# Results

Descriptive statistics are summarized in [Table here]. Study 1 was analyzed using a linear mixed model fitted to our support for UHC outcome measure. The linear mixed model we constructed had condition, time (pre or post intervention), and the condition x time interaction as our fixed effects. A random intercept for each of the subjects was included to account for within-subject correlation in scores. We observed no statistically significant main effect for our active intervention condition [t(198.5)= 1.22 ,p= .224] or for our passive intervention condition [t(198.5)= 1.04 ,p= .299]. Additionally, we observed no statistically significant main effect of time [t(181)= 1.00 ,p= .317]. Finally, we also saw no significant interaction effect between time and the active condition [t(181)= 1.14 ,p= .258] or the passive condition [t(181)= 1.67 ,p= .0963].

For our Bayesian estimation, we had four sampling chains, each with 2000 iterations and 1000 warmup repetitions. This yielded 4000 estimated samples at convergence. Participants in our uninformative control condition had no significant change in support for UHC post intervention (℮ = 4.78, CI =[4.49, 5.07]) than pre intervention (℮ = 4.84, CI =[4.55, 5.13]). Participants in our ‘active’ experimental condition had no difference in support for UHC post intervention (℮ = 5.03, CI =[4.74, 5.32]) than pre intervention (℮ =5.19, CI =[4.90, 5.48]). Participants in our ‘passive’ experimental condition had no difference in support for UHC post intervention (℮ =4.99, CI =[4.70, 1.34]) versus pre intervention (℮ = 5.21 , CI =[4.92, 5.50]). Participants in both intervention conditions had greater support for UHC compared to the control.

## Qualitative Results

Using frequentist methods, we found no statistically evidence at an of 0.05 confirming our initial hypotheses. Using Bayesian modeling, we found weak evidence supporting our first hypothesis, accounting for uncertainty in our point estimates of support per condition.