248)
4-Year Degree and Above		0.0477** (0.0205)
Age		0.338*** (0.0273)
Male		-0.0106 (0.0195)
Ideology		-0.0229 (0.0230)
Nonwhite		-0.0641*** (0.0240)
Media Index		0.106** (0.0498)
Battleground States		-0.00503 (0.0223)
Constant	0.663*** (0.0137)	0.451*** (0.0358)
Observations	2,245	2,111
R-Squared	0.001	0.090

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .05$ , \* $p < .10$ .