

Supplementary Materials

For

Accuracy and Social Incentives Shape Belief in (Mis)Information

Steve Rathje¹

Jay Van Bavel²

Sander van der Linden¹

¹Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3RQ, United Kingdom

²Department of Psychology & Center for Neural Science, New York University, New York, NY 10003

S1: Extended Results

Study 1

Analysis of Type of Headlines Impacted. To explore what kind of headlines the incentives impacted specifically, we conducted a 2 (incentives vs. control condition) X 2 (true headlines vs. false headlines) X 2 (politically-congruent versus politically-incongruent) mixed-design ANOVA with the percentage of articles rated as accurate as the dependent variable. There was a main effect of condition, $F(1, 460) = 12.71, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.01$, political congruence, $F(1, 460) = 263.50, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.11$, and veracity of the headlines, $F(1, 460) = 5.58, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.27$. There was also an interaction effect between the incentives and political congruence of the headlines, $F(1, 460) = 8.00, p = 0.01, \eta^2_G = 0.004$, and between the incentives and the veracity of the headlines $F(1, 460) = 7.77, p = 0.003, \eta^2_G = 0.004$.

Following up on these interaction effects with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests, we found that the incentives primarily increased belief in politically-incongruent true news ($M = 51.53, 95\% \text{ CI} = [47.36, 55.70]$) when compared to the control condition ($M = 38.25, 95\% \text{ CI} = [34.41, 42.08]$), $p < 0.001, d = 0.43$. However, incentives did not increase belief in politically-incongruent false news ($p = 0.444$), politically-congruent false news ($p = 0.999$), or politically-congruent true news ($p = 0.472$).

Study 2

Analysis of Type of Headlines Impacted. To test what types of headlines were affected by the incentives, we followed up on these results with a 2 (accuracy incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (social incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (politically congruent vs. politically incongruent) X 2 (true headlines vs. false headlines) mixed-design ANOVA with the percent of articles rated as accurate as the dependent variable. There was a significant main effect of the accuracy incentives, $F(1, 994) = 23.44, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.01$, veracity, $F(1, 994) = 550.43, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.20$, and political congruence, $F(1, 994) = 8.99, p = 0.003, \eta^2_G = 0.002$. Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between accuracy incentives and political congruence, $F(1, 994) = 8.99, p = 0.003, \eta^2_G = 0.00$, between accuracy incentives and veracity, $F(1, 994) = 29.06, p < 0.001, \eta^2_G = 0.01$, and between social incentives and veracity, $F(1, 994) = 7.613, p = 0.006, \eta^2_G = 0.00$. All other $ps > 0.085$.

Tukey HSD post-hoc tests found that there was a significant difference in the amount of *incongruent true* articles rated as accurate between the accuracy incentives condition ($M = 55.61\%, 95\% \text{ CI} = [51.68, 59.54]$) and the control condition ($M = 37.65\%, 95\% \text{ CI} = [33.83, 41.46]$), $p < 0.001, d = 0.58$. However, the mixed incentives condition ($M = 46.07\%, 95\% \text{ CI} = [42.04, 51.10]$) did not differ from the control condition ($M =$), $p = 0.092$, once again supporting the idea that social incentives distract from accuracy incentives. The incentives once again did not impact congruent true news, incongruent false news, or congruent false news ($ps > 0.148$).

Analysis of Sharing Behavior. To test how incentives influenced sharing intentions, we ran another 2X2X2X2 mixed ANOVA on sharing intentions. Here, there was no effect of accuracy incentives, $F(1, 994) = 0.05, p = 0.830, \eta^2 = 0.00$, but there was a significant main effect of social

incentives, $F(1, 994) = 10.07, p = 0.002, \eta^2 = 0.00$, political congruence, $F(1, 994) = 368.96, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.05$, and veracity, $F(1, 994) = 173.71, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.01$. Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between social incentives and political congruence, $F(1, 994) = 20.41, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.00$.

Following up on the interaction between the social incentives and political congruence, we found that those in the social incentives condition shared more politically congruent news (either true or false) ($M = 1.98, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.90, 2.05]$) as compared to the control condition ($M = 1.80, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.74, 1.87]$), $p = 0.015, d = 0.21$. Additionally, those in the mixed condition ($M = 2.02, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.94, 2.10]$) shared more politically congruent news (true or false) as compared to the control condition, $p < 0.001, d = 0.26$. Thus, thinking about whether an article will be liked by one's party, whether or not one is incentivized to be accurate, appears to indiscriminately increase sharing of both true and false news that appeal to one's political party.

Study 3

Analysis of Type of Headlines Impacted. We then ran a 2 (accuracy incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (social incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (politically congruent vs. politically incongruent) X 2 (true headlines vs. false headlines) mixed-design ANOVA. Here, we saw a significant main effect of political congruence on perceived accuracy, $F(1, 917) = 457.79, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.09$. There was also a significant main effect of veracity on perceived accuracy, $F(1, 917) = 945.35, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.20$. As in Study 2, there was a significant interaction between the accuracy incentives condition and political congruence, $F(1, 917) = 18.22, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.00$, a significant interaction between veracity and political congruence, $F(1, 917) = 5.65, p = 0.018, \eta^2 = 0.00$, a significant interaction between the accuracy incentives and source cues, $F(1, 917) = 4.71, p = 0.030, \eta^2 = 0.00$, and a significant interaction between the accuracy incentives and the veracity of the headline, $F(1, 917) = 4.71, p = 0.036, \eta^2 = 0.00$.

We then followed up on these interactions with Tukey post-hoc tests. Replicating the results of studies 1 and 2, there was a large difference in the percentage of *incongruent true* headlines rated as accurate in the accuracy incentive (with sources) condition ($M = 51.20, 95\% \text{ CI} = [47.28, 55.12]$) versus the control (with sources) condition ($M = 39.47, 95\% \text{ CI} = [35.69, 43.34]$), $p < 0.001, d = 0.39$. However, without sources present beside the headlines, there was no difference in the percentage of incongruent true headlines rated as accurate when comparing the accuracy incentive and control condition ($p = 0.605$). No other post-hoc tests were significant ($ps > 0.864$). These results replicate the finding that the effects are driven by an increase in belief in politically-incongruent headlines, but also show these effects depend upon source cues being present beside the headlines.

Integrative Data Analysis

Reaction Time Data. To further examine whether the accuracy incentives increased the amount of effort people put into discerning the accuracy of headlines, we also examined reaction time data (in seconds) in the pooled dataset. We ran a 2X2X2 ANOVA (Condition X Political Congruence X Veracity) and found a main effect of condition such that people spent more time on each item in the accuracy ($M = 18.27, 95\% \text{ CI} = [17.58, 18.95]$) as opposed to control condition ($M = 15.88, 95\% \text{ CI} = [15.45, 16.30]$), $F(1, 1458) = 20.50, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.01$. There

was also a main effect of veracity such that people spent more time on true news ($M = 18.77$, 95% CI = [18.15, 19.40]) than false news ($M = 16.56$, 95% CI = [15.82, 17.30]), $F(1, 1458) = 17.28$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta^2 = 0.00$.

Additional Self-Report Question Analysis. We also directly asked participants whether they believed their responses were influenced by the treatment conditions at the end of the experiment. In total, 20% of participants said they believed their judgements were influenced by the accuracy incentives, and 24% of participants said they believed their judgements were influenced by the task of identifying politically-congruent articles. Thus, while some participants were aware that the experimental conditions impacted how they responded, the majority were not aware of this. In most cases, it seems as if participants were responding in a way that they thought reflected their true beliefs and were blind to the impact of incentives. Furthermore, only 7% of participants said they would knowingly share fake news on social media.

S2: Item-by-Item Analysis

Type	Headline	Source	Mean (Accuracy)	Mean (Control)	Mean Difference	CI Low	CI High	t	df	p	Cohen's D
Democrat True	Trump allies are handing out cash to black voters	Politico	0.40	0.30	-0.10	0.05	0.15	3.97	1412.44	0.000	0.21
Democrat True	Trump targets Reagan foundation after it asks campaign, RNC to stop using former president's likeness	CBS News	0.69	0.55	-0.14	0.09	0.19	5.48	1424.16	0.000	0.29
Democrat True	Facebook removes Trump ads with symbols once used by Nazis	AP News	0.67	0.58	-0.09	0.04	0.14	3.51	1425.70	0.000	0.19
Democrat True	Melania Trump was praised for acknowledging racism. But she has also spread false 'birther' claims about Trump.	Washington Post	0.70	0.60	-0.10	0.05	0.15	3.87	1424.70	0.000	0.21
Democrat False	White House Chef Quits because Trump Has Only Eaten Fast Food For 6 Months	HalfWay Post	0.21	0.18	-0.03	-0.01	0.07	1.25	1415.68	0.212	0.07
Democrat False	Trump's Top Scientist Pick: "Scientists Are Just Dumb Regular People That Think Dinosaurs Existed and the Earth is Getting Warmer"	USPoln	0.27	0.23	-0.04	-0.01	0.08	1.65	1416.00	0.099	0.09
Democrat False	Hispanic Women Claims, "Donald Trump Paid Me For Sex in Cancun, This Is Our Love Child"	Now8News	0.18	0.11	-0.06	0.03	0.10	3.36	1363.43	0.001	0.18
Democrat False	Donald Trump Signs Executive Order Allowing the Hunting of Bald Eagles		0.18	0.18	0.01	-0.05	0.03	0.33	1425.48	0.745	-0.02
Republican True	Plant a Million Trees: Republicans Offer Fossil-Friendly Climate Fix	Reuters	0.56	0.45	-0.11	0.05	0.16	3.99	1424.56	0.000	0.21
Republican True	UPSP Flashback: Obama administration removed thousands of mailboxes	Fox News	0.49	0.34	-0.15	0.09	0.20	5.64	1415.93	0.000	0.30
Republican True	Trump gets support of NYC police union, warns 'no one will be safe in Biden's America'	NBC News	0.84	0.78	-0.06	0.02	0.10	2.73	1416.80	0.006	0.15
Republican True	Chinese dissident brought to US by Obama administration praises Trump at RNC	CNN	0.52	0.44	-0.07	0.02	0.13	2.79	1423.73	0.005	0.15
Republican False	UPDATE: Malia Obama Among 10 Arrested In Racist Antifa Attack -- US NEWS	PoliceUS.Info	0.09	0.10	0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.35	1425.91	0.730	-0.02
Republican False	Hillary Clinton Accepted \$30,000 Donation From NXIVM Child Sex Cult	YourNewsWire	0.30	0.27	-0.03	-0.02	0.08	1.22	1420.17	0.222	0.06
Republican False	The 'Obama Foundation' Just Broke Its First Federal Law	WeaponStricks	0.28	0.29	0.01	-0.05	0.04	0.30	1425.01	0.767	-0.02
Republican False	Donald Trump Sent His Own Plane To Transport 200 Stranded Marines	Uconservative	0.42	0.44	0.02	-0.07	0.03	0.78	1424.86	0.437	-0.04

Note: Data is from the integrative data analysis.

S3: Full Regression Models for Integrative Data Analysis

	Truth Discernment	Partisan Bias	Incongruent True News
(Intercept)	2.298 *** [2.092, 2.503]	1.615 *** [1.437, 1.793]	1.663 *** [1.553, 1.773]
conditionRecode	0.700 *** [0.468, 0.931]	-0.538 *** [-0.738, -0.337]	0.581 *** [0.457, 0.705]
PoliticalOrientation	-0.633 *** [-0.753, -0.513]	0.631 *** [0.527, 0.736]	-0.230 *** [-0.294, -0.166]
CRSum	0.371 *** [0.249, 0.493]	-0.157 ** [-0.263, -0.052]	0.116 *** [0.051, 0.181]
PKSum	0.444 *** [0.319, 0.568]	-0.034 [-0.142, 0.074]	0.074 * [0.007, 0.141]
outgrouphate	0.159 * [0.035, 0.282]	0.521 *** [0.414, 0.628]	-0.119 *** [-0.185, -0.053]
Education	-0.025 [-0.148, 0.099]	-0.087 [-0.194, 0.021]	0.081 * [0.015, 0.147]
Age	-0.161 ** [-0.280, -0.041]	0.202 *** [0.099, 0.306]	-0.106 ** [-0.170, -0.043]
Income	0.045 [-0.078, 0.168]	-0.016 [-0.123, 0.091]	0.028 [-0.038, 0.094]
GenderRecode	-0.170 [-0.409, 0.068]	0.324 ** [0.118, 0.531]	-0.249 *** [-0.376, -0.122]
N	1385	1385	1385
AIC	6117.177	5722.786	4380.750
BIC	6174.745	5780.354	4438.318
Pseudo R2	0.192	0.187	0.145

*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05.

S4: Full Relative Importance Analysis for Integrative Data Analysis

Truth Discernment			
term	lmg	conf.low	conf.high
conditionRecode	0.020532317	0.008935026	0.036625856
PoliticalOrientation	0.071745706	0.049429337	0.100798511
CRSum	0.035210002	0.02058485	0.054147144
PKSum	0.040337337	0.024215731	0.061294932
outgrouphate	0.013212485	0.005012211	0.025773805
Education	0.000615348	0.000255952	0.004317704
Age	0.005573851	0.001001938	0.014396754
Income	0.000445728	0.000133143	0.004277437
GenderRecode	0.002093208	0.000285042	0.008885336
Partisan Bias			
term	lmg	conf.low	conf.high
conditionRecode	0.015910588	0.00633209	0.030680641
PoliticalOrientation	0.079438354	0.053838595	0.106793351
CRSum	0.007990016	0.00192017	0.018036401
PKSum	0.000988131	0.000618156	0.005037605
outgrouphate	0.048763912	0.031689179	0.071379885
Education	0.004500754	0.000611908	0.014214294
Age	0.0174529	0.007333396	0.032545215
Income	0.000862162	0.000238516	0.005147937
GenderRecode	0.008326444	0.002133619	0.019153783
Incongruent True News			
term	lmg	conf.low	conf.high
conditionRecode	0.053477661	0.033399849	0.078825372
PoliticalOrientation	0.031479192	0.015709584	0.051636357
CRSum	0.012995727	0.004533847	0.02632355
PKSum	0.003228492	0.000391516	0.010660455
outgrouphate	0.006170344	0.000933994	0.015800282
Education	0.007324363	0.001636777	0.018196119
Age	0.010170418	0.002677802	0.021930849
Income	0.002166289	0.000335553	0.008761043
GenderRecode	0.012443196	0.004029015	0.026493235

S5: Example Stimuli

Example Republican-Leaning Real News:



Example Democrat-Leaning Real News:



Example Democrat-Leaning Fake News



Example Republican-Leaning Fake News:



Example headline without source:



The full set of stimuli are available in our OSF:

https://osf.io/75sqf/?view_only=623d654c17b94d958a0857c06b181073

S6: Manipulation Text

Accuracy Incentives Manipulation Text

You will be presented with a series of real and fake news headlines. There are 16 headlines in total.

We are interested in your opinion about the following:

- 1) How accurate is the headline?
- 2) How likely would you be to share the headline on social media?

You will be given 60 seconds to answer these two questions about each headline.

Note: You will receive a **BONUS PAYMENT** of up to **\$1.00** (£0.75) based on how many **CORRECT** answers you provide regarding the accuracy of the articles. Correct answers are based on the expert evaluations of non-partisan fact-checkers.

More specifically, if you answer 15 or more of the out 16 questions correctly, you will receive the full bonus payment of \$1.00. If you answer 13 or more of the 16 questions correctly, you will receive a partial bonus payment of \$0.50. Your bonus payment will be delivered to your Prolific ID. It may take a few weeks to calculate your scores and for you to receive your bonus payment.

We ask you about accuracy on a 6-point scale ranging from "extremely inaccurate" to "extremely accurate." For the purpose of this study, if the headline describes a true event, either "slightly accurate," "moderately accurate," or "extremely accurate" constitute correct responses. Similarly, if the headline describes a false event, either "extremely inaccurate," "moderately inaccurate," or "slightly inaccurate" constitute "correct" responses.

Your answers to all other questions will not contribute to your bonus payment.

After seeing each headline, questions in this condition appeared as follows:

Note: If you answer the question below about accuracy correctly, you have a higher chance of receiving a bonus payment.

To the best of your knowledge, is the claim in the above headline accurate?

Not at all accurate	Moderately inaccurate	Slightly inaccurate	Slightly accurate	Moderately accurate	Extremely accurate
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

If you were to see the above article on social media, how likely would you be to share it?

Extremely unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Extremely likely
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------

Control Text

You will be presented with a series of real and fake news headlines. There are 16 headlines in total.

We are interested in your opinion about the following:

- 1) How accurate is the headline?
- 2) How likely would you be to share the headline on social media?

You will be given 60 seconds to answer these two questions about each headline.

After seeing each headline, questions in this condition appeared as follows:

To the best of your knowledge, is the claim in the above headline accurate?

Not at all accurate	Moderately inaccurate	Slightly inaccurate	Slightly accurate	Moderately accurate	Extremely accurate
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

If you were to see the above article on social media, how likely would you be to share it?

Extremely unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Extremely likely
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------

Social Incentive Manipulation Text:

You will be presented with a series of real and fake news headlines. There are 16 headlines in total.

We are primarily interested in your opinion about the following:

1) How likely is this article to appeal to [Democrats/Republicans]?

We want to see how well you can identify articles that appeal to [Democrats/Republicans]? You will receive a **BONUS PAYMENT** of up to \$1.00 (£0.75) based on **how well you identify articles that are likely to appeal to [Democrats/Republicans]?**

More specifically, we have pre-tested these articles to see how much they are liked by [Democrats/Republicans]. We want to see how close your answers are to the answers we identified in the pre-test. If you correctly identify 15 or more out of 16 articles that are liked by [Democrats/Republicans], you will receive the full bonus payment of \$1.00. If you correctly identify 13 or more of the 16 articles that are liked by [Democrats/Republicans], you will receive a partial bonus payment of \$0.50.

We will also ask you:

2) How accurate is the headline?

3) How likely would you be to share the headline on social media?

But, we will not give you a bonus payment based on your response to these questions. Your answers to all other questions in the survey will not contribute to your bonus payment.

The images may take a second to load. Please wait for the images to load before answering the questions.

After seeing each headline, questions in this condition appeared as follows:

Note: If you correctly predict whether this headline will be liked by Democrats in the below question, you have a higher chance of receiving a bonus payment.

If you shared this article on social media, how likely is it that it would receive a positive reaction from Democrats (e.g., likes, shares, and positive comments)?

Very unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Very likely
---------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------

To the best of your knowledge, is the claim in the above headline accurate?

Not at all accurate	Moderately inaccurate	Slightly inaccurate	Slightly accurate	Moderately accurate	Extremely accurate
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

If you were to see the above article on social media, how likely would you be to share it?

Extremely unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Extremely likely
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------

Mixed Incentives Manipulation Text

You will be presented with a series of real and fake news headlines. There are 16 headlines in total.

We are primarily interested in your opinion about the following:

- 1) How likely is this article to appeal to [Democrats/Republicans]?
- 2) How accurate is the headline?

We want to see how well you can identify articles that appeal to [Democrats/Republicans]? You will receive a **BONUS PAYMENT** of up to **\$1.00 (£0.75)** based on **how well you identify articles that are likely to appeal to** [Democrats/Republicans]?

You will receive an **ADDITIONAL BONUS PAYMENT** of up to **\$1.00 (£0.75)** based on how many **CORRECT** answers you provide regarding the accuracy of the articles. Correct answers are based on the expert evaluations of non-partisan fact-checkers.

More specifically, we have pre-tested these articles to see how much they are liked by [Democrats/Republicans]. We want to see how close your answers are to the answers we identified in the pre-test. If you correctly identify 15 or more out of 16 articles that are liked by [Democrats/Republicans], you will receive the full bonus payment of \$1.00. If you correctly identify 13 or more of the 16 articles that are liked by [Democrats/Republicans], you will receive a partial bonus payment of \$0.50.

Additionally, if you answer 15 or more out of the 16 questions about accuracy correctly, you will receive the full bonus payment of \$1.00. If you answer 13 or more of the 16 questions correctly, you will receive a partial bonus payment of \$0.50. Your bonus payment will be delivered to your Prolific ID. It may take a few weeks to calculate your scores and for you to receive your bonus payment.

We ask you about accuracy on a 6-point scale ranging from "extremely inaccurate" to "extremely accurate." For the purpose of this study, if the headline describes a true event, either "slightly accurate," "moderately accurate," or "extremely accurate" constitute correct responses. Similarly, if the headline describes a false event, either "extremely inaccurate," "moderately inaccurate," or "slightly inaccurate" constitute "correct" responses.

We will also ask you:

- 3) How likely would you be to share the headline on social media?

But, we will not give you a bonus payment based on your response to this question. Your answers to all other questions in the survey will not contribute to your bonus payment.

After seeing each headline, questions in this condition appeared as follows:

Note: If you correctly predict whether this headline will be liked by Democrats in the below question, you have a higher chance of receiving a bonus payment.

If you shared this article on social media, how likely is it that it would receive a positive reaction from Democrats (e.g., likes, shares, and positive comments)?

Very unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Very likely
---------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------

Note: If you answer the question below about accuracy correctly, you have a higher chance of receiving a bonus payment.

To the best of your knowledge, is the claim in the above headline accurate?

Not at all accurate	Moderately inaccurate	Slightly inaccurate	Slightly accurate	Moderately accurate	Extremely accurate
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------

If you were to see the above article on social media, how likely would you be to share it?

Extremely unlikely	Moderately unlikely	Slightly unlikely	Slightly likely	Moderately likely	Extremely likely
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------

S7: Question Wording

Cognitive Reflection Test.

The ages of Mark and Adam add up to 28 years total. Mark is 20 years older than Adam. How many years old is Adam?

If it takes 10 seconds for 10 printers to print out 10 pages of paper, how many seconds will it take 50 printers to print out 50 pages of paper?

On a loaf of bread, there is a patch of mold. Every day, the patch doubles in size. If it takes 40 days for the patch to cover the entire loaf of bread, how many days would it take for the patch to cover half of the loaf of bread?

Affective Polarization.

How favorable do you feel towards Democrats?

How favorable do you feel towards Republicans?

Note: Affective polarization was measured as positive feelings toward the in-party minus negative feelings toward the out-party.

Political Knowledge.

Whose responsibility is it to determine if a law is constitutional or not – is it the President, the Congress, or the Supreme Court?

President

Congress

Supreme Court

How much of a majority is required for the U.S. Senate and House to override a presidential veto?

1/2 majority

1/3 majority

3/4 majority

What party currently has the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington?

Democrats

Republicans

Neither

Would you say that one of the major parties is more conservative than the other at the national level? If so, which party is more conservative?

Democrats

Republicans

Neither

How many justices are on the U.S. Supreme Court?

9

12

18

Political Conservatism.

Which of the following best describes your political preference?

Strongly Democratic

Democratic

Lean Democratic
Lean Republican
Republican
Strongly Republican

Education.

What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

Less than high school degree
High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)
Some college but no degree
Associate degree in college (2-year)
Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)
Master's degree
Doctoral degree
Professional degree (JD, MD)

Income.

Information about income is very important to understand. Would you please give your best guess?

Please indicate the answer that includes your entire household income in (previous year) before taxes.

Less than \$10,000
\$10,000 to \$19,999
\$20,000 to \$29,999
\$30,000 to \$39,999
\$40,000 to \$49,999
\$50,000 to \$59,999
\$60,000 to \$69,999
\$70,000 to \$79,999
\$80,000 to \$89,999
\$90,000 to \$99,999
\$100,000 to \$149,999
\$150,000 or more

Age.

What is your age?

Gender (Recoded for Regression Analysis as Female/Not Female)

What is your gender?

Male
Female
Transgender Female
Transgender Male
Trans/Non-Binary
Not Listed:

Additional Questions

Did you respond randomly at any point during the study?

Note: Please be honest! You will get your payment regardless of your response.

Yes

No

...

Please answer honestly:

Would you ever share an article on social media that you know is false?

Yes

No

Note: These questions were only shown to those in the accuracy incentives condition:

Please answer honestly: this will not affect your payment, and it is important to the researchers to understand how you responded.

Did you ever say an article was accurate simply because you thought it would get you a higher payment and not because you genuinely believed it was accurate?

Or did all answers about accuracy reflect your true beliefs?

Yes

No

...

Please answer honestly: do you think your answers were influenced by the extra financial incentive to be accurate?

Yes

No

Note: These questions were only shown to those in the social incentives condition:

Please answer honestly: this will not affect your payment, and it is important to understand how you responded.

Did you ever say an article was accurate simply because you liked it (or say an article was inaccurate because you disliked it)?

Or did all answers about accuracy reflect your true beliefs?

Yes

No

...

Please answer honestly: do you think your answers to other questions were influenced by your task of identifying articles that would appeal to your political party?

Yes

No

S8: Results for Continuously Coded Outcome Variables

Variable	Mean (Accuracy)	Mean (Control)	Difference	CI_low	CI_high	t	df	p	d	d_CI_low	d_CI_high
Truth Discernment	0.78	0.68	-0.11	0.03	0.18	2.77	1385.76	0.006	0.15	0.04	0.25
Partisan Bias	4.95	6.37	1.42	-2.36	-0.49	-3.00	1401.89	0.003	-0.16	0.26	0.06
Incongruent True News	3.99	3.79	-0.20	0.09	0.31	3.55	1414.72	0.000	0.19	0.08	0.29

Note: Above are the results for truth discernment, partisan bias, and incongruent true news when coded on a continuous, rather than dichotomous scale. Results shown above are from the integrative data analysis. Results do not change the conclusions, but the effect sizes are smaller. This smaller effect can likely be attributed to the fact that incentives rewarded responses as accurate regardless of whether people answered “slightly accurate,” “moderately accurate,” or “extremely accurate.” In other words, it appeared as though people were ignoring magnitude.

S9: Study 3 Results Including Additional News Items

Below, we show the results for Study 3 when including the 8 additional fake news stimuli. These additional analyses do not change our conclusions.

Truth Discernment. A 2X2 (Accuracy X Source) ANOVA found that there was a significant effect of the accuracy incentives on truth discernment such that the accuracy incentives improved discernment, $F(1, 917) = 4.08$, $p = 0.04$, $\eta^2_G = 0.004$. Additionally, there was a significant impact of source cues on truth discernment such that source cues improved accuracy, $F(1, 917) = 8.13$, $p = 0.004$, $\eta^2_G = 0.009$. However, there was no significant interaction between the accuracy incentive condition and source cues, $p = 0.649$.

Partisan Bias. A 2X2 (Accuracy X Source) ANOVA found that there was a significant effect of the accuracy incentives on partisan bias such that the incentives reduced bias, $F(1, 917) = 16.79$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2_G = 0.02$. The source cues did not impact partisan bias ($p = 0.603$), and there was no interaction between source cues and partisan bias ($p = 0.438$).

Sharing Discernment. A 2X2 (Accuracy X Source) ANOVA found that there was no significant effect of accuracy ($p = 0.733$), but there was a significant effect of the source cues, $F(1, 917) = 5.50$, $p = 0.019$, $\eta^2_G = 0.01$, and no interaction between accuracy incentives and source cues ($p = 0.533$).

Effects on Sharing Intentions Broken Down by Headline Type. We then ran a 2 (accuracy incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (social incentive vs. no incentive) X 2 (politically congruent vs. politically incongruent) X 2 (true headlines vs. false headlines) mixed-design ANOVA. We found no main effect of source cues ($p = 0.524$), but did find a main effect of the incentive, $F(1, 917) = 0.396$, $p = 0.047$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, political congruence, $F(1, 917) = 5.79$, $p = 0.016$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, and veracity, $F(1, 917) = 1330.58$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2_G = 0.24$. There was also a significant interaction between the incentives and political congruence, $F(1, 917) = 4.12$, $p = 0.043$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, the source cues and veracity, $F(1, 917) = 8.18$, $p = 0.004$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, incentives and veracity, $F(1, 917) = 4.06$, $p = 0.044$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, and political congruence and veracity, $F(1, 917) = 361.44$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2_G = 0.09$. There were also significant three-way interactions between source cues, incentives, and political congruence, $F(1, 917) = 5.00$, $p = 0.026$, $\eta^2_G = 0.00$, and incentives, political congruence, and veracity, $F(1, 917) = 16.74$, $p = 0.00$, $\eta^2_G = 0.01$.

Importantly, post-hoc Tukey HSD tests revealed that there was a difference between belief in *incongruent true* headlines rated as accurate in the accuracy incentive (with sources) condition ($M = 56.33$, 95% CI = [52.92, 59.75]) versus the control (with sources) condition ($M = 46.24$, 95% CI = [42.79, 49.70]), $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.39$. However, there was no difference between the accuracy incentives condition (without sources cues) as compared to the control condition (without source cues), $p = 0.311$.