

SOURCE INFORMATION AFFECTS NEWS BELIEFS

Additional Analysis

These supplementary materials consist of two parts. In part 1, we report more fully the results of our analyses that were not statistically significant (i.e., $p > .05$; in the manuscript, we reported only the lowest p -value for these analyses to reduce clutter). In part 2, we report the results of analyses that we preregistered but did not report in the main body of the paper. For Experiment 1a, these take the form of analyses conducted using different political groupings and for Experiments 2a and 2b, these take the form of multivariate analyses.

Part 1**Experiment 1a**

When examining headline ratings, we found no evidence that age interacted with any other factors: $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Source} \times \text{Affiliation}}(8, 2300) = 1.92, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .003$; $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Source}}(4, 2300) = 0.76, p = .55, \eta^2_p = .001$; $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Affiliation}}(2, 575) = 0.01, p = .99, \eta^2_p < .001$.

Political affiliation did not meaningfully influence ratings for headlines attributed to Fox News or Breitbart: $F_{\text{Fox News}}(2, 578) = 1.36, p = .26, \eta^2_p = .005$; $F_{\text{Breitbart}}(2, 578) = 0.94, p = .39, \eta^2_p = .003$.

For headlines attributed to either the New York Times, Occupy Democrats, or an unspecified source, Republicans and Others gave ratings that were not meaningfully different from each other: New York Times $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.02, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.11, 0.16], p = .88$; Occupy Democrats $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.02, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.11, 0.14], p = .96$; Unspecified $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.12, 0.15], p = .97$.

Experiment 1b

When examining headline ratings, we found no evidence that age interacted with any other factors: $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Source} \times \text{Affiliation}}(4, 390) = 1.56, p = .18, \eta^2_p = .005$; $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Source}}(2, 390) = 0.27, p = .76, \eta^2_p < .001$; $F_{\text{Age} \times \text{Affiliation}}(2, 195) = 0.96, p = .39, \eta^2_p = .006$.

Political affiliation did not meaningfully influence ratings for headlines attributed to an unspecified source: $F_{\text{Unspecified}}(2, 198) = 2.91, p = .06, \eta^2_p = .029$.

For headlines attributed to CNN, Democrats and Republicans gave ratings that were not meaningfully different from each other: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.20, 0.30], p = .89$. Republicans and Others also gave ratings that were not meaningfully different from each other: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.20, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.06, 0.46], p = .17$. For headlines attributed to Fox News, Republicans and Others gave ratings that were not meaningfully different from each other: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.19, 0.29], p = .89$. **Experiment**

2a

When we examined subjects' composite ratings as a function of the video version they saw and their political affiliation, we found no evidence of an interaction between video version and political affiliation, nor a main effect of video version: $F_{\text{Video} \times \text{Affiliation}}(4, 291) = 0.90, p = .47, \eta^2_p = .012$; $F_{\text{Video}}(2, 291) = 1.63, p = .20, \eta^2_p = 0.11$.

When we then included age as an additional covariate, we found no evidence of a main effect of age: $F(1, 292) = 0.01, p = .94, \eta^2_p < .001$. Note however, that we did find evidence that age interacted with political affiliation – as reported in the manuscript. When we examined this interaction more closely, we found no evidence that age meaningfully influenced Republican or

Other subjects' ratings: $F_{\text{Republican}}(1, 77) = 3.40, p = .07, \eta^2_p = .029$; $F_{\text{Other}}(1, 85) = 0.36, p = .55, \eta^2_p = .004$.

Ratings of the journalist's behavior were not meaningfully different from each other across Democrats and Others: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.24, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.04, 0.52], p = .10$.

Experiment 2b

When we examined subjects' composite ratings as a function of the video version they saw and their political affiliation, we found no evidence of an interaction between video version and political affiliation: $F_{\text{Video} \times \text{Affiliation}}(3, 477) = 1.58, p = .19, \eta^2_p = .010$.

When we then included age as an additional covariate, we found evidence of main effects of age and political affiliation: $F_{\text{Age}}(1, 476) = 6.88, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .014$; $F_{\text{Affiliation}}(3, 476) = 11.37, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .067$. Note however, that we also found evidence that age interacted with political affiliation – as reported in the manuscript. When we examined this interaction more closely, we found no evidence that age meaningfully influenced Republican or Other subjects' ratings:

$F_{\text{Republican}}(1, 128) = 0.11, p = .74, \eta^2_p = .001$; $F_{\text{Other}}(1, 26) = 0.27, p = .61, \eta^2_p = .010$.

Ratings of the journalist's behavior were not meaningfully different between Democrats and Others: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.30, 0.48], p = .94$. Nor between Democrats and members of no party: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.16, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.05, 0.38], p = .20$. Nor between Others and members of no party: $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.07, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.32, 0.47], p = .96$.

When we split our subjects into two groups on the basis of their familiarity with the event depicted in the video, we found no evidence in either group that subjects' ratings of the journalist's behavior were meaningfully influenced by an interaction between the version of the video they saw and their political affiliation: $F_{\text{Familiar}}(3, 170) = 0.76, p = .52, \eta^2_p = .013$; $F_{\text{Unfamiliar}}(3, 298) = 0.59, p = .62, \eta^2_p = .006$. Nor did we find any evidence in either group that

the version of the video subjects saw meaningfully influenced their ratings of the journalist's

behavior: $F_{\text{Familiar}}(1, 170) = 1.97, p = .16, \eta^2_p = .011$; $F_{\text{Unfamiliar}}(1, 298) = 3.98, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .013$.

Nor did we find any evidence for those unfamiliar with the event that political affiliation

influenced ratings of the journalist's behavior: $F_{\text{Affiliation}}(3, 298) = 2.20, p = .09, \eta^2_p = .022$.

Part 2

Experiment 1a

In the main body, we report the results of our primary and follow-up analyses using subjects' reported party membership to create the three political affiliation groups. Here, we report the results of analyses instead using subjects' rated political leaning to create the three groups, as per our preregistration.

Of the 581 subjects, based on their ratings, 200 were categorized as conservative, 184 as liberal, and 197 as moderate. Distributions of party membership were consistent with these categorizations: 76% of "conservative" subjects reported Republican party membership, 61% of "liberal" subjects reported Democrat party membership, and 47% of "moderate" subjects reported other (or no) party membership.

Using these rating-based categorizations, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on mean headline ratings revealed a statistically significant interaction between political affiliation and news source, $F(8, 2312) = 2.39, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .008$, suggesting that people's rating of a given news headline depended both on their own political affiliation and the purported source of that headline.

We then ran five one-way ANOVAs testing the effect of political affiliation on mean headline ratings for each news source condition in turn. Subjects' political affiliation made no

appreciable difference for their ratings of headlines attributed to Fox News ($F(2, 578) = 1.76, p = .17, \eta^2_p = .006$) or to Breitbart ($F(2, 578) = 2.63, p = .07, \eta^2_p = .009$). But subjects' political affiliation did matter when it came to their ratings of headlines attributed to the remaining three news sources: the New York Times ($F(2, 578) = 11.15, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .037$), Occupy Democrats ($F(2, 578) = 11.49, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .038$), and no specified source ($F(2, 578) = 14.11, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .047$).

Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons for those three sources revealed that, for headlines attributed to the New York Times, liberals ($M = 3.52$) rated them slightly more real than did conservatives ($M = 3.28$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.24$, 95% CI [0.10, 0.37], $p < .01$) and moderates ($M = 3.28$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.24$, 95% CI [0.10, 0.37], $p < .01$), but conservatives and moderates gave very similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} < 0.01$, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.14], $p > .99$). Similarly, for headlines attributed to Occupy Democrats, liberals ($M = 3.41$) rated them slightly more real than did conservatives ($M = 3.17$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.23$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.36], $p < .01$) and moderates ($M = 3.18$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.22$, 95% CI [0.09, 0.35], $p < .01$), but conservatives and moderates gave very similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.01$, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.14], $p = .97$). Finally, for headlines with no specified source, liberals ($M = 3.41$) rated them slightly more real than did conservatives ($M = 3.16$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.25$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.38], $p < .01$) and moderates ($M = 3.14$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.27$, 95% CI [0.14, 0.40], $p < .01$), but conservatives and moderates gave very similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.02$, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.15], $p = .95$).

Experiment 2a

In the main body, we report the results of univariate analyses using a simple composite of the four ratings subjects make (in relation to the interaction between the CNN journalist and the White House intern) as the dependent measure. Here, we report the results of a multivariate analysis and follow-ups, as per our preregistration.

We first examined subjects' ratings as a function of the video version they saw and their political affiliation. A two-way MANOVA revealed a significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(16, 880.49) = 1.73, p = .04$, Wilks' $\lambda = .91$. We then ran four two-way ANOVAs, testing the effect of video version and political affiliation for each rating item in turn.

For the first rating, about the harmfulness of the journalist's behavior toward the intern, there was no significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(4, 291) = 2.11, p = .08$, $\eta^2_p = .028$ and no main effect of video version, $F(2, 291) = 0.98, p = .38$, $\eta^2_p = .007$, but a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(2, 291) = 11.65, p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .074$. Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.59$) rated the journalist's behavior as more harmful than did Democrats ($M = 1.93$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.66$, 95% CI [0.33, 0.98], $p < .01$) and Others ($M = 2.22$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.37$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.73], $p = .04$), but Democrats and Others gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.29$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.60], $p = .09$).

For the second rating, about the reasonableness of the journalist's behavior toward the intern (reversed scored), there was no significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(4, 291) = 1.57, p = .18$, $\eta^2_p = .021$, and no main effect of video version, $F(2, 291) = 0.87, p = .42$, $\eta^2_p = .006$, but a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(2, 291) = 18.41, p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .112$. Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 3.10$) rated the journalist's behavior as more unreasonable than did Democrats ($M = 2.18$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.92$, 95% CI [0.56, 1.28], $p < .01$) and Others ($M = 2.47$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.63$, 95% CI [0.24, 1.02], $p < .01$), but Democrats and Others gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.29$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.64], $p = .12$).

For the third rating, about the reasonableness of the White House's response—revoking the journalist's press pass, banning him from the White House—there was no significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(4, 291) = 0.17, p = .96, \eta^2_p = .002$, a marginally significant main effect of video version, $F(2, 291) = 3.07, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .021$, and a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(2, 291) = 27.82, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .161$.

Tukeycorrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that subjects who saw the “original” video ($M = 2.53$) rated the White House's response as more reasonable than did those who saw the “looped” video ($M = 2.03$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.50$, 95% CI [0.09, 0.91], $p = .01$), but as similarly reasonable as those who saw the “altered” video ($M = 2.29$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.24$, 95% CI [-0.17, 0.64], $p = .35$); “looped” and “altered” subjects' ratings were also similar ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.26$, 95% CI [-0.15, 0.67], $p = .29$).

Tukeycorrected post-hoc comparisons further revealed that Republicans ($M = 3.10$) rated the White

House's response as more reasonable than did Democrats ($M = 1.88$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 1.22$, 95% CI [0.84, 1.60], $p < .01$) and Others ($M = 2.15$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.95$, 95% CI [0.54, 1.37], $p < .01$), but Democrats and Others gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.27$, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.64], $p = .20$).

For the fourth rating, about the reasonableness of a federal judge's ruling (reversed scored)—that revoking the journalist's press pass was a violation of his right to a fair and transparent process, and ordering that the ban be lifted—there was no significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(4, 291) = 1.36, p = .25, \eta^2_p = .018$, and no main effect of video version, $F(2, 291) = 0.67, p = .51, \eta^2_p = .005$, but a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(2, 291) = 24.55, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .144$. Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.41$) rated the judge's ruling as more unreasonable than did

Democrats ($M = 1.52$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.89$, 95% CI [0.59, 1.20], $p < .01$) and Others ($M = 1.63$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.78$, 95% CI [0.45, 1.11], $p < .01$), but Democrats and Others gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.11$, 95% CI [-0.18, 0.41], $p = .64$).

Experiment 2b

In the main body, we report the results of univariate analyses using a simple composite of the four ratings subjects make (in relation to the interaction between the CNN journalist and the White House intern) as the dependent measure. Here, we report the results of a multivariate analysis and follow-ups, as per our preregistration.

We first examined subjects' ratings as a function of the video version they saw and their political affiliation. A two-way MANOVA revealed no significant interaction between video version and political affiliation, $F(12, 1254.38) = 1.22$, $p = .27$, Wilks' $\lambda = .97$, but significant main effects of video version, $F(4, 474) = 3.76$, $p < .01$, Wilks' $\lambda = .97$, and of political affiliation, $F(12, 1254.38) = 2.93$, $p < .01$, Wilks' $\lambda = .93$. We then ran four two-way ANOVAs, testing the effect of video version and of political affiliation (but not their interaction) for each rating item in turn.

For the first rating, about the harmfulness of the journalist's behavior toward the intern, there was no main effect of video version, $F(1, 480) = 0.34$, $p = .56$, $\eta^2_p = .001$, but a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(3, 480) = 5.09$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .031$. Tukey-corrected posthoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.62$) rated the journalist's behavior as more harmful than did Democrats ($M = 2.22$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.40$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.66], $p < .01$), but gave similar ratings as Others ($M = 2.32$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.29$, 95% CI [-0.19, 0.78], $p = .40$), and members of no party did ($M = 2.38$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.23$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.51], $p = .15$). Democrats also

gave similar ratings as Others ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.10$, 95% CI [-0.37, 0.57], $p = .94$) and members of no party did ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.17$, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.43], $p = .34$); Others and members of no party gave similar ratings, too ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.06$, 95% CI [-0.42, 0.54], $p = .99$).

For the second rating, about the reasonableness of the journalist's behavior toward the intern (reversed scored), there was no main effect of video version, $F(1, 480) = 0.01$, $p = .91$, $\eta^2_p < .001$, but a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(3, 480) = 6.48$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .039$.

Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.88$) rated the journalist's behavior as more unreasonable than did Democrats ($M = 2.39$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.50$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.79], $p < .01$), but gave similar ratings as Others ($M = 2.54$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.35$, 95% CI [-0.18, 0.88], $p = .33$), and members of no party did ($M = 2.61$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.28$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.58], $p = .10$). Democrats also gave similar ratings as Others ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.15$, 95% CI [-0.37, 0.67], $p = .88$) and members of no party did ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.22$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.51], $p = .18$); Others and members of no party gave similar ratings, too ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.07$, 95% CI [-0.45, 0.60], $p = .98$).

For the third rating, about the reasonableness of the White House's response—revoking the journalist's press pass, banning him from the White House—there was a significant main effect of video version, $F(1, 480) = 9.68$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .020$, and a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(3, 480) = 7.89$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .047$. More specifically, people who viewed the “original” version of the video ($M = 2.58$) rated the White House's response as more reasonable than did people who viewed the “altered” version ($M = 2.25$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.33$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.52]). Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.80$) rated the White House's response as more reasonable than Democrats ($M = 2.19$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.61$, 95% CI

[0.29, 0.93], $p < .01$), Others ($M = 2.36$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.44$, 95% CI [-0.13, 1.02], $p = .20$), and members of no party did ($M = 2.38$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.42$, 95% CI [0.09, 0.76], $p < .01$), though the difference from Others was not significant. Democrats gave similar ratings as Others ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.19$, 95% CI [-0.12, 0.50], $p = .40$) and members of no party did ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.17$, 95% CI [-0.39, 0.73], $p = .87$); Others and members of no party also gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.02$, 95% CI [-0.55, 0.59], $p > .99$).

For the fourth rating, about the reasonableness of a federal judge's ruling (reversed scored)—that taking away the journalist's press pass was a violation of his right to a fair and transparent process, and ordering that the ban be lifted—there was a significant main effect of video version, $F(1, 480) = 6.10$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2_p = .013$, and a significant main effect of political affiliation, $F(3, 480) = 7.91$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2_p = .047$. More specifically, people who viewed the “original” version of the video ($M = 1.89$) rated the judge's ruling as more unreasonable than did people who viewed the “altered” version ($M = 1.67$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.21$, 95% CI [0.06, 0.37]). Tukey-corrected post-hoc comparisons further revealed that Republicans ($M = 2.10$) rated the judge's ruling as more unreasonable than did Democrats ($M = 1.64$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.46$, 95% CI [0.20, 0.71], $p < .01$), Others ($M = 1.57$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.53$, 95% CI [0.06, 0.99], $p = .02$), and members of no party ($M = 1.72$; $M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.38$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.65], $p < .01$). Democrats gave similar ratings as Others ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.07$, 95% CI [-0.38, 0.52], $p < .98$) and members of no party did ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.08$, 95% CI [-0.17, 0.33], $p = .85$); Others and members of no party also gave similar ratings ($M_{\text{Diff}} = 0.15$, 95% CI [-0.31, 0.61], $p = .84$).