

Title: Main analyses omitting attention check item failures appendix for “Examining accuracy-prompt efficacy in combination with using colored borders to differentiate news and social content online”

Authors: Venya Bhardwaj (1), Cameron Martel (1), David G. Rand (1,2)

Date: February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023

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 H: Main analyses omitting attention check item failures

As a pre-registered secondary analysis, we also planned to conduct our main analyses excluding those who failed both pre-treatment attention check items (included  $N=841$ ).

**Table S33.** *Sharing predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed attention check items).*

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	0.174	0.02	8.723	<.001***
True	-0.043	0.019	-2.314	.021*
Non-political Social	-0.061	0.023	-2.681	.007**
Political Social	-0.043	0.02	-2.155	.031*
AccOnly	0.012	0.02	0.617	.537
AccBorder	-0.001	0.019	-0.032	.975
True:AccOnly	0.017	0.011	1.471	.141
Non-political Social:AccOnly	0.003	0.019	0.162	.871
Political Social:AccOnly	0.014	0.014	1.006	.314
True:AccBorder	0.02	0.01	2.044	.041*
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.02	0.02	-1.018	.309
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.022	0.016	-1.361	.174

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

**Table S34.** *Wald test comparing news veracity sharing discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed attention check items).*

Res. Df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
60,540	0.113	.736

Hypothesis tested:  $True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0$

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

**Table S35.** Liking predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed attention check items).

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	0.09	0.012	7.757	<.001***
True	0.054	0.014	3.852	<.001***
Non-political Social	0.282	0.024	11.77	<.001***
Political Social	0.139	0.017	8.04	<.001***
AccOnly	0.045	0.017	2.599	.009**
AccBorder	0.05	0.018	2.828	.005**
True:AccOnly	-0.005	0.008	-0.563	.574
Non-political Social:AccOnly	-0.017	0.025	-0.701	.483
Political Social:AccOnly	-0.011	0.012	-0.919	.358
True:AccBorder	-0.002	0.009	-0.277	.781
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.104	0.028	-3.675	<.001***
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.067	0.018	-3.745	<.001***

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

**Table S36.** Wald test comparing news veracity liking discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed attention check items).

Res. Df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
60,540	0.127	.722

Hypothesis tested: True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0

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

**Table S37.** Engagement (sharing and/or liking) predicted by post type, condition, and their interaction (excluding participants who failed attention check items).

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	0.239	0.022	10.955	<.001***
True	0.005	0.022	0.238	.811
Non-political Social	0.201	0.028	7.21	<.001***
Political Social	0.079	0.023	3.399	.001***
AccOnly	0.054	0.026	2.08	.037*
AccBorder	0.059	0.025	2.358	.018*
True:AccOnly	0.014	0.013	1.054	.292
Non-political Social:AccOnly	-0.006	0.026	-0.249	.803
Political Social:AccOnly	0.002	0.014	0.14	.888
True:AccBorder	0.016	0.012	1.34	.180
Non-political Social:AccBorder	-0.111	0.029	-3.796	<.001***
Political Social:AccBorder	-0.084	0.02	-4.274	<.001***

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

**Table S38.** Wald test comparing news veracity engagement discernment between accuracy-prompt-only and accuracy-prompt-plus-border (excluding participants who failed attention check items).

Res. Df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
60,540	0.190	.663

Hypothesis tested: True:AccOnly - True:AccBorder = 0

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