Appendix: Statistical results

Table A1. *Mean of correct responses by each condition group.*

Group	M (SD)	n
Control	18.02 (3.34)	93
Feedback	22.09 (2.55)	94
Feedback+Education	22.26 (2.30)	81

Table A2. *ANOVA results for correct responses by condition.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prof > F
Between Groups	1047.01	2	523.50	67.29	0.001
Within Groups	2061.65	265	7.78		
Total	3108.66	267	11.64		

Power analysis

An *a priori* power analysis was conducted via GPower software (Faul et al., 2009) for our OLS regression comparing mean differences in correct responses as the dependent variable with our treatment vs control variable as the independent variable. We had eight predictor variables in total (seven control variables plus our independent variable), and our power analysis was set at an alpha level of .05. Our power analysis found that to achieve .95 power with a medium (.15) effect size (see Cohen, 1988), we would need at least 160 participants. Our sample size exceeded 160 in our main analyses, which provided a satisfactory number of participants for our study.

Table A3. *OLS regression tables for treatment 1 vs. control and treatment 2 vs. control.*

	Feedback vs. Control	Feedback+Education vs. Control
Male	-0.883*	-0.869
	(0.490)	(0.530)
Age	-0.0715	-0.0927
	(0.271)	(0.278)
Education	0.317	0.182
	(0.273)	(0.270)
White	-0.0195	0.105
	(0.527)	(0.533)
Social media	-0.219	-0.520*
	(0.300)	(0.299)
Familiarity	0.915**	0.904**
	(0.409)	(0.432)
Conservative	-0.0640	-0.0342
	(0.218)	(0.232)
Feedback	4.106***	
	(0.478)	
Feedback + Education		4.112***
		(0.496)
Constant	16.95***	18.63***
	(2.138)	(2.060)
Observations	164	146
R^2	0.347	0.384

Note: Standard errors in parentheses; *** p < .01, ** p < .05, * p < .10

Table A4. _Exploratory analysis of first four images._

	Accuracy of first four images
Male	0.203
	(0.122)
Age	0.026
	(0.066)
Education	0.033
	(0.064)
White	0.215
	(0.128)
Social media	-0.134
	(0.075)
Familiarity	0.119
	(0.103)
Conservative	-0.023
	(0.053)
Treatment conditions combined vs. Control	0.530***
	(0.122)
Constant	1.887***
	(0.519)
Observations	228
R^2	0.123

Note: Standard errors in parentheses; *** p < .01, ** p < .05, * p < .1

All Mean Differences Between Image Types Across Each Condition Group

Table A5. *Control descriptive statistics by group.*

Group	M	SD	n
Erasing	0.401	0.491	374
Copy-paste	0.567	0.496	372
Splicing	0.621	0.486	372
Photoshop touchup	0.650	0.478	371

Table A6. *Analysis of variance.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	prob > F
Between groups	13.826	3.0	4.609	19.380	0.0
Within groups	353.163	1485.0	0.238		
Total	366.990	1488.0	0.247		

Table A7. *Control post hoc Bonferroni test results (control).*

				95% CI		
Group 1	Group 2	MD	p-adj	Lower bound	Upper bound	Reject
copy-paste	**erasing**	-0.166	.000	-0.258	-0.074	True
copy-paste	**Photoshop touchup**	0.082	.098	-0.010	0.174	False
copy-paste	**splicing**	0.054	.436	-0.038	0.146	False
erasing	**Photoshop touchup**	0.249	.000	0.157	0.340	True
erasing	**splicing**	0.220	.000	0.128	0.312	True
Photoshop touchup	**splicing**	-0.029	.854	-0.121	0.063	False

Table A8. *Treatment 1 (feedback) descriptive statistics by group.*

Group	M	SD	n
Erasing	0.617	0.487	376
Copy-paste	0.686	0.465	376
Splicing	0.750	0.434	376
Photoshop touchup	0.670	0.471	376

Table A9. *Post hoc Bonferroni test results (treatment 1).*

| | | | | 95% CI | | |
Group 1	Group 2	*MD*	*p*-adj	lower bound	upper bound	Reject
copy-paste	erasing	-0.069	.173	-0.156	0.018	False
copy-paste	Photoshop touchup	-0.016	.965	-0.103	0.071	False
copy-paste	splicing	0.064	.235	-0.023	0.151	False
erasing	Photoshop touchup	0.053	.396	-0.034	0.140	False
erasing	splicing	0.133	.001	0.046	0.220	True
Photoshop touchup	splicing	0.080	.086	-0.007	0.167	False

Table A10. *Treatment 2 (feedback + education) descriptive statistics by group.*

Group	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Erasing	0.574	0.495	324
Copy-paste	0.701	0.459	324
Splicing	0.781	0.414	324
Photoshop touchup	0.744	0.437	324

Table A11. *Post hoc Bonferroni test results (treatment 2).*

| | | | | 95% CI | | |
Group 1	Group 2	*MD*	*p*-adj	lower bound	upper bound	Reject
copy-paste	erasing	-0.127	.002	-0.218	-0.035	True
copy-paste	Photoshop touchup	0.043	.617	-0.048	0.135	False
copy-paste	splicing	0.080	.109	-0.011	0.172	False
erasing	Photoshop touchup	0.170	.000	0.078	0.261	True
erasing	splicing	0.207	.000	0.115	0.298	True
Photoshop touchup	splicing	0.037	.037	-0.054	0.129	False

Table A12. *Correlation between time spent and image classification accuracy for all images.*

		SE	*z*	*p* > |z|	95% CI [0.025	0.975]
Const	.945	0.039	24.357	.000	0.869	1.021
Time Spent	-.034	0.003	-10.589	.000	-0.040	-0.027

Note: r_{pb}: -0.12, p-value < .001

**Table A13.** Demographic data.

Demographic Category	n
Gender	
Women	112
Men	95
Preferring not to say	33
Other genders	28
Age	
18-24	36
25-34	103
35-50	80
50+	44
Education Level	
High school	32
Some college	62
College degree	118
Graduate degree	53
Social Media Use	
Daily	208
Weekly	42
Monthly	3
Less than monthly	7
Never	6
Familiarity with Image Manipulation	
Not familiar	18
Somewhat familiar	165
Very familiar	79
Experts	4
Political Affiliation	
Liberal	76
Somewhat liberal	74
Moderate	59
Somewhat conservative	27
Conservative	15
Apolitical	16
Racial Demographics	
White	178
Black	32
Asian	22
Latino/a/x	19
Other	15