

Title: Supplementary models appendix for “Increasing accuracy motivations using moral reframing does not reduce Republicans’ belief in false news”

Authors: Michael Stagnaro (1,2), Sophia Pink (3), David G. Rand (1), Robb Willer (2)

Date: November 6th, 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 B: Supplementary models

Table 2. Linear regressions examining relationship between value placed on accuracy and headlines’ perceived accuracy, with (2, 4) and without (1, 3) controls and split by concordance (concordant headlines, models 1 and 2; discordant headlines, models 3 and 4).

VARIABLES	(1) Rating	(2) Rating	(3) Rating	(4) Rating
AccVale	0.0142 (0.0246)	0.0462* (0.0230)	-0.0237 (0.0233)	0.0304 (0.0222)
False	-0.497*** (0.0704)	-0.499*** (0.0719)	-0.578*** (0.0568)	-0.583*** (0.0567)
False X AccValue	-0.201*** (0.0320)	-0.207*** (0.0320)	-0.204*** (0.0307)	-0.211*** (0.0297)
Year of birth		-0.00524** (0.00162)		-0.00981*** (0.00167)
Gender		-0.0798* (0.0344)		-0.125** (0.0391)
Income		-0.0159** (0.00556)		-0.0205** (0.00653)
Edu dummies		Yes		Yes
Race dummies		Yes		Yes
Constant	1.988*** (0.0470)	2.111*** (0.196)	1.802*** (0.0469)	2.107*** (0.216)
Observations	10,072	9,944	10,076	9,946
R-squared	0.075	0.106	0.095	0.178

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$.

Table 3. Linear regressions examining treatment effect on value placed on accuracy, with (2) and without (1) controls.

VARIABLES	(1) Mod	(2) Mod
Treatment	2.080*** (0.537)	2.075*** (0.521)
Year of birth		0.163*** (0.0201)
Gender		1.199* (0.534)
Income		0.261** (0.0869)
Edu dummies		Yes
Race dummies		Yes
Constant	55.35*** (0.370)	49.76*** (2.414)
Observations	202,909	200,586
R-squared	0.007	0.078

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$.

Table 4. Linear regressions examining treatment effect on headlines' perceived accuracy, with (2) and without (1) controls.

VARIABLES	(1) Rating	(2) Rating
Treatment	-0.00892 (0.0257)	-0.00392 (0.0253)
Concordant	0.182** (0.0619)	0.182** (0.0630)
False	-0.560*** (0.0544)	-0.566*** (0.0548)
Concordant X False	0.0801 (0.0845)	0.0833 (0.0859)
Concordant X Treatment	-0.0313 (0.0254)	-0.0284 (0.0266)
False X Treatment	-0.00456 (0.0307)	-0.00317 (0.0325)
Concordant X Treatment X False	0.0298 (0.0313)	0.0253 (0.0336)
Year of birth		-0.00770*** (0.00113)
Gender		-0.159*** (0.0250)
Income		-0.0170*** (0.00392)
Edu dummies		Yes
Race dummies		Yes
Constant	1.804*** (0.0457)	1.921*** (0.185)
Observations	40,160	39,702
R-squared	0.075	0.137

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$.

Table 5. Linear regressions examining treatment effect on headlines' perceived accuracy, with (2, 4, 6) and without (1, 3, 5) controls, broken down by each level of conservatism (on a 7-point scale, with 4 being the midpoint, 5–7 represents three levels of conservatism: low, moderate, and high).

VARIABLES	Level 5		Level 6		Level 7	
	(1) Rating	(2) Rating	(3) Rating	(4) Rating	(5) Rating	(6) Rating
Treatment	-0.000206 (0.0455)	-0.00759 (0.0437)	0.0309 (0.0448)	0.0465 (0.0433)	-0.0686 (0.0501)	-0.0720 (0.0457)
Concordant	0.129+ (0.0696)	0.128+ (0.0703)	0.239*** (0.0675)	0.238*** (0.0687)	0.165** (0.0625)	0.166** (0.0630)
False	-0.697*** (0.0640)	-0.705*** (0.0641)	-0.532*** (0.0639)	-0.537*** (0.0651)	-0.460*** (0.0631)	-0.463*** (0.0629)
Concordant X False	0.0913 (0.0960)	0.0944 (0.0980)	0.0566 (0.0883)	0.0612 (0.0897)	0.0973 (0.0892)	0.0994 (0.0893)
Concordant X Treatment	-0.0413 (0.0483)	-0.0393 (0.0470)	-0.0626 (0.0410)	-0.0584 (0.0418)	0.0160 (0.0455)	0.0189 (0.0458)
False X Treatment	-0.00898 (0.0571)	-0.00422 (0.0563)	-0.0193 (0.0480)	-0.0175 (0.0508)	0.0141 (0.0619)	0.0125 (0.0613)
Concordant X Treatment X False	0.0101 (0.0571)	0.00652 (0.0569)	0.0705 (0.0493)	0.0623 (0.0518)	0.000328 (0.0622)	-0.000747 (0.0614)
Year of birth		-0.00404** (0.00156)		-0.00713*** (0.00152)		- 0.0104*** (0.00173)
Gender		-0.126*** (0.0374)		-0.219*** (0.0382)		-0.127** (0.0418)
Income		-0.0160** (0.00590)		-0.0119* (0.00604)		-0.0217** (0.00718)
Edu dummies		Yes		Yes		Yes
Race dummies		Yes		Yes		Yes
Constant	1.747*** (0.0517)	1.704*** (0.270)	1.743*** (0.0551)	1.810*** (0.149)	1.936*** (0.0509)	1.590*** (0.262)
Observations	12,278	12,198	15,228	15,028	12,654	12,476
R-squared	0.116	0.161	0.078	0.141	0.049	0.134

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$.

Table 6. Linear regressions examining treatment effect on headlines' perceived accuracy for those who took below (1), or above (2), the median time to reading the treatment or control essays.

VARIABLES	(1) Rating	(2) Rating
Treatment	-0.0121 (0.0366)	0.0148 (0.0312)
Concordant	0.0766** (0.0281)	0.265** (0.0979)
False	-0.189*** (0.0335)	-0.851*** (0.0784)
Concordant X False	0.0319 (0.0414)	0.117 (0.130)
Concordant X Treatment	-0.0303 (0.0284)	-0.0414 (0.0370)
False X Treatment	-0.0550 (0.0385)	0.0628+ (0.0353)
Concordant X Treatment X False	0.0129 (0.0373)	0.0379 (0.0457)
Constant	2.051*** (0.0283)	1.611*** (0.0679)
Observations	17,068	23,092
R-squared	0.015	0.157

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$.