Contents

Appendix A. Experimental manipulation: Stimuli

Fig A1. Screenshot of the Embedded Condition stimulus. During the experiment, the stimulus appeared to be a normal online news article; the above format is for ease of display in this context.

Mueller reportedly interviewed Michael Cohen about aspects of Trump's dealings with Russia

Sep. 20, 2018, 4:25 PM

Michael Cohen. Flickr

Michael Cohen, President Donald Trump's former longtime lawyer, sat down with the special counsel Robert Mueller for hours of interviews spanning multiple sessions over the last month.

Mueller is said to have asked Cohen about every aspect of Trump's dealings — financial, political, and otherwise — with Russian interests.

The special counsel is tasked with investigating Russia's interference in the 2016 US election and whether members of the Trump campaign colluded with Moscow to tilt the race in his favor. Trump has strongly opposed the suggestion of collusion with Russia.

Trump took to Twitter to decry the Mueller investigation: "The illegal Mueller Witch Hunt continues in search of a crime. There was never Collusion with Russia, except by the Clinton campaign, so the 17 Angry Democrats are looking at anything they can find. Very unfair and BAD for the country. ALSO, not allowed under the LAW!"

Cohen pleaded guilty last month to eight counts of tax evasion, one count of bank fraud, and two counts related to campaign-finance violations. He is now cooperating with that investigation, as well as a separate New York state investigation into the Trump Organization.

But his sit-down with Mueller was entirely voluntary and did not include any promise of leniency on the part of prosecutors.

In addition to discussing Trump's business dealings and potential collusion with Russia, Mueller's team also reportedly asked Cohen whether Trump or any of his associates discussed the possibility of a pardon with Cohen.

That line of questioning would suggest the special counsel is continuing to gather new information as part of a parallel investigation into whether Trump sought to obstruct justice after the existence of the Russia investigation became public knowledge last year.

Donald Trump has spoken out on Twitter: "Where's the Collusion? They made up a phony crime called Collusion, and when there was no Collusion they say there was Obstruction (of a phony crime that never existed). If you FIGHT BACK or say anything bad about the Rigged Witch Hunt, they scream Obstruction!"

What does Cohen know?

Cohen is a key figure in several threads of the Russia investigation, including the creation of a Russia-friendly 'peace plan' during the early days of Trump's presidency, as well as an allegation that Cohen traveled to Prague during the summer of 2016 to meet with Kremlin-linked officials.

Last month, it also emerged that Cohen is said to have claimed that Trump knew in advance about a Russian lawyer's offer to the campaign of 'dirt' on the Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton in 2016.

Cohen's lawyer, Lanny Davis, later walked back that claim, however, saying he could not independently confirm it.

President Trump picked up on the point, posting on Twitter: "Michaels Cohen's attorney clarified the record, saying his client does not know if President Trump knew about the Trump Tower meeting (out of which came nothing!). The answer is that I did NOT know about the meeting. Just another phony story by the Fake News Media!"

More: Russia investigation   Russia Newsletter   Michael Cohen ⌄

Fig A2. Screenshot of the Quoted Condition stimulus. During the experiment, the stimulus appeared to be a normal online news article; the above format is for ease of display in this context.

BUSINESS INSIDER   TECH | FINANCE | POLITICS | STRATEGY | LIFE | ALL   PRIME | INTELLIGENCE

Mueller reportedly interviewed Michael Cohen about aspects of Trump's dealings with Russia

Sep. 20, 2018, 4:25 PM

Michael Cohen. Flickr

Michael Cohen, President Donald Trump's former longtime lawyer, sat down with the special counsel Robert Mueller for hours of interviews spanning multiple sessions over the last month.

Mueller is said to have asked Cohen about every aspect of Trump's dealings — financial, political, and otherwise — with Russian interests.

The special counsel is tasked with investigating Russia's interference in the 2016 US election and whether members of the Trump campaign colluded with Moscow to tilt the race in his favor. Trump has strongly opposed the suggestion of collusion with Russia.

Trump took to Twitter to decry the Mueller investigation as an illegal witch-hunt and denied cooperation with Russians. Instead, he stated that the Clinton campaign were guilty of collusion and those Democrats on the special council are looking for incriminating evidence on others, something the President said is very unfair and bad for the country, as well as against the law.

Cohen pleaded guilty last month to eight counts of tax evasion, one count of bank fraud, and two counts related to campaign-finance violations. He is now cooperating with that investigation, as well as a separate New York state investigation into the Trump Organization.

But his sit-down with Mueller was entirely voluntary and did not include any promise of leniency on the part of prosecutors.

In addition to discussing Trump's business dealings and potential collusion with Russia, Mueller's team also reportedly asked Cohen whether Trump or any of his associates discussed the possibility of a pardon with Cohen.

That line of questioning would suggest the special counsel is continuing to gather new information as part of a parallel investigation into whether Trump sought to obstruct justice after the existence of the Russia investigation became public knowledge last year.

Donald Trump has spoken out on Twitter, asking where is the evidence of collusion before claiming that the alleged crime of collusion had been made up. Trump contested that when evidence failed to be found, his opponents switched to claiming he was guilty of obstruction of a crime that never existed. Trump riled against what he described as a rigged witch hunt, saying that if anyone challenges it they are accused of obstruction.

What does Cohen know?

Cohen is a key figure in several threads of the Russia investigation, including the creation of a Russia-friendly 'peace plan' during the early days of Trump's presidency, as well as an allegation that Cohen traveled to Prague during the summer of 2016 to meet with Kremlin-linked officials.

Last month, it also emerged that Cohen is said to have claimed that Trump knew in advance about a Russian lawyer's offer to the campaign of 'dirt' on the Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton in 2016.

Cohen's lawyer, Lanny Davis, later walked back that claim, however, saying he could not independently confirm it.

President Trump picked up on the point, posting on Twitter that Cohen's attorney had clarified that Cohen doesn't know if the President had knowledge of the Trump Tower meeting. Trump further stated that he did not know about the meeting and that, ultimately, nothing had come out of it before blaming what he described as the fake news media for the suggestion of impropriety.

More: Russia investigation   Russia Newsletter   Michael Cohen ⌄

Fig A3. Screenshot of the Paraphased Condition stimulus. During the experiment, the stimulus appeared to be a normal online news article; the above format is for ease of display in this context.

Appendix B. Time spent reading the experimental stimulus by study and experimental condition

Table B1. Time spent on stimulus and reading speed rates						
	Republican Experiment			Democrat Experiment		
	Embedded condition (540 words)	Quotation condition (492 words)	Paraphrasing condition (526 words)	Embedded condition (540 words)	Quotation condition (492 words)	Paraphrasing condition (526 words)
Time spent on stimulus (in seconds)						
Median	140.00	160.00	139.00	130.00	118.00	147.00
Mean	159.69	177.45	166.10	142.54	139.10	161.07
Sd	92.42	84.89	81.49	56.94	71.14	61.59
Reading speed rate (in words per minute)						
Median	231.43	184.51	227.05	249.23	250.17	214.70
Mean	237.55	203.04	220.12	260.67	312.48	219.99
Sd	76.09	138.54	73.02	120.28	448.68	68.93
N	100	98	77	59	79	72

Appendix C. Simple experimental effects on Trump warmth and competence evaluations

Note: To ensure we ran the correct analyses, we first checked the distribution of residuals in both cases. The results from the Shapiro-Wilk test showed no deviations from normality for Republicans, but highly significant deviations for Democrats (W=0.703, p=0.000 for warmth ratings, and W=0.827, p=0.000 for competence ratings). Upon further inspection, because high proportions (i.e., between 64% and 77%) of Democrats in all conditions rated Trump on both variables at the lowest point, zero, we recoded the Trump ratings as binary, with "1" meaning "some warmth/competence" and "0" meaning "no warmth/competence". The tables below present the results from the regression analysis for Republicans and the logit regression analysis for Democrats (both with bootstrapped standard errors over 1000 replications).

Table C-R1. Dependent Variable: Trump Warmth Rating (0-10) (Republican-Only Sample)						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.301	0.358	0.840	0.400	-0.400	1.003
EC	0.663	0.346	1.920	0.055	-0.015	1.341
Republican Identity: Strong	1.035	0.345	3.000	0.003	0.359	1.711
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.501	0.076	-6.570	0.000	-0.650	-0.352
Mueller Approval	-0.537	0.172	-3.120	0.002	-0.874	-0.200
Education	-0.098	0.121	-0.810	0.419	-0.336	0.140
Female	0.055	0.315	0.180	0.861	-0.562	0.672
Age	0.025	0.011	2.350	0.019	0.004	0.046
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.266	0.072	3.680	0.000	0.124	0.408
Constant	6.797	0.901	7.540	0.000	5.031	8.563
Wald chi^2(9)	323.38					
Prob > chi^2	0.000					
Adjusted R^2	0.521					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Linear regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Table B-R1a. Predicted Margins for Trump Warmth Rating by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	5.545	0.265	20.910	0.000	5.025	6.065
QC	5.846	0.245	23.820	0.000	5.365	6.328
EC	6.208	0.232	26.720	0.000	5.752	6.663
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=237 (Republicans only)						

Table C-R2. Dependent Variable: Trump Competence Rating (0-10) (Republican-Only Sample)						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.133	0.368	0.360	0.718	-0.588	0.854
EC	0.426	0.349	1.220	0.222	-0.258	1.109
Republican Identity: Strong	0.962	0.327	2.950	0.003	0.322	1.602
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.410	0.078	-5.270	0.000	-0.563	-0.258
Mueller Approval	-0.491	0.174	-2.820	0.005	-0.833	-0.150
Education	-0.088	0.120	-0.730	0.463	-0.323	0.147
Female	0.217	0.317	0.690	0.493	-0.404	0.839
Age	0.034	0.010	3.320	0.001	0.014	0.054
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.198	0.066	2.980	0.003	0.068	0.328
Constant	6.692	0.839	7.980	0.000	5.048	8.336
Wald chi^2(9)	212.39					
Prob > chi^2	0.000					
Adjusted R^2	0.4570					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Linear regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Table B-R2a. Predicted Margins for Trump Competence Rating by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	6.121	0.259	23.680	0.000	5.614	6.628
QC	6.254	0.251	24.910	0.000	5.762	6.746
EC	6.547	0.241	27.150	0.000	6.074	7.020
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=237 (Republicans only)						

Table C-D1. Dependent Variable: Trump Warmth Rating (0-1) (Democrat-Only Sample)						
	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.876	0.468	-0.250	0.804	0.307	2.498
EC	1.511	0.885	0.700	0.481	0.479	4.760
Democrat Identity: Strong	0.371	0.185	-1.990	0.047	0.139	0.987
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.658	0.087	-3.170	0.002	0.508	0.852
Mueller Approval	0.879	0.299	-0.380	0.704	0.450	1.714
Education	0.744	0.168	-1.310	0.189	0.478	1.157
Female	0.658	0.294	-0.940	0.349	0.274	1.579
Age	0.971	0.021	-1.360	0.174	0.930	1.013
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.150	0.104	1.550	0.122	0.963	1.373
Constant	181.165	254.179	3.710	0.000	11.583	2833.524
Log Likelihood	-79.840					
Wald chi^2(9)	27.77					
Prob > chi^2	0.001					
Pseudo R^2	0.196					
N	177					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Table C-D1a. Predicted Margins for Trump Warmth Rating by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.240	0.055	4.370	0.000	0.132	0.347
QC	0.222	0.051	4.320	0.000	0.121	0.322
EC	0.303	0.071	4.260	0.000	0.164	0.442
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=177 (Democrats only)						

Table C-D2. Dependent Variable: Trump Competence Rating (0-1) (Democrat-Only Sample)						
	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.568	0.263	-1.220	0.222	0.229	1.407
EC	1.084	0.549	0.160	0.874	0.402	2.923
Democrat Identity: Strong	0.469	0.207	-1.720	0.086	0.197	1.114
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.741	0.079	-2.820	0.005	0.601	0.913
Mueller Approval	0.818	0.203	-0.810	0.417	0.503	1.330
Education	0.985	0.188	-0.080	0.937	0.678	1.431
Female	0.845	0.336	-0.420	0.673	0.387	1.844
Age	1.006	0.018	0.340	0.737	0.971	1.043
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.167	0.091	1.990	0.047	1.002	1.360
Constant	15.052	18.539	2.200	0.028	1.346	168.271
Log Likelihood	-97.280					
Wald chi^2(9)	18.50					
Prob > chi^2	0.030					
Pseudo R^2	0.125					
N	177					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Table C-D2a. Predicted Margins for Trump Competence Rating by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.359	0.063	5.700	0.000	0.236	0.483
QC	0.257	0.054	4.800	0.000	0.152	0.362
EC	0.375	0.075	5.000	0.000	0.228	0.522
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=177 (Democrats only)						

Appendix D. Experimental treatment effects on Trump-activated positive emotions

Table D-R1. Dependent Variable: Trump-Activated Positive Emotions (Yes/No) (Republican-Only Sample)						
	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	P> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	1.465	0.581	0.960	0.336	0.673	3.188
EC	2.194	0.875	1.970	0.049	1.003	4.796
Republican Identity: Strong	1.457	0.518	1.060	0.290	0.726	2.923
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.860	0.069	-1.870	0.062	0.735	1.007
Mueller Approval	0.724	0.130	-1.800	0.072	0.510	1.029
Education	1.053	0.135	0.400	0.686	0.819	1.355
Female	0.533	0.178	-1.880	0.060	0.277	1.027
Age	1.021	0.013	1.620	0.106	0.996	1.047
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.065	0.079	0.850	0.397	0.921	1.231
Constant	0.720	0.648	-0.360	0.715	0.123	4.203
Log likelihood	-139.616					
Wald chi^2(9)	32.850					
Prob > chi^2	0.0001					
Pseudo R^2	0.147					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities "Trump-Activated Positive Emotions"=Yes by Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.378	0.058	6.500	0.000	0.264	0.492
QC	0.454	0.054	8.490	0.000	0.349	0.559
EC	0.537	0.054	9.930	0.000	0.431	0.643
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=237 (Republicans only)						

Appendix E. Mediation model

Table E-R1. Mediation Model: Experimental Conditions → Trump-Activated Positive Emotions → Trump Warmth Rating (Republican-Only Sample)						
Dependent Variable: Trump-Activated Positive Emotions (Yes/No) Logit Regression Results						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.382	0.399	0.960	0.339	-0.400	1.163
EC	0.786	0.400	1.960	0.049	0.002	1.569
Republican Identity: Strong	0.376	0.371	1.010	0.311	-0.351	1.103
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.150	0.082	-1.830	0.068	-0.312	0.011
Mueller Approval	-0.323	0.188	-1.720	0.086	-0.691	0.045
Education	0.052	0.136	0.380	0.702	-0.214	0.318
Female	-0.629	0.337	-1.870	0.062	-1.290	0.032
Age	0.021	0.013	1.630	0.103	-0.004	0.045
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.063	0.074	0.850	0.395	-0.082	0.207
Constant	-0.328	0.952	-0.340	0.730	-2.195	1.538
Dependent Variable: Trump Warmth Rating (0-10) Linear Regression Results						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.193	0.341	0.570	0.572	-0.476	0.861
EC	0.435	0.356	1.220	0.222	-0.263	1.134
Trump-Activated Positive Emotions (1=Yes)	1.439	0.320	4.500	0.000	0.813	2.066
Republican Identity: Strong	0.914	0.340	2.690	0.007	0.247	1.580
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.456	0.078	-5.860	0.000	-0.608	-0.304
Mueller Approval	-0.442	0.170	-2.610	0.009	-0.774	-0.109
Education	-0.116	0.123	-0.940	0.345	-0.358	0.125
Female	0.240	0.303	0.790	0.428	-0.353	0.833
Age	0.019	0.011	1.780	0.075	-0.002	0.039
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.246	0.066	3.750	0.000	0.117	0.375
Constant	6.196	0.895	6.920	0.000	4.441	7.951
var(e.Trump Warmth Rating)	4.392	0.418			3.645	5.292
Log pseudolikelihood	-651.265					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Mediation results computed with the gsem command in Stata 14.						

Table E-R2. Mediation Model: Experimental Conditions → Trump-Activated Positive Emotions → Trump Competence Rating (Republican-Only Sample)						
Dependent Variable: Trump-Activated Positive Emotions (Yes/No) Logit Regression Results						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.382	0.390	0.980	0.327	-0.382	1.145
EC	0.786	0.399	1.970	0.049	0.004	1.567
Republican Identity: Strong	0.376	0.367	1.020	0.306	-0.344	1.096
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.150	0.082	-1.830	0.068	-0.312	0.011
Mueller Approval	-0.323	0.175	-1.840	0.065	-0.666	0.020
Education	0.052	0.131	0.400	0.691	-0.204	0.308
Female	-0.629	0.336	-1.870	0.061	-1.288	0.029
Age	0.021	0.013	1.590	0.112	-0.005	0.046
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.063	0.075	0.830	0.405	-0.085	0.210
Constant	-0.328	0.907	-0.360	0.717	-2.105	1.448
Dependent Variable: Trump Competence Rating (0-10) Linear Regression Results						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.026	0.369	0.070	0.944	-0.698	0.750
EC	0.202	0.357	0.570	0.572	-0.498	0.903
Trump-Activated Positive Emotions (1=Yes)	1.416	0.302	4.700	0.000	0.825	2.008
Republican Identity: Strong	0.843	0.306	2.760	0.006	0.244	1.442
Collusion: Own Opinion	-0.366	0.073	-5.030	0.000	-0.509	-0.223
Mueller Approval	-0.398	0.160	-2.490	0.013	-0.711	-0.084
Education	-0.106	0.116	-0.920	0.358	-0.333	0.120
Female	0.399	0.303	1.320	0.188	-0.195	0.993
Age	0.027	0.010	2.840	0.004	0.009	0.046
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.178	0.062	2.870	0.004	0.056	0.299
Constant	6.100	0.854	7.140	0.000	4.426	7.774
var(e.Trump Competence Rating)	4.391	0.431			3.622	5.323
Log pseudolikelihood	-651.227					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Mediation results computed with the gsem command in Stata 14.						

Appendix F. Article evaluations

Table F-R1. Dependent Variable: "Article: Cannot/Can be trusted" (Republican-Only Sample)						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	Z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	-0.824	0.396	-2.080	0.038	-1.601	-0.047
EC	0.020	0.402	0.050	0.960	-0.767	0.808
Republican Identity: Strong	-0.404	0.382	-1.060	0.291	-1.153	0.345
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.250	0.077	3.230	0.001	0.098	0.402
Mueller Approval	0.623	0.198	3.150	0.002	0.235	1.012
Education	0.195	0.131	1.490	0.136	-0.061	0.452
Female	-0.670	0.364	-1.840	0.065	-1.383	0.043
Age	-0.017	0.013	-1.250	0.213	-0.043	0.009
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.047	0.075	0.630	0.527	-0.099	0.194
Constant	-1.940	0.999	-1.940	0.052	-3.898	0.017
Wald chi^2(9)	128.10					
Prob > chi^2	0.000					
Adjusted R^2	0.292					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Linear regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Margins for "Article: Cannot/Can be trusted" by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	-0.019	0.275	-0.070	0.945	-0.559	0.521
QC	-0.843	0.274	-3.080	0.002	-1.380	-0.306
EC	0.001	0.284	0.000	0.997	-0.555	0.558
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=237 (Republicans only)						

Table F-R2. Dependent Variable: "Article: Opinionated/Factual" (Republican-Only Sample)						
	Observed Coeff.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	-0.753	0.451	-1.670	0.095	-1.637	0.131
EC	-0.108	0.445	-0.240	0.808	-0.981	0.765
Republican Identity: Strong	-0.333	0.408	-0.820	0.414	-1.133	0.466
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.284	0.092	3.100	0.002	0.104	0.463
Mueller Approval	0.504	0.243	2.070	0.038	0.027	0.981
Education	0.071	0.142	0.500	0.617	-0.207	0.349
Female	-0.461	0.403	-1.150	0.252	-1.251	0.328
Age	-0.022	0.015	-1.490	0.137	-0.051	0.007
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	0.092	0.092	1.000	0.319	-0.089	0.273
Constant	-1.298	1.139	-1.140	0.254	-3.531	0.934
Wald chi^2(9)	102.86					
Prob > chi^2	0.000					
Adjusted R^2	0.216					
N	237					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Linear regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Margins for "Article: Opinionated/Factual" by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	-0.036	0.323	-0.110	0.912	-0.668	0.597
QC	-0.789	0.307	-2.560	0.010	-1.391	-0.186
EC	-0.144	0.331	-0.430	0.664	-0.792	0.505
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=237 (Republicans only)						

Table F-D0. Distribution of re-cut article evaluation variables for Democrats			
	Evaluation level		
	Low	Medium	High
Article: Trusted			
%	32.49	39.59	27.92
N	64	78	55
Article: Factual			
%	31.98	37.56	30.46
N	63	74	60
Article: tells Full Story			
%	53.3	30.96	15.74
N	105	61	31
Article: Accurate			
%	29.44	41.12	29.44
N	58	81	58
Article: Fair			
%	29.44	36.55	34.01
N	58	72	67

Table F-D1. Dependent Variable: "Article: Trusted" (Democrat-Only Sample)						
	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.536	0.192	-1.750	0.081	0.266	1.080
EC	0.472	0.195	-1.810	0.070	0.209	1.063
Democrat Identity: Strong	1.935	0.648	1.970	0.049	1.003	3.731
Collusion: Own Opinion	1.090	0.122	0.780	0.438	0.876	1.357
Mueller Approval	1.773	0.452	2.240	0.025	1.075	2.923
Education	1.251	0.188	1.480	0.138	0.931	1.680
Female	1.195	0.390	0.540	0.586	0.630	2.266
Age	1.007	0.015	0.490	0.624	0.979	1.036
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.093	0.070	1.390	0.166	0.964	1.240
Cut 1	3.486	1.376			0.789	6.182
Cut 2	5.450	1.436			2.636	8.265
Log likelihood	-173.707					
Wald chi^2(9)	27.67					
Prob > chi^2	0.001					
Pseudo R^2	0.088					
N	175					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Oredered logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Trusted" = Low, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.223	0.046	4.860	0.000	0.133	0.312
QC	0.329	0.049	6.720	0.000	0.233	0.425
EC	0.353	0.067	5.300	0.000	0.223	0.484
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Trusted" = Medium, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.386	0.041	9.460	0.000	0.306	0.466
QC	0.401	0.039	10.230	0.000	0.324	0.478
EC	0.399	0.040	9.860	0.000	0.320	0.478
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Trusted" = High, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.391	0.061	6.460	0.000	0.273	0.510
QC	0.270	0.047	5.720	0.000	0.178	0.362
EC	0.248	0.055	4.490	0.000	0.140	0.356
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Table F-D2. Dependent Variable: "Article: Factual" (Democrat-Only Sample)	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.536	0.218	-1.530	0.126	0.241	1.191
EC	0.436	0.181	-2.000	0.046	0.193	0.984
Democrat Identity: Strong	2.369	0.834	2.450	0.014	1.188	4.725
Collusion: Own Opinion	1.081	0.111	0.760	0.447	0.885	1.321
Mueller Approval	1.632	0.392	2.040	0.041	1.019	2.612
Education	1.029	0.155	0.190	0.851	0.766	1.381
Female	1.432	0.473	1.090	0.278	0.749	2.737
Age	1.011	0.015	0.720	0.472	0.982	1.040
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.048	0.067	0.730	0.464	0.924	1.188
Cut 1	2.579	1.423			-0.209	5.368
Cut 2	4.485	1.466			1.611	7.359
Log likelihood	-175.853					
Wald chi^2(9)	19.23					
Prob > chi^2	0.023					
Pseudo R^2	0.079					
N	175					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Oredered logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Factual" = Low, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.217	0.051	4.220	0.000	0.116	0.318
QC	0.324	0.055	5.930	0.000	0.217	0.432
EC	0.365	0.060	6.130	0.000	0.248	0.482
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Factual" = Medium, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.377	0.042	9.020	0.000	0.295	0.459
QC	0.394	0.040	9.830	0.000	0.316	0.473
EC	0.390	0.041	9.480	0.000	0.309	0.470
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Factual" = High, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.405	0.068	5.970	0.000	0.272	0.538
QC	0.281	0.053	5.350	0.000	0.178	0.384
EC	0.245	0.048	5.150	0.000	0.152	0.338
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Table F-D3. Dependent Variable: "Article: Tells Full Story" (Democrat-Only Sample)	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.378	0.157	-2.340	0.019	0.168	0.853
EC	0.397	0.173	-2.120	0.034	0.169	0.931
Democrat Identity: Strong	1.155	0.448	0.370	0.711	0.540	2.470
Collusion: Own Opinion	0.923	0.097	-0.760	0.446	0.751	1.134
Mueller Approval	2.408	0.656	3.220	0.001	1.411	4.108
Education	1.108	0.194	0.590	0.558	0.786	1.562
Female	0.850	0.304	-0.450	0.650	0.421	1.715
Age	0.999	0.014	-0.100	0.921	0.971	1.027
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.120	0.071	1.780	0.075	0.989	1.268
Cut 1	3.087	1.341			0.459	5.714
Cut 2	4.850	1.380			2.146	7.555
Log likelihood	-162.584					
Wald chi^2(9)	24.88					
Prob > chi^2	0.003					
Pseudo R^2	0.089					
N	175					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Oredered logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Tells Full Story" = Low, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.362	0.064	5.650	0.000	0.236	0.488
QC	0.568	0.061	9.300	0.000	0.448	0.688
EC	0.558	0.062	8.940	0.000	0.435	0.680
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Tells Full Story" = Medium, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.365	0.042	8.710	0.000	0.283	0.447
QC	0.300	0.043	6.960	0.000	0.215	0.384
EC	0.305	0.044	7.000	0.000	0.220	0.391
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Tells Full Story" = High, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.273	0.064	4.280	0.000	0.148	0.398
QC	0.132	0.034	3.870	0.000	0.065	0.199
EC	0.137	0.035	3.880	0.000	0.068	0.207
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Table F-D4. Dependent Variable: "Article: Accurate" (Democrat-Only Sample)	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	Z	P> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.463	0.177	-2.020	0.044	0.219	0.978
EC	0.478	0.212	-1.660	0.096	0.201	1.140
Democrat Identity: Strong	2.335	0.813	2.440	0.015	1.181	4.620
Collusion: Own Opinion	1.066	0.111	0.610	0.544	0.868	1.308
Mueller Approval	1.919	0.503	2.480	0.013	1.147	3.208
Education	1.136	0.169	0.860	0.389	0.850	1.520
Female	1.115	0.403	0.300	0.764	0.549	2.263
Age	1.003	0.016	0.220	0.828	0.973	1.034
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.124	0.072	1.830	0.067	0.992	1.274
Cut 1	3.052	1.452			0.206	5.899
Cut 2	5.141	1.514			2.174	8.109
Log likelihood	-169.837					
Wald chi^2(9)	28.75					
Prob > chi^2	0.001					
Pseudo R^2	0.105					
N	175					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Oredered logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Accurate" = Low, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.196	0.042	4.690	0.000	0.114	0.278
QC	0.318	0.051	6.270	0.000	0.218	0.417
EC	0.312	0.064	4.840	0.000	0.186	0.438
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Accurate" = Medium, by Experimental Condition	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.387	0.041	9.490	0.000	0.307	0.468
QC	0.413	0.038	10.800	0.000	0.338	0.488
EC	0.413	0.038	10.790	0.000	0.338	0.488
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Accurate" = High, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.416	0.061	6.880	0.000	0.298	0.535
QC	0.269	0.047	5.670	0.000	0.176	0.362
EC	0.275	0.061	4.540	0.000	0.156	0.393
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Table F-D5. Dependent Variable: "Article: Fair" (Democrat-Only Sample)						
	Observed Odd Ratio	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
QC	0.441	0.176	-2.050	0.040	0.202	0.964
EC	0.543	0.225	-1.480	0.140	0.241	1.222
Democrat Identity: Strong	1.473	0.488	1.170	0.242	0.770	2.820
Collusion: Own Opinion	1.155	0.127	1.310	0.190	0.931	1.432
Mueller Approval	1.602	0.412	1.830	0.067	0.968	2.651
Education	1.296	0.213	1.580	0.114	0.940	1.788
Female	1.264	0.393	0.760	0.450	0.688	2.324
Age	1.000	0.013	0.030	0.973	0.974	1.027
Twitter Weekly News Consumption	1.071	0.070	1.060	0.291	0.943	1.218
Cut 1	3.074	1.470			0.193	5.955
Cut 2	4.859	1.553			1.814	7.903
Log likelihood	-176.595					
Wald chi^2(9)	18.85					
Prob > chi^2	0.027					
Pseudo R^2	0.075					
N	175					
Bootstrap Replications	1000					
Note: Oredered logistic regression results computed with Stata 14.						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Fair" = Low, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.192	0.048	4.040	0.000	0.099	0.285
QC	0.329	0.050	6.610	0.000	0.231	0.426
EC	0.290	0.054	5.380	0.000	0.184	0.396
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Fair" = Medium, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.343	0.041	8.300	0.000	0.262	0.424
QC	0.378	0.039	9.820	0.000	0.303	0.454
EC	0.377	0.039	9.750	0.000	0.301	0.452
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						

Predicted Probabilities of "Article: Fair" = High, by Experimental Condition						
	Margin	Delta-method Std. Err.	z	p> |z|	95% Confidence Interval	
Condition						
PC	0.465	0.070	6.660	0.000	0.328	0.602
QC	0.293	0.050	5.840	0.000	0.195	0.391
EC	0.334	0.058	5.740	0.000	0.220	0.448
Note: Margins computed with Stata 14 with 1000 Bootstrap replications. N=175 (Democrats only)						