

Online Appendix for

Toeing the party lie: Ostracism promotes endorsement of partisan falsehoods

doi: 10.1080/10584609.2019.1666943

R. Kelly Garrett and Daniel Sude
Ohio State University School of Communication

Paolo Riva
Department of Psychology University of Milano-Bicocca

Table of Contents

Appendix A. Fact-checking messages	2
Election message targeting Republican misperceptions	2
Election message targeting Democrat misperceptions	3
Science message targeting Democrat misperceptions	4
Appendix B. Question wording and descriptives	6
Pretest.....	6
Credibility	6
News value.....	6
Source Expertise	8
Public Opinion – Republican election issue	8
Public Opinion – Democrat election issue.....	9
Public Opinion – Democrat science issue.....	10
Experiment.....	11
Belief Accuracy	11
Needs Threat Scale	14
Cognitive Reflection Test	16
Faith in Intuition for Facts	16
Demographics (Pre-Test and Experiment).....	17
Appendix C. Regression tables	19
Table C1. Main effect of social exclusion	19
Table C2. Interaction with anonymity	19
Table C3. Interaction with political ideology	20
Table C4. Interaction with CRT.....	21
Table C5. Interaction with Faith in Intuition for Facts	21
Figures.....	22
Fig. S1. Screenshot of ostracism manipulation.....	22

Appendix A. Fact-checking messages

Election message targeting Republican misperceptions

FactCheck: No evidence that illegal votes were cast in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election

President Trump argues that our electoral system is threatened by double voting, and by votes cast by dead people and noncitizens. According to him, “voter fraud is very, very common.” It isn’t, according to numerous studies. To the contrary, there is strong evidence that voter fraud is very rare.

Double voting occurs when a person votes more than once in an election. A team of researchers wanted to see how common this is. The researchers came from several prominent universities, including Harvard and Stanford. They worked together to scour election records. They were searching for voters who share a name and birth date. The number of duplicates is high, but that isn’t evidence of double voting. The Birthday Paradox helps explain why. In a room of 23 people, there’s a 50-50 chance that two will have the same birthday. By the same logic, in a country with millions of voters, duplicates will occur by chance in very large numbers. Analyzing 130 million ballots cast in the 2012 presidential election, the researchers estimate that only about 0.02 percent of votes cast were duplicate votes.

Trump has also cited a 2012 Pew Charitable Trust report as evidence that “dead people” vote in large numbers. But that’s not what the report says. People who vote do sometimes appear in Social Security records as having died before Election Day. But this isn’t evidence of widespread fraud. Almost all of these citizens voted using absentee ballots. They then died later in the election season. Others were flagged as dead because officials confused their names or mistook stray pen marks on checklists of voters.

In another report often cited by Trump, a pair of Old Dominion University professors examined data from an election study managed by Harvard and MIT. The researchers mistakenly interpreted the data to mean that 2.2% of non-citizens voted in 2010. Harvard researchers, more familiar with the data, explained that this estimate reflects mistakes made by people taking the survey. Individuals participating in the multi-year study would sometimes check the wrong box next to citizenship in one year. If someone was a citizen for several years, there is no reason they would suddenly become a non-citizen. Of the participants who consistently reported being non-citizens, none voted.

“The best facts we can gather to assess the magnitude of the alleged problem of voter fraud show that, although millions of people cast ballots every year, almost no one knowingly and willfully casts an illegal vote in the United States today,” Lorraine Minnite, a Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, writes in her book *The Myth of Voter Fraud*.

In short, voter fraud is very rare. Careful examination of voter records in a wide variety of ways offers consistent evidence that only eligible American citizens are voting.

Election message targeting Democrat misperceptions

FactCheck: No evidence that Russia altered vote tallies in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election

Although Russia tried to tamper with voting machines, the evidence suggests that their efforts failed. Still, many who opposed Trump in the 2016 election are worried that the election results were fixed in his favor. For example, the liberal news site *Daily Kos* carried a photo of a damaged seal on a voting machine with a headline suggesting that someone tampered with the device.

When the rumor-debunking website *Snopes* followed up, there was a simple explanation. A manager with the firm that supplied the machine explained that a technician simply forgot to replace a warranty seal.

In terms of protecting the vote, those seals don't mean anything. "These are warranty seals used by technicians and should not be confused with security seals that the county would have used on Election Day," the manager wrote.

Each state sets its own standards for protecting the vote. They use different voting machines. They use different ways to double-check the accuracy of the count. Some states require photo identification and others don't. Cybersecurity experts say this variation alone makes systemic hacking unlikely. It would take too much work to penetrate enough systems to have any effect on the outcome.

Still, some people are worried. In June 2017 a classified National Security Agency report was leaked. The report shows that Russian intelligence carried out cyberattacks in 2016 on a company that supplies software for voting machines in eight states. But the report contains no evidence that any votes were changed as a result of the hack.

Voting systems analyst Philip Stark at the University of California, Berkeley says, "There's been no evidence of widespread voter fraud or widespread malfunction of equipment." Thad Hall agrees. Hall has co-authored several leading books and reports on election systems. He said that the 2000 election led to significant improvements. Many states now link their voter rolls to their driver's license database. They have also invested in more training for election workers. "Elections have become much more professional," Hall said. "There might be mistakes, but pulling off large-scale fraud would be a lot harder today."

During the hearing into his private conversations with President Trump, former FBI Director James Comey also weighed in on this issue. He testified that he had no doubt that the Russians attempted to interfere in the 2016 presidential election. He indicated that the Russians were

behind hacking the email systems of the Democratic National Committee and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. He also confirmed that Russians initiated a cyber intrusion in state voter files.

But when asked whether Comey was confident that no votes cast in the 2016 presidential election were “altered”, Comey responded with confidence: “When I left as director, I had seen no indication of that whatsoever.” Comey’s position on that has not changed.

Science message targeting Democrat misperceptions

ScienceFacts: Fracking and drinking water quality

Hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, is a way of getting natural gas and oil from shale located deep underground. It works by pumping water, sand, and chemicals into the Earth at very high pressure, releasing the fuels trapped there.

Fifteen years ago, fracking was rarely used. Today, about half of all U.S. crude oil production and two-thirds of natural gas production involve fracking, according to the Energy Information Administration.

With this boom have come concerns about the impact of this type of drilling on water quality.

Much of the debate about fracking and groundwater contamination is the result of a lack of data. We do not have good water quality data from before fracking became so important.

Without this information, researchers are poorly equipped to assess fracking’s impact.

So how could the boom in fracking lead to water contamination? A team of civil engineers, including researchers from Stanford, Duke, and the Los Alamos National Laboratory, demonstrate one risk. Methane, released through the fracking process, could leak into the water supply through improperly constructed drilling wells or through cracks underground that are produced during the fracking process.

Salty fracking fluids, which can contain toxic chemicals, also could leak into the water supply if they are disposed of improperly or spilled. Yale researchers found 157 chemicals linked to developmental and reproductive toxicity. These include arsenic, lead, formaldehyde, chlorine, and mercury.

Lastly, fracking can promote the growth of dangerous bacteria underground. There’s even a species of bacteria, called “Frackibacter,” that has evolved to thrive in the subterranean environment shaped by fracking.

The risks are clear, but without historic water quality data, the effects of fracking are hard to measure. Plus, fracking isn't the only thing that can impact groundwater quality. Other types of drilling for oil can be harmful, too. And there are naturally occurring processes that can hurt our water supply, including the natural growth of bacteria, and water supply contamination by naturally occurring methane gas.

Overall, given the lack of baseline data, it's difficult to confirm that fracking in particular has played a role in water contamination.

Although there are some high-profile cases of drinking water contamination caused by fracking accidents, we do not have enough evidence to conclude that fracking is a danger. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), we lack detailed information about the locations of both drinking water resources and fracking activities. Without this information, it is impossible to determine whether fracking-related activities are impacting U.S. drinking water resources.

Appendix B. Question wording and descriptives

Pretest

Credibility

Please rate the article you just read on the following scales:

- Authoritative (9) — Inexpert (1)
- Honest (9) — Deceptive (1)
- Reputable (9) — Disreputable (1)
- Has my interest at heart (9) — Does not have my interest at heart (1)
- Accurate (9) — Inaccurate (1)
- Provides complete information (9) — Provides incomplete information (1)
- Is current (9) — Is outdated (1)
- Objective (9) — Biased (1)
- Trustworthy (9) — Untrustworthy (1)
- Reliable (9) — Unreliable (1)
- Credible (9) — Sensational (1)
- Clear (9) — Unclear (1)

Table B1. Credibility descriptives

Message Condition	Credibility		Frequency
	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Republican Election	6.68	1.69	50
Democrat Election	5.80	1.93	48
Democrat Science	6.43	1.67	52
Total	6.24	1.70	200

Note: Cronbach's Alpha: .985

News value

How interesting is this article to you?

- Extremely interesting (5)
- Very interesting (4)
- Moderately interesting (3)
- Slightly interesting (2)
- Not at all interesting (1)

Table B2. Interestingness descriptives

Message Condition	Mean	Interesting	
		Standard Deviation	Frequency
Republican Election	3.26	1.10	50
Democrat Election	3.06	1.20	49
Democrat Science	3.69	0.94	52
Total	3.34	1.07	201

How important is this article to you?

Extremely important (5)

Very important (4)

Moderately important (3)

Slightly important (2)

Not at all important (1)

Table B3. Importance descriptives

Message Condition	Mean	Important	
		Standard Deviation	Frequency
Republican Election	3.32	1.10	50
Democrat Election	2.90	1.14	49
Democrat Science	3.56	0.90	52
Total	3.26	1.09	201

How newsworthy was this article?

Extremely newsworthy (5)

Very newsworthy (4)

Moderately newsworthy (3)

Slightly newsworthy (2)

Not at all newsworthy (1)

Table B4. Newsworthiness descriptives

Message Condition	Mean	Newsworthy	
		Standard Deviation	Frequency
Republican Election	3.62	1.10	50
Democrat Election	3.40	1.23	48
Democrat Science	3.42	1.04	52
Total	3.48	1.09	200

Source Expertise

To what extent is the information in the article supported by expert sources?

- Extremely supported (5)
- Moderately supported (4)
- Neither support nor not supported (3)
- Moderately unsupported (2)
- Extremely unsupported (1)

Table B5. Source expertise descriptives

Message Condition	Mean	Expertise	Frequency
		Standard Deviation	
Republican Election	4.18	0.91	51
Democrat Election	3.57	0.98	49
Democrat Science	3.72	0.77	53
Total	3.75	0.96	204

Public Opinion – Republican election issue

Please think about the people you talk to about politics. This may include your friends and family, your coworkers, or even strangers you talk to online. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about voter fraud?

- All or almost all think that voter fraud is common (1)
- Most think that voter fraud is common (2)
- Belief in voter fraud is evenly divided between those who think it is rare and those who think it is common (3)
- Most think that voter fraud is rare (4)
- All or almost all think that voter fraud is rare (5)

Please think about the news media you rely on most. This may include newspapers or magazines, online news sites, television news shows, or political talk shows. Which statement best describes the beliefs expressed in these media about voter fraud?

- All or almost all think that voter fraud is common (1)
- Most think that voter fraud is common (2)
- Belief in voter fraud is evenly divided between those who think it is rare and those who think it is common (3)
- Most think that voter fraud is rare (4)
- All or almost all think that voter fraud is rare (5)

Please think about the political leaders you trust most. This may include national, state, or local political figures. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about voter fraud?

- All or almost all think that voter fraud is common (1)
- Most think that voter fraud is common (2)
- Belief in voter fraud is evenly divided between those who think it is rare and those who think it is common (3)
- Most think that voter fraud is rare (4)
- All or almost all think that voter fraud is rare (5)

Table B6. Public opinion descriptives for Republican election issue

Group	Public opinion – Republican election issue	
	Democrat or Leaning	Republican or Leaning
	Democrat Mean (SD)	Republican Mean (SD)
Discussion Network	3.93 (0.92)	2.93 (0.83)
Media	3.70 (0.87)	3.29 (1.07)
Politicians	4.11 (0.85)	3.14 (0.86)

Public Opinion – Democrat election issue

Please think about the people you talk to about politics. This may include your friends and family, your coworkers, or even strangers you talk to online. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about Russia's attempts to tamper with the election?

- All or almost all think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (1)
- Most think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (2)
- Belief about Russia's success is evenly divided between those who think Russia failed and those who think Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (3)
- Most think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (4)
- All or almost all think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (5)

Please think about the news media you rely on most. This may include newspapers or magazines, online news sites, television news shows, or political talk shows. Which statement best describes the beliefs expressed in these media about Russia's attempts to tamper with the election?

- All or almost all think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (1)
- Most think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (2)
- Belief about Russia's success is evenly divided between those who think Russia failed and those who think Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (3)
- Most think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (4)
- All or almost all think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (5)

Please think about the political leaders you trust most. This may include national, state, or local political figures. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about Russia's attempts to alter vote tallies.

- All or almost all think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (1)
- Most think that Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (2)
- Belief about Russia's success is evenly divided between those who think Russia failed and those who think Russia succeeded in altering vote tallies (3)
- Most think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (4)
- All or almost all think that Russia failed to alter vote tallies. (5)

Table B7. Public opinion descriptives for Democratic election issue

Group	Public opinion – Democrat election issue	
	Democrat or Leaning	Republican or Leaning
	Democrat Mean (SD)	Republican Mean (SD)
Discussion Network	2.92 (1.23)	3.65 (1.41)
Media	2.89 (1.01)	2.76 (1.25)
Politicians	3.11 (1.12)	3.82 (1.07)

Public Opinion – Democrat science issue

Please think about the people you talk to about politics. This may include your friends and family, your coworkers, or even strangers you talk to online. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about fracking and water quality?

- All or almost all think that fracking is a threat to water quality (1)
- Most think that fracking is a threat to water quality (2)
- Belief that fracking is a threat to water quality is evenly divided between those who think it is a threat and those who think it is not a threat. (3)
- Most think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (4)
- All or almost all think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (5)

Please think about the news media you rely on most. This may include newspapers or magazines, online news sites, television news shows, or political talk shows. Which statement best describes the beliefs expressed in these media about fracking and water quality?

- All or almost all think that fracking is a threat to water quality (1)
- Most think that fracking is a threat to water quality (2)
- Belief that fracking is a threat to water quality is evenly divided between those who think it is a threat and those who think it is not a threat. (3)
- Most think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (4)
- All or almost all think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (5)

Please think about the political leaders you trust most. This may include national, state, or local political figures. Which statement best describes the beliefs of this group about fracking and water quality?

- All or almost all think that fracking is a threat to water quality (1)
- Most think that fracking is a threat to water quality (2)
- Belief that fracking is a threat to water quality is evenly divided between those who think it is a threat and those who think it is not a threat. (3)
- Most think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (4)
- All or almost all think that fracking is not a threat to water quality (5)

Table B8. Public opinion descriptives for Democratic science issue

Group	Public opinion – Democrat science issue	
	Democrat or Leaning Democrat Mean (SD)	Republican or Leaning Republican Mean (SD)
Discussion Network	2.08 (0.64)	2.75 (1.07)
Media	2.36 (0.81)	2.88 (0.81)
Politicians	2.20 (0.87)	3.31 (1.01)

Experiment

Belief Accuracy

Republican Election

Illegal immigrants vote in large numbers in order to secure favorable election outcomes. (R)

- Strongly disagree (7)
- Disagree (6)
- Somewhat disagree (5)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (3)
- Agree (2)
- Strongly agree (1)

Double voting is widespread in the U.S. (R)

- Strongly disagree (7)
- Disagree (6)
- Somewhat disagree (5)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (3)

Agree (2)
Strongly agree (1)

Votes cast by people who died in an election year are often legitimate.

Strongly disagree (1)
Disagree (2)
Somewhat disagree (3)
Neither agree nor disagree (4)
Somewhat agree (5)
Agree (6)
Strongly agree (7)

Voter fraud is very common. (R)

Strongly disagree (7)
Disagree (6)
Somewhat disagree (5)
Neither agree nor disagree (4)
Somewhat agree (3)
Agree (2)
Strongly agree (1)

Democrat Election

It is highly likely that a foreign power, including Russia, could directly alter American election outcomes by targeting voting procedures, including voting machines. (R)

Strongly disagree (7)
Disagree (6)
Somewhat disagree (5)
Neither agree nor disagree (4)
Somewhat agree (3)
Agree (2)
Strongly agree (1)

Because state standards differ, tampering with election results is very easy. (R)

Strongly disagree (7)
Disagree (6)
Somewhat disagree (5)
Neither agree nor disagree (4)
Somewhat agree (3)
Agree (2)

Strongly agree (1)

Since the 2000 election, American voting procedures have only become safer.

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Somewhat disagree (3)

Neither agree nor disagree (4)

Somewhat agree (5)

Agree (6)

Strongly agree (7)

Broken seals on voting booths observed in the 2016 election indicated at least some tampering.
(R)

Strongly disagree (7)

Disagree (6)

Somewhat disagree (5)

Neither agree nor disagree (4)

Somewhat agree (3)

Agree (2)

Strongly agree (1)

Democrat Science

There is no question that fracking is causing widespread harm to drinking water. (R)

Strongly disagree (7)

Disagree (6)

Somewhat disagree (5)

Neither agree nor disagree (4)

Somewhat agree (3)

Agree (2)

Strongly agree (1)

Scientists are missing critical information to determine whether fracking is harming U.S. drinking water.

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Somewhat disagree (3)

Neither agree nor disagree (4)

Somewhat agree (5)

Agree (6)

Strongly agree (7)

We know a lot about groundwater quality before and after the introduction of oil and gas production in the U.S. (R)

Strongly disagree (7)

Disagree (6)

Somewhat disagree (5)

Neither agree nor disagree (4)

Somewhat agree (3)

Agree (2)

Strongly agree (1)

Needs Threat Scale

In case the unsuccessful team-based study influenced your responses to this study, we have a few questions about what you experienced there.

Belonging

I felt “disconnected” from the group. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt rejected. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt like an outsider. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt I belonged to the group.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt the other people interacted with me a lot.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

Self-Esteem

I felt good about myself.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

My self-esteem was high.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt liked.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt insecure. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

Meaning

I felt satisfied. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt invisible. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt meaningless. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt nonexistent.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt important.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt useful.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

Control

I felt powerful.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt I had control over the course of the meeting with my fellow team members.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt I had the ability to significantly alter events when meeting my fellow team members.

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

I felt I was unable to influence the action of my fellow team members. (R)

Not at all (1) — Extremely (5)

Cognitive Reflection Test

A bat and a ball cost \$1.10 in total. The bat costs \$1.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost (in cents)? [open-ended response]

If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to make 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets (in minutes)? [open-ended response]

In a lake, there is a patch of lily pads. Every day, the patch doubles in size. If it takes 48 days for the patch to cover the entire lake, how long would it take for the patch to cover half of the lake (in days)? [open-ended response]

Faith in Intuition for Facts

I trust my gut to tell me what's true and what's not

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Agree (4)

Strongly agree (5)

I trust my initial feelings about the facts.

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Agree (4)

Strongly agree (5)

My initial impressions are almost always right.

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Agree (4)

Strongly agree (5)

I can usually feel when a claim is true or false even if I can't explain how I know.

Strongly disagree (1)

Disagree (2)

Neither agree nor disagree (3)

Agree (4)

Strongly agree (5)

Demographics (Pre-Test and Experiment)

Are you...?

Male (1)

Female (2)

Other (3) _____

How old are you?

Generally speaking, when it comes to political parties in the United States, how would you best describe yourself?

A Strong Democrat (1)

A Not Very Strong Democrat (2)

Independent, lean toward democrat (3)

Independent (close to neither party) (4)

Independent, lean toward Republican (5)

A Not Very Strong Republican (6)

A Strong Republican (7)

Something else (please specify) (8)

When thinking about politics, how would you describe your political views?

Very Liberal (1)

Liberal (2)

Somewhat Liberal (3)

Moderate or Middle of the Road (4)

Somewhat Conservative (5)

Conservative (6)

Very Conservative (7)

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

Less than high school degree (1)

High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) (2)

Some college but no degree (3)

Associate degree in college (2-year) (4)

Bachelor's degree in college (4-year) (5)

Master's degree (6)

Doctoral degree (7)

Professional degree (JD, MD) (8)

Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino or none of these?

Yes (1)

None of these (2)

Display This Question: If Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino or none of these? = Yes

Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

Spanish (1)

Hispanic (2)

Latino (3)

Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be:

White (1)

Black or African American (2)

American Indian or Alaska Native (3)

Asian (4)

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)

Other (6)

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 (1)

\$10,000 to \$19,999 (2)

\$20,000 to \$29,999 (3)

\$30,000 to \$39,999 (4)

\$40,000 to \$49,999 (5)

\$50,000 to \$59,999 (6)

\$60,000 to \$69,999 (7)

\$70,000 to \$79,999 (8)

\$80,000 to \$89,999 (9)

\$90,000 to \$99,999 (10)

\$100,000 to \$149,999 (11)

\$150,000 or more (12)

Appendix C. Regression tables**Table C1. Main effect of ostracism**

	(1) Avg. accuracy of election issue knowledge	(2) Avg. accuracy of science issue knowledge
Ostracism manipulation	-0.278* (0.116)	-0.0515 (0.148)
Constant	4.093*** (0.0822)	4.045*** (0.105)
Observations	413	221
R-squared	0.014	0.001

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table C2. Interaction with anonymity

	(1) Avg. accuracy of election issue knowledge	(2) Avg. accuracy of science issue knowledge
Ostracism manipulation	-0.093 (0.166)	0.0488 (0.223)
Anonymous report of beliefs	0.130 (0.165)	0.0408 (0.213)
Exclusion X Anonymous	-0.366 (0.232)	-0.185 (0.298)
Constant	4.022*** (0.122)	4.022*** (0.162)
Observations	413	221
R-squared	0.020	0.003

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table C3. Interaction with political ideology

	(1) Avg. accuracy of election issue knowledge	(2) Avg. accuracy of science issue knowledge
Ostracism manipulation	-0.528* (0.251)	0.260 (0.302)
Weak ideology	0.199 (0.253)	0.194 (0.313)
Moderate ideology	-0.565* (0.242)	-0.347 (0.297)
Strong ideology	-0.556* (0.239)	-0.285 (0.293)
Exclusion X Weak	-0.363 (0.362)	-0.690 (0.453)
Exclusion X Moderate	0.641* (0.323)	-0.298 (0.401)
Exclusion X Strong	0.431 (0.331)	-0.310 (0.416)
Constant	4.375*** (0.188)	4.181*** (0.221)
Observations	413	221
R-squared	0.057	0.049

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table C4. Interaction with CRT

	(1) Avg. accuracy of election issue knowledge	(2) Avg. accuracy of science issue knowledge
Ostracism manipulation	-0.439** (0.135)	-0.257 (0.171)
1 or more CRT questions correct	0.0111 (0.187)	-0.165 (0.223)
Exclusion X CRT	0.540* (0.257)	0.826* (0.330)
Constant	4.090*** (0.0943)	4.096*** (0.124)
Observations	413	221
R-squared	0.037	0.036

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table C5. Interaction with Faith in Intuition for Facts

	(1) Avg. accuracy of election issue knowledge	(2) Avg. accuracy of science issue knowledge
Ostracism manipulation	1.780** (0.645)	0.394 (0.819)
Faith in Intuition-Facts	-0.0260 (0.121)	-0.413* (0.161)
Exclusion X FI-Facts	-0.540** (0.167)	-0.104 (0.216)
Constant	4.191*** (0.466)	5.568*** (0.602)
Observations	413	221
R-squared	0.069	0.083

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Figures

Fig. S1. Screenshot of ostracism manipulation.

The screenshot displays a grid of user profiles in a social media-like interface. Each profile card contains a profile picture, a name, a bio, and a 'Like' button with a heart icon. The profiles are arranged in three rows. The first row contains Test (1 like), Georgeee (4 likes), and Sarah (9 likes). The second row contains John (2 likes) and AncaD (5 likes). The third row contains Lauren (0 likes) and Mary (5 likes). Below the Mary profile, the top of a profile for Rosey is visible. On the right side, a sidebar provides instructions: 'You can click "Like" if you have enjoyed somebody's description', a timer showing '00:00' with the text 'time left:', and a 'Continue' button.

Name	Profile Picture	Bio	Likes
Test		I'm a quite person, but friendly once you get to know me. I like puzzles, especially when I can work on them with other people. And although I spend a lot of time at work, I do love to get outdoors whenever I can.	1
Georgeee		I'm a 19 year old dude from Wisconsin (commence making fun of my accent). I love exercise and lately you can catch me running and lifting weights. Besides exercise I like learning languages, psychology, drawing, and writing.	4
Sarah		Let me introduce myself. I'm Sarah, married, and mother of two wonderful (grown up) children. My career has been a bit peculiar. Starting off as a graduate student, I switched to an entirely different path: occupational assessor trying to help young people with disabilities to get a job. I've just retired and started spending more time on my hobbies, such as singing, reading, and playing volleyball.	9
John		Hi there, I'm 57 years old, married, with two kids. I've been a computer programmer in the US for about 30 years, but don't worry: I don't have the dusty haircut, oversized buttoned shirt and nerdy big frame glasses. Looking forward to working with you all. Cheers, John	2
AncaD		I am a Computer Science student, interested in Natural Language processing. Also a lover of loose leaf tea and a Semantic Web enthusiast. I'm curious about what this task is about.	5
Nick		My life revolves around rock climbing. I started climbing when I was 12 (turning 18 soon) and usually climb 4-5 hours a day. Climbing never bores me, because each time is different – the routes, the weather, my strength and endurance. It's great!	5
Lauren		I'm Lauren, I love to hang out with friends and go shopping. Just doing some online studies here!	0
Mary		My name is Mary and I am 49 years old. I have a husband and 2 grown sons. My family and I lived in different countries. Our sons attended international schools wherever we went	5
Rosey			

Right sidebar:

- You can click "Like" if you have enjoyed somebody's description
- time left: 00:00
- Continue