

Title: Additional details for our statistical analyses appendix for “Playing Gali Fakta inoculates Indonesian participants against false information”

Authors: Matthew J. Facciani (1), Denisa Apriliawati (2), Tim Weninger (1)

Date: August 13th, 2024

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: Additional details for our statistical analyses

Table A1. Regression tables of Gali Fakta’s impact on skepticism and sharing intent as discussed in Findings 1 and 2.

	Lower Accuracy of False Headlines	Lower Accuracy of Factual Headlines	Reduced Sharing of False Headlines	Reduced Sharing of Factual Headlines
Gali Fakta vs Control	0.192*** (0.0520)	0.0561 (0.0412)	0.215*** (0.0702)	0.112 (0.0705)
Age	0.0054** (0.0023)	0.0038** (0.0018)	0.0078** (0.0031)	0.0073** (0.0031)
Male	0.0858 (0.0526)	-0.0670 (0.0416)	0.0842 (0.0710)	0.0056 (0.0713)
Education	0.0809 (0.0621)	0.0126 (0.0492)	0.150* (0.0839)	0.0657 (0.0842)
Media Literacy	0.0332 (0.0302)	-0.197*** (0.0239)	-0.0957** (0.0408)	-0.285*** (0.0410)
Urban vs Rural	0.140* (0.0734)	-0.0311 (0.0581)	0.0919 (0.0991)	0.0163 (0.0995)
Religiosity	-0.0956*** (0.0333)	-0.0520** (0.0264)	-0.125*** (0.0450)	-0.119*** (0.0452)
Income	-6.13e-11 (8.67e-11)	-0 (6.86e-11)	-1.9e-10* (1.17e-10)	-1.44e-10 (1.17e-10)
Conservatism	-0.121*** (0.0263)	-0.0278 (0.0208)	-0.199*** (0.0355)	-0.152*** (0.0357)
Constant	2.928*** (0.306)	3.908*** (0.242)	3.839*** (0.413)	4.949*** (0.414)
Observations	801	801	801	801
R²	0.080	0.107	0.094	0.111

*Notes: Table includes regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses). *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < 0.1$.*

Table A2. Regression tables of Gali Fakta’s impact on skepticism and sharing intent without political variable to include the participants who did not report their politics.

	Lower Accuracy of False Headlines	Lower Accuracy of Factual Headlines	Reduced Sharing of False Headlines	Reduced Sharing of Factual Headlines
Gali Fakta vs Control	0.176*** (0.0459)	0.0595 (0.0366)	0.218*** (0.0634)	0.117* (0.0645)
Age	0.00595*** (0.00205)	0.00437*** (0.00164)	0.0101*** (0.00283)	0.00927*** (0.0029)
Male	0.0447 (0.0464)	-0.0891** (0.0371)	-0.00137 (0.0641)	-0.0687 (0.0653)
Education	0.0929* (0.0536)	-0.0186 (0.0428)	0.108 (0.0740)	0.0189 (0.0753)
Media Literacy	0.0196 (0.0251)	-0.184*** (0.0200)	-0.106*** (0.0346)	-0.272*** (0.0352)
Urban vs Rural	0.0979 (0.0617)	-0.0530 (0.0493)	0.0596 (0.0852)	-0.0197 (0.0868)
Religiosity	-0.115*** (0.0288)	-0.0630*** (0.0230)	-0.193*** (0.0397)	-0.180*** (0.0405)
Income	9.83e-12 (4.21e-11)	8.13e-11** (3.36e-11)	-2.34e-11 (5.81e-11)	3.52e-12 (5.92e-11)
Constant	2.715*** (0.248)	3.948*** (0.198)	3.694*** (0.343)	4.864*** (0.349)
Observations	987	987	987	987
R²	0.045	0.115	0.060	0.098

Notes: Table includes regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses). *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$.

Table A3. Means, standard deviations, and effect sizes of false headline accuracy and sharing ratings between the Gali Fakta and control conditions.

	Gali Fakta (n = 495)		Control (n = 511)		T-Score and Effect Size Between Groups	
	M	SD	M	SD	t	Cohen’s d
Accuracy Rating (1 = very accurate, 5 = very inaccurate)	3.34	0.70	3.16	0.74	-3.92	-0.247
Reduced Sharing Rating (1 = very likely to share, 5 = very unlikely to share)	3.47	0.97	3.26	1.05	-3.38	-0.213

Table A4. *Regression tables of Gali Fakta’s impact on headline accuracy and sharing discernment.*

	Accuracy Discernment	Sharing Discernment
Gali Fakta vs Control	0.136** (0.0560)	0.104** (0.0485)
Age	0.00157 (0.00249)	0.000535 (0.00215)
Male	0.153*** (0.0566)	0.0786 (0.0490)
Education	0.0683 (0.0669)	0.0843 (0.0579)
Media Literacy	0.230*** (0.0326)	0.189*** (0.0282)
Urban vs Rural	0.171** (0.0791)	0.0757 (0.0684)
Religiosity	-0.0436 (0.0359)	-0.00617 (0.0311)
Income	-0 (9.34e-11)	-0 (8.08e-11)
Conservatism	-0.0931*** (0.0284)	-0.0472* (0.0245)
Constant	-0.980*** (0.329)	-1.110*** (0.285)
Observations	801	801
R²	0.106	0.081

*Notes: Table includes regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses). ***p < .01, **p < .05, *p < .10. Discernment calculated by subtracting false headline rating from factual headline score. A higher discernment score means participants evaluated false headlines as being more inaccurate than factual headlines. Our Gali Fakta condition significantly predicted higher discernment scores for both accuracy and sharing.*

Table A5. Regression table of Gali Fakta's impact on media literacy as discussed in Finding 3.

	Media Literacy
Gali Fakta vs Control	-0.0302 (0.0611)
Age	-0.0005 (0.00271)
Male	0.0504 (0.0618)
Education	0.214*** (0.0726)
Urban vs Rural	0.247*** (0.0858)
Religiosity	0.180*** (0.0387)
Income	3.14e-10*** (1.01e-10)
Conservatism	-0.0337 (0.0309)
Constant	3.881*** (0.332)
Observations	801
R²	0.073

Notes: Table includes regression coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses). *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .10$.

Power analysis

We calculated a post-hoc power analysis using GPower software (Faul et al., 2009) for the OLS regressions used in Findings 1, 2, and 3. We used a sample size of 801 to account for the participants lost from not reporting their political ideology. We included eight predictor variables at an alpha level of .05. According to Cohen's (1988) guidelines, effect sizes of 0.02 are considered small, 0.15 are medium, and 0.35 are large. Ideally, statistical power should be greater than or equal to 0.80. Our post-hoc power analysis concluded that the statistical power for our analyses was greater than 0.99 for detecting a large or medium effect and was 0.825 for detecting a small effect using Cohen's (1988) guidelines. Thus, our sample size was sufficiently large for our analyses.