

Title: Null treatment effects for separate experiment appendix for “White consciousness helps explain conspiracy thinking”

Author: Feodor Snagovsky (1)

Date: December 12th, 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 E: Null treatment effects for separate experiment

A separate experiment was conducted within the same survey on the effects of perceived demographic change on White identity. Respondents read either one of three fictional vignettes about changing demographics or a control article where respondents read about hikers discovering a large icicle.

To verify that this experiment had no impact on the present study about conspiracy endorsement, the analyses in Tables D1–D4 (and correspondingly Figures 1–4 of the main paper) were repeated for only those respondents in the control group. The results were substantively identical but with a corresponding loss of power given the smaller sample size. Tables E1–E4 present these results. For completeness, both bivariate and multivariate estimates are presented.

Table E1. Predictors of the “great replacement” conspiracy theory (control group only).

	(1)	(2)
	White replacement	White replacement
White identity	2.400*** (0.415)	1.565* (0.323)
Conspiracy thinking		2.685*** (0.490)
Age		1.021 (0.051)
Age (squared)		1.000 (0.001)
Woman		0.713 (0.199)
University education		0.560 (0.183)
Income		0.980 (0.050)
Political interest		0.918 (0.045)
Political knowledge		1.191 (0.179)
Ideology (right)		1.219** (0.078)
Satisfaction with democracy		0.673* (0.114)
Québec		0.792 (0.253)
Observations	337	337

Note: Corresponds to Figure 1 in main paper but using only the subset of the sample which did not receive the demographic change treatment; coefficients are odds-ratios; standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table E2. Predictors of conspiracy thinking (control group only).

	(1) Conspiracy thinking	(2) Conspiracy thinking
White identity	0.357*** (0.060)	0.369*** (0.058)
Age		0.012 (0.014)
Age (squared)		-0.000 (0.000)
Woman		-0.094 (0.079)
University education		-0.063 (0.088)
Income		-0.004 (0.015)
Political interest		-0.012 (0.015)
Political knowledge		-0.077 (0.044)
Ideology (right)		0.013 (0.018)
Satisfaction with democracy		-0.394*** (0.046)
Québec		0.015 (0.094)
Constant	0.020 (0.044)	1.188** (0.366)
Observations	386	386

Note: Corresponds to Figure 2 in main paper but using only the subset of the sample which did not receive the demographic change treatment; standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table E3. Predictors of non-racial conspiracy endorsement (control group only).

	(1) Conspiracy endorsement	(2) Conspiracy endorsement
White identity	0.097* (0.041)	0.064 (0.041)
Conspiracy thinking	0.530*** (0.035)	0.428*** (0.037)
White identity x Conspiracy thinking	0.103* (0.044)	0.092* (0.042)
Age		0.006 (0.009)
Age (squared)		-0.000 (0.000)
Woman		-0.046 (0.055)
University education		-0.113 (0.061)
Income		0.003 (0.010)
Political interest		0.004 (0.010)
Political knowledge		-0.037 (0.030)
Ideology (Right)		0.072*** (0.013)
Satisfaction with democracy		-0.139*** (0.034)
Québec		-0.072 (0.064)
Constant	0.049 (0.030)	0.100 (0.255)
Observations	382	382

Note: Corresponds to Figure 3 in main paper but using only the subset of the sample which did not receive the demographic change treatment; standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table E4. Predicted effects of conspiracy thinking on conspiracy endorsement at various levels of White identity (WI) (control group only).

	Mean
WI = -1.75	0.267*** (0.073)
WI = -1.5	0.290*** (0.064)
WI = -1.25	0.313*** (0.056)
WI = -1.0	0.336*** (0.048)
WI = -0.75	0.359*** (0.042)
WI = -0.5	0.382*** (0.037)
WI = -0.25	0.405*** (0.035)
WI = 0	0.428*** (0.037)
WI = 0.25	0.451*** (0.041)
WI = 0.5	0.474*** (0.047)
WI = 0.75	0.497*** (0.054)
WI = 1.0	0.520*** (0.062)
WI = 1.25	0.543*** (0.071)
WI = 1.5	0.566*** (0.081)
Observations	382

Note: Corresponds to Figure 4 in main paper but using only the subset of the sample which did not receive the demographic change treatment; marginal effects; standard errors in parentheses; (d) for discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1;

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.