Appendix G: Main analyses omitting practice item failures

As a pre-registered secondary analysis, we planned to conduct our main analyses excluding those who never answered the practice newsfeed questions correctly after two attempts (included $N = 1,264$).

Table S27. Sharing predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed practice items).

	b	SE	z	p
Intercept	0.242	0.02	12.352	<.001***
True	-0.05	0.018	-2.804	.005**
Non-political Social	-0.108	0.023	-4.737	<.001***
Political Social	-0.071	0.019	-3.643	<.001***
AccOnly	-0.03	0.019	-1.59	.112
AccBorder	-0.006	0.019	-0.334	.739
True:AccOnly	0.022	0.01	2.186	.029*
Non-political Social:AccOnly	0.024	0.018	1.344	.179
Political Social:AccOnly	0.031	0.014	2.221	.026*
True:AccBorder	0.021	0.007	3.263	.001**
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.017	0.02	-0.843	.399
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.021	0.016	-1.351	.177

Note: *** p < .001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.

Table S28. Wald test comparing news veracity sharing discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed practice items).

Res. Df	F	p
90,996	0.002	.967

Hypothesis tested: True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0
Note: *** p < .001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.

Table S29. *Liking predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed practice items).*

	b	SE	z	p
Intercept	0.131	0.012	11.178	<.001***
True	0.045	0.013	3.496	<.001***
Non-political Social	0.301	0.021	14.428	<.001***
Political Social	0.153	0.017	9.052	<.001***
AccOnly	0.027	0.016	1.747	.081
AccBorder	0.047	0.017	2.763	.006**
True:AccOnly	0	0.006	0.035	.972
Non-political Social:AccOnly	-0.022	0.02	-1.067	.286
Political Social:AccOnly	-0.02	0.011	-1.795	.073
True:AccBorder	-0.001	0.007	-0.2	.841
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.112	0.026	-4.317	<.001***
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.077	0.019	-4.168	<.001***

Note: *** *p* < .001. ** *p* < .01. * *p* < .05.

Table S30. *Wald test comparing news veracity liking discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed practice items).*

Res. Df	F	p
90,996	0.038	.846

Hypothesis tested: True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0
Note: *** *p* < .001. ** *p* < .01. * *p* < .05.

Table S31. Engagement (sharing and/or liking) predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed practice items).

	b	SE	z	p
Intercept	0.341	0.022	15.234	<.001***
True	-0.007	0.021	-0.339	.735
Non-political Social	0.18	0.025	7.24	<.001***
Political Social	0.068	0.022	3.115	.002**
AccOnly	0	0.024	-0.015	.988
AccBorder	0.041	0.025	1.677	.093
True:AccOnly	0.022	0.008	2.657	.008**
Non-political Social:AccOnly	0.006	0.021	0.291	.771
Political Social:AccOnly	0.01	0.012	0.841	.401
True:AccBorder	0.017	0.009	1.95	.051
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.117	0.025	-4.672	<.001***
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.094	0.018	-5.32	<.001***

*Note: *** p < .001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.*

Table S32. Wald test comparing news veracity engagement discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed practice items).

Res. Df	F	p
90,996	0.664	.415

Hypothesis tested: True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0
*Note: *** p < .001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.*