Supplementary Materials for

Psychological inoculation improves resilience against misinformation on social media

Jon Roozenbeek et al.

Corresponding author: Jon Roozenbeek, jjr51@cam.ac.uk

Sci. Adv. 8, eabo6254 (2022)
DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abo6254

This PDF file includes:

Notes i to x
Supplementary Analyses
Figs. S1 to S8
Tables S1 to S56
References
i We deviate from our preregistrations for Studies 1-5 in several ways. First, we preregistered that we would conduct linear regressions to check if there are “three-way interactions” with each of the covariates. This was an error on the part of the authors, because there are only two interacting variables (condition and covariate), plus the outcome variable. Therefore, we instead check for two-way interactions between condition (treatment - control) and each of the covariates, predicting technique discernment (see Tables S44-S48 in the supplement); for additional clarity, we also provide linear regressions with all these covariates in the same model, for each of our four outcome variables, see Tables S23-S27. Second, we did not collect our preregistered covariates of minority status and region of origin, and so do not include these analyses in our manuscript.

ii We deviate from our preregistration for Study 7 in several ways. First, we preregistered that we would administer 5 survey items per study, but due to cost limitations could only administer 3. Second, we aimed to collect 4,000 survey responses per question for a total of 80,000 responses. As it proved to be more difficult than anticipated to collect these responses (most likely because the survey questions were shown at the very end of a YouTube video), we did not achieve our target sample; see Table S55. Third, we do not provide Bayesian analyses here due to space limitations. Fourth, we anticipated a Smallest Effect Size of Interest of Cohen’s $d = 0.10$; we instead provide effect sizes in Cohen’s $h$ (see again Table S55), as this is the most applicable effect size for the two-proportion $z$-tests that we present here. Finally, we preregistered that we would conduct a series of moderation analyses, but we were not able to obtain any demographic data from YouTube, and so are unable to provide these analyses.

iii For the confidence measure, discernment is not a meaningful analytical construct, because a hypothetical participant who is both highly confident that a manipulative post contains a particular manipulation technique and that a non-manipulative post does not contain such a technique would nonetheless have low “confidence discernment”.

iv In a further analysis (not preregistered), we checked if participants update their confidence in the right direction, i.e., if they only become more confident if they are also more accurate in their assessment. To do so, we conducted a series of linear regressions with technique recognition of manipulative and neutral stimuli as the dependent variables and the confidence measures and the condition (inoculation/control) as independent variables. For all five studies, we find that, for the manipulative stimuli, the perceived use of a technique is significantly and positively correlated with participants’ confidence in recognizing these techniques, when controlling for experimental condition (all $p$-values < 0.001). For the neutral stimuli, we find that perceived technique use is significantly and negatively correlated with confidence (all $p$-values < 0.008), in the sense that participants who indicate that neutral stimuli are not manipulative (i.e., they are more correct in their assessment) also tend to be highly confident in this assessment. We thus find that greater accuracy in manipulation technique recognition is consistently correlated with greater confidence, indicating that participants update their confidence for the right reason, and not due to overconfidence. See Tables S36 and S37.
We also conducted a series of exploratory analyses of the sharing measure that excluded “never sharers”, i.e., participants who answered “strongly disagree” on the sharing measure for all stimuli. The exclusion of participants who would never share either manipulative or neutral posts with people in their network follows guidelines established in previous work by Pennycook et al. (54); these results are highly similar to those reported below, and can be found in Table S35.

Technique recognition for control group participants is higher in some studies than others: an ANOVA shows that technique recognition among control group participants differs significantly across studies ($F(4,2787) = 84.1, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.109, d = 0.70$), and is highest in the scapegoating study, for which we also report a descriptively lower effect size than for the other four studies (see Table S33). We find the same pattern for trustworthiness (see Table S34). Thus, it is possible that compared to the other manipulation techniques, participants were better at spotting scapegoating in social media content even without an intervention, which may explain the lower effect size and non-significant effects for the trustworthiness and sharing intentions measures.

In addition to the preregistered moderation analyses, we conducted a series of (non-preregistered) ANOVAs with technique recognition as the dependent variable and condition (inoculation – control) and political ideology (converted from a 7-point scale to “left”, “moderate” and “right”), “bullshit receptivity” (converted to “high” and “low”), and analytical thinking (also converted to “high” and “low”), respectively, as independent variables, separately for each study. We find that technique recognition is significantly higher in the inoculation condition than in the control condition for those on the left and right, as well as for moderates (all $p$-values < 0.003), for participants with high and low “bullshit receptivity” (all $p$-values < 0.01), and for participants with high and low analytical thinking scores (all $p$-values < 0.015), with two exceptions: there is no difference between conditions among moderates for the “emotional language” study ($p = 0.685$), and for moderates and conservatives for the “scapegoating” study ($p = 0.148$ and $p = 0.652$, respectively). See Tables S23-S27, S38-S43, and S52-S54 for the regression tables, as well as Figures S2-S6.

This type of survey is called a YouTube “brand lift” survey. For more information about how this works, see: https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/4574026?hl=en.

We note that Item 1 for the emotional language survey (“What this airline did for its passengers will make you tear up - SO heart-warming.”) is different from the other two headlines in that it does not make use of negative emotions; as the emotional language video specifically inoculates people against the use of negative emotions such as fear, anger, or outrage, it is possible that this discrepancy between the headline and the lessons learned in the video explains the lack of a significant effect for Item 1.

As an example, one of the manipulative (incoherent) posts from the incoherence study reads: “The ‘scientific consensus’ on global warming is a myth. Only a few scientists dare go against the grain. They are our heroes, and they should be celebrated”. This post is incoherent because it simultaneously asserts that climate change consensus does not exist and that there are only a few scientists who disagree with the consensus. Its non-manipulative counterpart reads “While there is an ongoing discussion about the exact level of agreement, approximately 97% of scientists
agree that anthropogenic climate change is happening”. For the emotional language study, we used real-world examples of emotionally manipulative social media content as stimuli, following Brady et al. (22), and conducted a stimuli validation test using a sentiment analysis library to ensure that the manipulative stimuli capture the intended dimension of emotionality and that the neutral stimuli do not; please see the Supplementary Analyses section for further details.
Supplementary Analyses

Robustness checks

As preregistered, we conducted a series of linear regressions with robust standard errors at the rating level for the technique recognition, trustworthiness and sharing measures, clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral), following the approach laid out by Pennycook et al. (54). The regression tables can be found in Tables S28-S32. The results show that the findings reported in the main body are robust, except for one: trustworthiness discernment for the incoherence video is significant when conducting a Student’s ($p = 0.002$) and Bayesian $t$-test ($BF_{10} = 7.876$, indicating strong support in favor of hypothesis H3 (55)), but not when doing a linear regression at the rating level ($p = 0.168$).

In addition (although not preregistered), we provide Bayesian $t$-test results alongside the standard Student’s $t$-tests for the averaged manipulative, neutral and discernment scores, as well as for all individual stimuli. In line with standard practices for reporting Bayesian statistics, we used a Cauchy prior, centered around 0, with a width parameter of 0.707, representing an 80% chance that the observed effect sizes are between -2 and 2, as recommended by van Doorn et al (55). Similarly, a Bayes Factor $_{10}$ ($BF_{10}$) lower than 3 is considered weak support for the directional hypothesis; between 3 and 5 is considered medium support, and > 5 strong support (55). These Bayesian analyses support the findings reported in the main body; see Supplementary Tables S3-S22.

Finally, because it is known that many people on social media never share news or other information, we conducted a series of exploratory analyses of the sharing measure that excluded “never sharers”, i.e., participants who answered “strongly disagree” (1 out of 7) on the sharing measure for all stimuli. The exclusion of participants who would never share either manipulative
or neutral posts with people in their network follows guidelines established in previous work by Pennycook et al. (54). When these “never-sharers” are excluded, we find a significant difference in sharing discernment for the incoherence study ($M_{control} = 0.70$ vs $M_{inoculation} = 0.87$, $M_{diff} = 0.17$, $t(2,872) = 2.332$, $p = 0.02$, $d = 0.16$, 95%CI [0.025, 0.29]), but not for scapegoating ($M_{control} = 0.67$ vs $M_{inoculation} = 0.82$, $M_{diff} = 0.15$, $t(2,850) = 1.835$, $p = 0.067$, $d = 0.13$, 95%CI [-0.009, 0.26]). See Table S35.

**Emotional language study – stimuli validation test**

While the manipulation techniques tested in Studies 2-5 (incoherence, false dichotomies, scapegoating and ad hominem attacks) are straightforward and require no further elaboration, this is not the case for Studies 1 and 6 (emotional language) (22, 56). For these studies, the manipulative social media posts were selected from real-world examples of social media content that seeks to evoke strong negative emotions such as fear or outrage in a manipulative manner (27, 46, 50). To establish whether social media posts that contain manipulative content indeed make more use of negative emotional language and fearmongering than their matched controls (which were formulated to be emotionally neutral), we conducted a sentiment analysis using Empath, a Python-based linguistic sentiment analyzer (57). Empath iterates over a corpus of text (in this case the social media posts), and assigns numerical values to a particular category of language use (e.g., “fear”, “anger”, or “emotional language”) based on whether words in the text appear in its dictionary under that category. This method allows us to compare the extent to which emotional language is used in the emotional-manipulative and neutral social media posts. Figure S1 shows the results for the categories “emotional language”, “negative emotion”, “fear’, “hate” and “suffering’.
Fig. S1. Bar graphs for unnormalized Empath scores for the emotional language, negative emotion, fear, hate and suffering Empath categories, by stimulus type (manipulative vs neutral).

The (unnormalized) Empath scores are indicated on the Y-axis of each bar graph. The red bars show the Empath scores for the emotional social media posts, the blue bars (where visible) show the Empath scores for the neutral posts. Error bars show the standard error.

Figure S1 shows that the emotional-manipulative social media posts use emotional language, negative emotion, fear-based language, hate-based language, and language related to suffering, whereas the non-emotional (neutral) posts contain no language related to these categories (except negative emotion). These results confirm that our test stimuli capture the intended dimension of (negative) emotionality.
Supplementary Figures

Figure S2.
Studies 1-5: technique recognition (Diff-Technique, or technique recognition), broken down by political ideology (where 1-3 on a 7-point scale is converted to “left”, 4 is “moderate” and 5-7 is “right”). For the full moderation analysis, see Tables S38 and S39. Figure created using Jamovi (www.jamovi.org).

Figure S3.
Studies 1-5: technique recognition (Diff-Technique, or technique recognition), broken down by “bullshit receptivity” (where below-average “bullshit receptivity” scores are converted to “low” and above-average scores to “high”). For the full moderation analysis, see Tables S40 and S41. Figure created using Jamovi (www.jamovi.org).
Figure S4.
Studies 1-5: technique recognition (Diff-Technique, or technique recognition), broken down by analytical thinking (where a score of 0 or 1 out of 3 is converted to “low” and a score of 2 or 3 out of 3 to “high”). For the full moderation analysis, see Tables S42 and S43. Figure created using Jamovi (www.jamovi.org).

Figure S5.
Study 6: technique discernment, trustworthiness discernment, and sharing discernment, as moderated by actively open-minded thinking (AOT) (40). See also Table S53. Figure created using Jamovi (www.jamovi.org).
Figure S6. 
Study 6: technique discernment, trustworthiness discernment, and sharing discernment, as moderated by Veracity Discernment Ability (the ability to discern true from false news headlines), according to the 20-item Misinformation Susceptibility Test (41). See also Table S54. Figure created using Jamovi (www.jamovi.org).
Figure S7.
Studies 1-6: Examples of manipulative and neutral stimuli.

| Study Description | Manipulative Example | Neutral Example |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1 & 6 Emotional language | NEWS ALERT: Baby formula linked to horrific outbreak of new, terrifying disease among helpless infants: Parents despair. [Link](http://www.example.com) | Infants who receive formula feedings may be at slightly higher risk of acute otitis media (ear infections). [Link](http://www.example.com) |
| 2 Incoherence | "If we are silent, we lose our children": The moms fighting gun violence | Why mothers are leading the fight for gun safety. |
| 3 False dichotomies | You don’t know what you’re talking about. Even though science is yet to show a correlation, it’s very clear that violent video games like [Redacted] make people more likely to commit crimes. | You don’t know what you’re talking about. Science is yet to show a correlation between violent video games like [Redacted] and criminal behavior. |
| 4 Scapegoating | Your beliefs leave me completely unfazed, but by God your vapid ideas make me angry. | Your beliefs leave me completely unfazed. It’s your face that makes me angry. |

---

*Note: The images in the figure are placeholders for real examples.*
5 Ad hominem

Figure S8.
Study 7: Examples of manipulative stimuli as they were implemented on YouTube (left: emotional language, right: false dichotomy).
## Supplementary Tables

### Table S1a.
Sample composition for Studies 1-6 (demographics).

| Variable                                | 1 Emo. language | 2 Incoherence | 3 False dichotomies | 4 Scapegoating | 5 Ad hominem | 6 Emo. language |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| **Gender**                              |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| Female                                  | 547 (51.0%)     | 542 (49.9%)   | 556 (50.8%)         | 539 (49.9%)    | 538 (49.7%)  | 540 (50.7%)     |
| Male                                    | 509 (47.5%)     | 531 (48.9%)   | 531 (48.5%)         | 525 (48.6%)    | 528 (48.8%)  | 510 (47.8%)     |
| Non-binary                              | 12 (1.1%)       | 11 (1.0%)     | 7 (0.6%)            | 12 (1.1%)      | 11 (1.0%)    | 13 (1.2%)       |
| Other                                   | 2 (0.2%)        | 1 (0.1%)      | 0 (0.0%)            | 3 (0.3%)       | 4 (0.4%)     | 2 (0.2%)        |
| Prefer not to say                       | 2 (0.2%)        | 1 (0.1%)      | 1 (0.1%)            | 1 (0.1%)       | 2 (0.2%)     | 1 (0.1%)        |
| **Age**                                 |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| 18-24                                   | 163 (15.2%)     | 128 (11.8%)   | 106 (9.7%)          | 132 (12.2%)    | 172 (15.9%)  | 114 (10.8%)     |
| 25-34                                   | 231 (21.5%)     | 209 (19.2%)   | 250 (22.8%)         | 255 (23.6%)    | 323 (29.8%)  | 225 (21.1%)     |
| 35-44                                   | 195 (18.2%)     | 192 (17.7%)   | 178 (16.3%)         | 212 (19.6%)    | 244 (22.5%)  | 190 (17.8%)     |
| 45-54                                   | 158 (14.7%)     | 178 (16.4%)   | 186 (17.0%)         | 181 (16.8%)    | 204 (18.8%)  | 162 (15.2%)     |
| 55 or older                             | 325 (30.3%)     | 379 (34.9%)   | 375 (34.2%)         | 300 (27.8%)    | 140 (12.9%)  | 374 (35.1%)     |
| **Education**                           |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| No formal education above age 16       | 14 (1.3%)       | 6 (0.6%)      | 6 (0.5%)            | 7 (0.6%)       | 4 (0.4%)     | 8 (0.8%)        |
| Professional or technical qualifications above age 16 | 28 (2.6%)       | 33 (3.0%)      | 31 (2.8%)           | 30 (2.8%)     | 26 (2.4%)     | 25 (2.3%)       |
| School education up to age 18          | 355 (33.1%)     | 332 (30.6%)   | 340 (31.1%)         | 334 (30.9%)    | 335 (30.9%)  | 289 (27.1%)     |
| Degree (Bachelor's) or equivalent       | 462 (43.1%)     | 472 (43.5%)   | 463 (42.3%)         | 433 (40.1%)    | 457 (42.2%)  | 503 (47.2%)     |
| Degree (Master's) or other postgraduate qualification | 181 (16.9%)     | 206 (19.0%)   | 224 (20.5%)         | 238 (22.0%)    | 215 (19.9%)  | 200 (18.8%)     |
| Doctorate                              | 32 (3.0%)       | 37 (3.4%)     | 31 (2.8%)           | 38 (3.5%)      | 46 (4.2%)    | 41 (3.8%)       |
| **How often do you check the news**    |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| Never                                   | 9 (0.8%)        | 14 (1.3%)     | 12 (1.1%)           | 4 (0.4%)       | 13 (1.2%)    | 11 (1.0%)       |
| Rarely                                  | 85 (7.9%)       | 67 (6.2%)     | 80 (7.3%)           | 58 (5.4%)      | 91 (8.4%)    | 94 (8.8%)       |
| Sometimes                               | 261 (24.3%)     | 240 (22.1%)   | 269 (24.6%)         | 262 (24.3%)    | 281 (25.9%)  | 264 (24.8%)     |
| Frequently                              | 508 (47.4%)     | 527 (48.5%)   | 492 (44.9%)         | 511 (47.3%)    | 477 (44.0%)  | 474 (44.5%)     |
| All the time                            | 209 (19.5%)     | 238 (21.9%)   | 242 (22.1%)         | 245 (22.7%)    | 221 (20.4%)  | 222 (20.8%)     |
| **How often do you use social media**  |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| Never                                   | 33 (3.1%)       | 43 (4.0%)     | 39 (3.6%)           | 42 (3.9%)      | 21 (1.9%)    | 41 (3.8%)       |
| Rarely                                  | 66 (6.2%)       | 71 (6.5%)     | 88 (8.0%)           | 85 (7.9%)      | 87 (8.0%)    | 101 (9.5%)      |
| Sometimes                               | 190 (17.7%)     | 238 (21.9%)   | 221 (20.2%)         | 219 (20.3%)    | 182 (16.8%)  | 191 (17.9%)     |
| Frequently                              | 428 (40.0%)     | 435 (40.1%)   | 454 (41.5%)         | 416 (38.5%)    | 429 (39.6%)  | 420 (39.4%)     |
| All the time                            | 354 (33.1%)     | 299 (27.5%)   | 293 (26.8%)         | 318 (29.4%)    | 364 (33.6%)  | 312 (29.3%)     |
| **Political party support**             |                 |               |                     |                |              |                 |
| Democratic Party                       |                 |               |                     |                |              | 525 (49.3%)     |
| Republican Party                       |                 |               |                     |                |              | 195 (18.3%)     |
| Independent                            |                 |               |                     |                |              | 317 (29.8%)     |
| Other                                  |                 |               |                     |                |              | 28 (2.6%)       |
Table S1b.
Sample composition for Studies 1-6 (covariates/continuous variables).

| Variable                                | 1 Emo. lang | 2 Incoherence | 3 False dichot. | 4 Scapegoating | 5 Ad hominem | 6 Emo. lang |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
|                                          | Mean        | SD            | Mean            | SD             | Mean         | SD          |
| Political ideology (1-7)                 | 3.37        | 1.79          | 3.35            | 1.74           | 3.38         | 1.77        |
| Populism (1-5)                          | 3.78        | 0.61          | 3.68            | 0.61           | 3.72         | 0.61        |
| Bullshit receptivity (1-5)              | 2.73        | 0.95          | 2.58            | 0.92           | 2.67         | 0.95        |
| Conspiracy belief (0-1)                 | 0.63        | 0.21          | 0.59            | 0.23           | 0.59         | 0.23        |
| Analytical thinking (0-3)               | 1.32        | 1.23          | 1.14            | 0.97           | 1.19         | 0.97        |
| Numerical thinking (0-4)                | 2.96        | 1.04          | 2.99            | 0.99           | 3.03         | 0.97        |
| Act. open-minded thinking (0-10)        | 4.17        | 0.54          |                 |                |              |             |
| MIST veracity discernment (0-1)         | 0.83        | 0.15          |                 |                |              |             |
| Personality (TIPI) (1-7)                |             |               |                 |                |              |             |
| Openness                                | 5.21        | 1.23          |                 |                |              |             |
| Conscientiousness                       | 5.64        | 1.22          |                 |                |              |             |
| Extraversion                            | 3.49        | 1.69          |                 |                |              |             |
| Agreeableness                           | 5.40        | 1.23          |                 |                |              |             |
| Neuroticism (emo. stability)             | 4.88        | 1.61          |                 |                |              |             |
Table S2.
Pilot study (emotional language): independent samples and Bayesian $t$-tests for averaged scores for manipulativeness, confidence (manipulative/fake posts and control/neutral posts separately), credibility, and sharing. *Note:* Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2).

| Variable                        | Statistic     | ±%  | df  | $p$  | $M_{diff}$ | 95% CI       | Cohen’s $d$ | 95% CI       |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----|------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Discernment-Manipulativeness    | Student’s $t$ | -2.341 | 192 | 0.02 | -0.48      | -0.88, -0.075 | -0.34       | -0.62, -0.05 |
|                                 | Bayes factor₁₀ | 1.974 | 1.59E-08 |       |            |              |             |              |
| Fake-Confidence                 | Student’s $t$ | -2.075 | 192 | 0.039 | -0.33      | -0.65, -0.02  | -0.30       | -0.58, -0.01 |
|                                 | Bayes factor₁₀ | 1.151 | 2.30E-08 |       |            |              |             |              |
| Control-Confidence              | Student’s $t$ | -0.161 | 192 | 0.872 | -0.028     | -0.37, 0.31   | -0.02       | -0.31, 0.26  |
|                                 | Bayes factor₁₀ | 0.158 | 5.84E-08 |       |            |              |             |              |
| Discernment-Credibility         | Student’s $t$ | -0.0169 | 192 | 0.987 | -0.0029    | -0.34, 0.33   | 0.00        | -0.28, 0.28  |
|                                 | Bayes factor₁₀ | 0.156 | 5.86E-08 |       |            |              |             |              |
| Discernment-Sharing             | Student’s $t$ | -1.358 | 192 | 0.176 | -0.19      | -0.46, 0.08   | -0.20       | -0.48, 0.09  |
|                                 | Bayes factor₁₀ | 0.369 | 4.33E-08 |       |            |              |             |              |
Table S3.
Study 1 (emotional language): technique recognition measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “C.” denotes a manipulativeness post’s matched neutral control.

| Manipulativeness                  | Statistic | ±%  | df   | p      | M_{u} | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----|------|--------|-------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Manipulativeness    | Student’s t | 9.2897 | 1069 | <.001 | 0.68  | 0.53, 0.82 | 0.57      | 0.44, 0.69 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 4.59E+16 | 3.30E-22 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Neutral-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | -0.2205 | 1069 | 0.825 | -0.02 | -0.16, 0.13 | -0.01     | -0.13, 0.11 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.0701 | 4.39E-4 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Discernment-Manipulativeness     | Student’s t | 7.9421 | 1068 | <.001 | 0.69  | 0.52, 0.86 | 0.49      | 0.36, 0.61 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 9.82E+11 | 1.81E-17 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Abduction-Manipulativeness       | Student’s t | 1.8014 | 527  | 0.072 | 0.30  | -0.03, 0.63 | 0.16      | -0.01, 0.33 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.4676 | 7.99E-7 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Abduction-C-Manipulativeness     | Student’s t | -1.8126 | 541  | 0.07  | -0.25 | -0.53, 0.02 | -0.16     | -0.32, 0.01 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.4713 | 1.03E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Airline-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | 8.0943 | 531  | <.001 | 1.23  | 0.93, 1.52 | 0.70      | 0.52, 0.88 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 1.37E+12 | 7.00E-20 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Airline-C-Manipulativeness       | Student’s t | 0.8805 | 537  | 0.379 | 0.14  | -0.17, 0.44 | 0.08      | -0.09, 0.24 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.1398 | 3.43E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Gun2a-Manipulativeness           | Student’s t | 4.033  | 533  | <.001 | 0.60  | 0.31, 0.89 | 0.35      | 0.18, 0.52 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 239.5645 | 1.25E-9 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Gun2a-C-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | -1.8492 | 535  | 0.065 | -0.28 | -0.57, 0.02 | -0.16     | -0.33, 0.01 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.5066 | 8.18E-7 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Immigration-Manipulativeness     | Student’s t | -1.4509 | 534  | 0.147 | -0.23 | -0.53, 0.08 | -0.13     | -0.30, 0.04 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.2678 | 1.61E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Immigr-C-Manipulativeness        | Student’s t | 0.5145 | 534  | 0.607 | 0.08  | -0.22, 0.37 | 0.04      | -0.13, 0.21 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.1097 | 3.99E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Suicide-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | 7.7556 | 531  | <.001 | 1.02  | 0.76, 1.28 | 0.67      | 0.49, 0.85 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 1.29E+11 | 8.53E-19 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Suicide-C-Manipulativeness       | Student’s t | 0.0305 | 537  | 0.976 | 0.00  | -0.30, 0.30 | 0.00      | -0.17, 0.17 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.0959 | 5.12E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Baby-Manipulativeness            | Student’s t | 5.1962 | 533  | <.001 | 0.70  | 0.43, 0.96 | 0.45      | 0.28, 0.62 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 3.7385.6246 | 6.49E-12 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Baby-C-Manipulativeness          | Student’s t | -3.1298 | 535  | 0.002 | -0.46 | -0.76, -0.17 | -0.27     | -0.44, -0.10 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 10.9215 | 3.42E-8 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Elephant-Manipulativeness        | Student’s t | 9.2423 | 537  | <.001 | 1.42  | 1.12, 1.72 | 0.80      | 0.61, 0.98 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 7.60E+15 | 1.02E-23 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Elephant-C-Manipulativeness      | Student’s t | 2.3871 | 531  | 0.017 | 0.35  | 0.06, 0.64 | 0.21      | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 1.5275 | 2.42E-7 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Health-Manipulativeness          | Student’s t | 5.8033 | 531  | <.001 | 0.84  | 0.55, 1.12 | 0.50      | 0.33, 0.68 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 827141.6117 | 2.40E-13 |        |       |        |           |        |
| Health-C-Manipulativeness        | Student’s t | -0.5035 | 537  | 0.615 | -0.08 | -0.38, 0.22 | -0.04     | -0.21, 0.13 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.1086 | 4.42E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Phone-Manipulativeness           | Student’s t | 2.4336 | 532  | 0.015 | 0.40  | 0.08, 0.73 | 0.21      | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 1.6991 | 2.26E-7 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Phone-C-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | 1.4221 | 536  | 0.156 | 0.22  | -0.09, 0.53 | 0.12      | -0.05, 0.29 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.2565 | 1.80E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Suppl-Manipulativeness           | Student’s t | 3.8452 | 532  | <.001 | 0.48  | 0.23, 0.73 | 0.33      | 0.16, 0.51 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 118.7088 | 2.50E-9 |       |       |        |           |        |
| Suppl-C-Manipulativeness         | Student’s t | 1.0095 | 536  | 0.313 | 0.16  | -0.15, 0.46 | 0.09      | -0.08, 0.26 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.1576 | 2.96E-6 |       |       |        |           |        |

*Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances
### Table S4.
Study 1 (emotional language): confidence measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian $t$-tests). *Note:* Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). "--C--" denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Confidence            | Statistic | ±%     | df    | $p$     | $M_{diff}$ | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------|-------|---------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Confidence | Student's t | 8.1402 | 1069  | < .001 | 0.53       | 0.40, 0.66 | 0.50     | 0.37, 0.62 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 4.35E+12 | 4.04E-18 | 1069  | < .001 | 0.22 | 0.09, 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.09, 0.33 |
| Neutral-Confidence    | Student's t | 3.3833 | 18.8684 | 1.46E-6 | 1068  | < .001 | 0.30 | 0.20, 0.41 | 0.34 | 0.22, 0.46 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 5.583  | 266058.84 | 8.59E-11 | 527 | 0.041 | 0.28 | 0.01, 0.56 | 0.18 | 0.01, 0.35 |
| Discrimment-Confidence | Student's t | 2.0473 | 0.7393 | 4.92E-7 | 541 | 0.014 | 0.30 | 0.06, 0.54 | 0.21 | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 2.4558 | 1.7779 | 2.57E-7 | 531 | < .001 | 0.67 | 0.44, 0.91 | 0.49 | 0.32, 0.67 |
| Abduction-Confidence  | Student's t | 2.4173 | 5.6973 | 471090.10 | 4.36E-13 | 537 | 0.123 | 0.20 | -0.05, 0.45 | 0.13 | -0.04, 0.30 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 0.305  | 0.357  | 0.1515 | 0.29E-9 | 533 | < .001 | 0.48 | 0.24, 0.71 | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.52 |
| Gun2a-Confidence       | Student's t | 3.9849 | 199447.5 | 1.52E-9 | 535 | 0.335 | 0.12 | -0.12, 0.36 | 0.08 | -0.09, 0.25 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 0.9657 | 0.1515 | 2.92E-6 | 534 | 0.457 | 0.09 | -0.15, 0.33 | 0.06 | -0.11, 0.23 |
| Immigration-Confidence | Student's t | 0.7445 | 0.126  | 3.56E-6 | 534 | 0.956 | 0.01 | -0.24, 0.26 | 0.00 | -0.17, 0.18 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 0.0555 | 0.0966 | 4.56E-6 | 531 | < .001 | 0.92 | 0.69, 1.16 | 0.67 | 0.49, 0.85 |
| Suicide-Confidence     | Student's t | 7.7141 | 9.70E+10 | 1.15E-18 | 537 | 0.075 | 0.22 | -0.02, 0.46 | 0.15 | -0.02, 0.32 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 1.7828 | 0.4491 | 1.01E-6 | 533 | < .001 | 0.69 | 0.46, 0.93 | 0.50 | 0.33, 0.68 |
| Baby-Confidence        | Student's t | 5.7898 | 770621.43 | 2.74E-13 | 535 | 0.014 | 0.32 | 0.07, 0.57 | 0.21 | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 2.473  | 1.8607 | 2.19E-7 | 532 | 0.025 | 0.30 | 0.04, 0.56 | 0.19 | 0.02, 0.37 |
| Elephant-Confidence    | Student's t | 6.3991 | 2.34E+10 | 8.77E-15 | 537 | < .001 | 0.78 | 0.54, 1.03 | 0.55 | 0.38, 0.73 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 1.7567 | 0.432  | 9.18E-7 | 531 | 0.08 | 0.24 | -0.03, 0.50 | 0.15 | -0.02, 0.32 |
| Health-Confidence      | Student's t | 4.6828 | 34771565 | 7.39E-11 | 531 | < .001 | 0.59 | 0.34, 0.84 | 0.41 | 0.23, 0.58 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 3.4974 | 350431 | 1.02E-8 | 537 | < .001 | 0.42 | 0.18, 0.65 | 0.30 | 0.13, 0.47 |
| Phone-Confidence       | Student's t | 2.2503 | 1.1226 | 3.50E-7 | 532 | 0.025 | 0.30 | 0.04, 0.56 | 0.19 | 0.02, 0.37 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 1.6813 | 0.3789 | 1.19E-6 | 536 | 0.093 | 0.21 | -0.04, 0.45 | 0.14 | -0.02, 0.31 |
| Suppl-Confidence       | Student's t | 3.9763 | 193289 | 1.50E-9 | 532 | < .001 | 0.47 | 0.24, 0.70 | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.52 |
|                       | BF$_{10}$ | 2.3224 | 1.3128 | 3.18E-7 | 536 | 0.021 | 0.29 | 0.04, 0.54 | 0.20 | 0.03, 0.37 |

*Levene’s test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.*
Table S5.
Study 1 (emotional language): trustworthiness measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “*C.-*” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Trustworthiness              | Statistic | ±%   | df | p     | M_mfd | 95% CI  | Cohen's d | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-----------|------|----|-------|--------|----------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Trustworthiness | Student's t | -0.474 | 1069 | 0.636 | 0.03 | -0.17, 0.10 | -0.03 | -0.15, 0.09 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.0765 | 4.01E-04 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Neutral-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | 4.156 | 1069 | <.001 | 0.26 | 0.14, 0.38 | 0.25 | 0.13, 0.37 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 321.9585 | 8.10E-08 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Discrimment-Trustworthiness  | Student's t | 4.051 | 1068 | <.001 | 0.29 | 0.15, 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.13, 0.37 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 212.0718 | 1.23E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Abduction-Trustworthiness    | Student's t | 2     | 527  | 0.046 | 0.31 | 0.01, 0.61 | 0.17 | 0.00, 0.34 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.674 | 5.43E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Abduction-C-Trustworthiness  | Student's t | 2.705 | 541  | 0.007 | 0.33 | 0.09, 0.57 | 0.23 | 0.06, 0.40 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 3.3061 | 1.34E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Airline-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | -2.014 | 531  | 0.045 | -0.26 | -0.52, -0.01 | -0.17 | -0.34, 0.00 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.6896 | 5.77E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Airline-C-Trustworthiness    | Student's t | 1.649 | 537  | 0.1 | 0.21 | -0.04, 0.45 | 0.14 | -0.03, 0.31 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.3593 | 1.27E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Gun2a-Trustworthiness        | Student's t | -1.765 | 533  | 0.078 | -0.27 | -0.57, 0.03 | -0.15 | -0.32, 0.02 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.4369 | 9.50E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Gun2a-C-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | 0.853 | 535  | 0.394 | 0.11 | -0.14, 0.35 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.1371 | 3.25E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Immigration-Trustworthiness  | Student's t | 2.119 | 534  | 0.035 | 0.33 | 0.02, 0.64 | 0.18 | 0.01, 0.35 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.8505 | 4.75E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Immigr-C-Trustworthiness     | Student's t | 1.559 | 534  | 0.12 | 0.20 | -0.05, 0.45 | 0.14 | -0.04, 0.31 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.314 | 1.31E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Suicide-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | -1.268 | 531  | 0.205 | -0.17 | -0.44, 0.10 | -0.11 | -0.28, 0.06 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.2107 | 2.02E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Suicide-C-Trustworthiness    | Student's t | 1.429 | 537  | 0.154 | 0.19 | -0.07, 0.44 | 0.12 | -0.05, 0.29 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.2589 | 1.80E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Baby-Trustworthiness         | Student's t | -0.868 | 533  | 0.386 | -0.13 | -0.41, 0.16 | -0.08 | -0.24, 0.09 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.1389 | 3.24E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Baby-C-Trustworthiness       | Student's t | 4.068 | 535  | <.001 | 0.53 | 0.27, 0.78 | 0.35 | 0.18, 0.52 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 273.339 | 1.17E-09 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Elephant-Trustworthiness     | Student's t | 2.431 | 537  | 0.015 | -0.33 | -0.60, -0.06 | -0.21 | -0.38, -0.04 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 1.6821 | 2.51E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Elephant-C-Trustworthiness   | Student's t | 1.938 | 531  | 0.053 | 0.25 | 0.00, 0.51 | 0.17 | 0.00, 0.34 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.598 | 6.51E-07 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Health-Trustworthiness       | Student's t | -1.699 | 531  | 0.09 | -0.23 | -0.49, 0.04 | -0.15 | -0.32, 0.02 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.3919 | 1.04E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Health-C-Trustworthiness     | Student's t | 4.273 | 537  | <.001 | 0.53 | 0.28, 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.20, 0.54 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 614.1642 | 5.12E-10 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Phone-Trustworthiness        | Student's t | 0.742 | 532  | 0.459 | 0.11 | -0.17, 0.39 | 0.06 | -0.11, 0.23 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.1259 | 3.52E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Phone-C-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | 1.545 | 536  | 0.123 | 0.20 | -0.05, 0.45 | 0.13 | -0.04, 0.30 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.3062 | 1.49E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Suppl-Trustworthiness        | Student's t | 0.158 | 532  | 0.875 | 0.02 | -0.25, 0.29 | 0.01 | -0.16, 0.18 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.0976 | 4.46E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |
| Suppl-C-Trustworthiness      | Student's t | 1.321 | 536  | 0.187 | 0.18 | -0.09, 0.45 | 0.11 | -0.06, 0.28 |
|                            | BF₁₀      | 0.2244 | 2.04E-06 | 0.00, 0.00 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances
Table S6.
Study 1 (emotional language): sharing intentions measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Sharing          | Statistic | %  | df  | p    | Mdiff | 95% CI             | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|------------------|-----------|----|-----|------|-------|---------------------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Sharing | Student's t | -0.24 | 1069 | 0.81 | -0.02 | -0.20, 0.15 | -0.01 | -0.13, 0.11 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.0704 | 4.37E-04 |
| Neutral-Sharing  | Student's t | 2.209 | 1069 | 0.027 | 0.21 | 0.02, 0.39 | 0.14 | 0.01, 0.26 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.7568 | 3.87E-05 |
| Discernment-Sharing  | Student's t | 3.496 | 1068 | <.001 | 0.23 | 0.10, 0.36 | 0.21 | 0.09, 0.33 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 27.5131 | 9.83E-07 |
| Abduction-Sharing | Student's t | 2.742 | 527  | 0.006 | 0.47 | 0.13, 0.81 | 0.24 | 0.07, 0.41 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 3.683 | 9.01E-08 |
| Abduction-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.4 | 541  | 0.689 | 0.07 | -0.39, 0.26 | -0.03 | -0.20, 0.13 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1032 | 5.09E-06 |
| Airline-Sharing  | Student's t | -1.748 | 531  | 0.081 | 0.28 | -0.59, 0.03 | -0.15 | -0.32, 0.02 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.4249 | 9.62E-07 |
| Airline-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.259 | 537  | 0.796 | -0.04 | -0.37, 0.28 | -0.02 | -0.19, 0.15 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.0991 | 4.94E-06 |
| Gun2a-Sharing    | Student's t | -0.151 | 533  | 0.88  | -0.02 | -0.33, 0.28 | -0.01 | -0.18, 0.16 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.0974 | 4.64E-06 |
| Gun2a-C-Sharing  | Student's t | 0.6  | 535  | 0.549 | 0.10 | -0.23, 0.43 | 0.05  | -0.12, 0.22 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1147 | 3.93E-06 |
| Immigration-Sharing | Student's t | 1.586 | 534  | 0.85  | 0.03 | -0.30, 0.37 | 0.02  | -0.15, 0.19 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.0979 | 4.65E-06 |
| Immigr-C-Sharing | Student's t | 1.586 | 534  | 0.113 | 0.25 | -0.06, 0.57 | 0.14  | -0.03, 0.31 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.3271 | 1.26E-06 |
| Suicide-Sharing  | Student's t | -0.279 | 531  | 0.78  | -0.04 | -0.34, 0.26 | -0.02 | -0.19, 0.15 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1001 | 4.44E-06 |
| Suicide-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.267 | 537  | 0.79  | -0.04 | -0.33, 0.25 | -0.02 | -0.19, 0.15 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.0993 | 4.94E-06 |
| Baby-Sharing     | Student's t | -0.588 | 533  | 0.557 | -0.09 | -0.41, 0.22 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.12 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1138 | 3.99E-06 |
| Baby-C-Sharing   | Student's t | 3.26  | 535  | 0.001 | 0.53 | 0.21, 0.85 | 0.28  | 0.11, 0.45 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 16.2521 | 2.25E-08 |
| Elephant-Sharing | Student's t | -1.297 | 537  | 0.195 | -0.21 | -0.52, 0.11 | -0.11 | -0.28, 0.06 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.2172 | 2.16E-06 |
| Elephant-C-Sharing | Student's t | 1.42  | 531  | 0.156 | 0.24 | -0.09, 0.58 | 0.12  | -0.05, 0.29 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.2571 | 1.59E-06 |
| Health-Sharing   | Student's t | -1.088 | 531  | 0.277 | -0.17 | -0.47, 0.13 | -0.09 | -0.26, 0.08 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1714 | 2.50E-06 |
| Health-C-Sharing | Student's t | 2.41  | 537  | 0.016 | 0.39 | 0.07, 0.70 | 0.21  | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 1.6024 | 2.60E-07 |
| Phone-Sharing    | Student's t | 0.8   | 532  | 0.424 | 0.14 | -0.20, 0.49 | 0.07  | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1315 | 3.36E-06 |
| Phone-C-Sharing  | Student's t | 1.447 | 536  | 0.149 | 0.25 | -0.09, 0.58 | 0.12  | -0.04, 0.29 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.2654 | 1.73E-06 |
| Suppl-Sharing    | Student's t | 0.729 | 532  | 0.466 | 0.11 | -0.19, 0.41 | 0.06  | -0.11, 0.23 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.125 | 3.44E-06 |
| Suppl-C-Sharing  | Student's t | 1.145 | 536  | 0.253 | 0.17 | -0.12, 0.47 | 0.10  | -0.07, 0.27 |
|                  | BF₁₀      | 0.1816 | 2.55E-06 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
### Table S7.
Study 2 (incoherence): technique recognition measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). **Note**: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). "-"C"-" denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Incoherence        | Statistic | ±%  | df  | p     | M_{diff} | 95% CI     | Cohen's d | 95% CI |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|----------|------------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Incoherence | Student's t | 17.89 | 1084 | <.001 | 1.44  | 1.28, 1.60 | 1.09 | 0.95, 1.22 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 1.82E+59 | 1.63E-65 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Neutral-Incoherence   | Student's t | 7.08 | 1082 | <.001 | 0.52  | 0.38, 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.31, 0.55 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 2.21e0+9 | 1.04E-14 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Discrimment-Incoherence | Student's t | 10.12 | 1082 | <.001 | 0.92  | 0.74, 1.10 | 0.62 | 0.49, 0.74 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 7.57E+19 | 2.13E-25 |       |         |            |           |        |
| StockMarket-Incoherence | Student's t | 11.13 | 543  | <.001 | 1.81  | 1.49, 2.13 | 0.95 | 0.77, 1.14 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 6.33E+22 | 5.29E-31 |       |         |            |           |        |
| StockMarket-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 7.84    | 539  | <.001 | 1.34  | 1.00, 1.67 | 0.68 | 0.50, 0.85 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 2.28E+11 | 5.90E-19 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Morality-Incoherence  | Student's t | 8.72    | 543  | <.001 | 1.45  | 1.12, 1.77 | 0.75 | 0.57, 0.93 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 1.45E+14 | 8.99E-22 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Morality-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 7.29    | 539  | <.001 | 1.23  | 0.90, 1.56 | 0.63 | 0.45, 0.80 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 5.78e0+9 | 3.03E-17 |       |         |            |           |        |
| TanningBeds-Incoherence  | Student's t | 3.93    | 543  | <.001 | 0.70  | 0.35, 1.04 | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.51 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 162.627 | 2.34e0-9 |       |         |            |           |        |
| TanningBeds-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 1.75    | 539  | 0.08  | 0.25  | -0.03, 0.53 | 0.15 | -0.02, 0.32 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 0.427   | 1.10e0-6 |       |         |            |           |        |
| VideoGames-Incoherence | Student's t | 9.2     | 542  | <.001 | 1.54  | 1.21, 1.87 | 0.79 | 0.61, 0.97 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 5.67E+15 | 1.84E-23 |       |         |            |           |        |
| VideoGames-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 3.2     | 540  | 0.001 | 0.51  | 0.20, 0.82 | 0.28 | 0.10, 0.45 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 13.5    | 3.02e0-8 |       |         |            |           |        |
| TrueOrFalse-Incoherence | Student's t | 7.24    | 540  | <.001 | 1.19  | 0.86, 1.51 | 0.62 | 0.45, 0.80 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 4.24e0+9 | 4.31E-17 |       |         |            |           |        |
| TrueOrFalse-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 2.9     | 542  | 0.004 | 0.51  | 0.16, 0.85 | 0.25 | 0.08, 0.42 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 5.641   | 7.81e0-8 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Consensus-Incoherence  | Student's t | 6.9     | 542  | <.001 | 1.25  | 0.90, 1.61 | 0.59 | 0.42, 0.77 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 4.79e0+8 | 4.41E-16 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Consensus-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 5.52    | 540  | <.001 | 0.95  | 0.61, 1.29 | 0.47 | 0.30, 0.65 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 186016.535 | 1.44E-12 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Predictions-Incoherence | Student's t | 9.55    | 543  | <.001 | 1.64  | 1.31, 1.98 | 0.82 | 0.64, 1.00 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 9.45E+16 | 1.00E-24 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Predictions-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 1.01    | 539  | 0.313 | 0.15  | -0.15, 0.45 | 0.09 | -0.08, 0.26 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 0.157   | 3.15e0-6 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Temperatures-Incoherence  | Student's t | 10.6    | 543  | <.001 | 1.81  | 1.48, 2.15 | 0.91 | 0.72, 1.09 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 6.29E+20 | 8.70E-29 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Temperatures-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 3.86    | 539  | <.001 | 0.60  | 0.29, 0.91 | 0.33 | 0.16, 0.50 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 125.02  | 2.87e0-9 |       |         |            |           |        |
| DataPrivacy-Incoherence  | Student's t | 10.56   | 541  | <.001 | 1.90  | 1.54, 2.25 | 0.91 | 0.72, 1.09 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 4.11E+20 | 1.19E-28 |       |         |            |           |        |
| DataPrivacy-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 1.37    | 541  | 0.172 | 0.23  | -0.10, 0.57 | 0.12 | -0.05, 0.29 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 0.237   | 2.12e0-6 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Beliefs-Incoherence   | Student's t | 6.58    | 541  | <.001 | 1.07  | 0.75, 1.38 | 0.57 | 0.39, 0.74 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 6.98e0+7 | 3.19E-15 |       |         |            |           |        |
| Beliefs-C-Incoherence | Student's t | 1.01    | 541  | 0.314 | 0.18  | -0.17, 0.54 | 0.09 | -0.08, 0.26 |
|                    | BF_{10}   | 0.157   | 3.29e0-6 |       |         |            |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S8.
Study 2 (incoherence): confidence measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Confidence               | Statistic   | ±%   | df   | p    | M_{diff} | 95% CI     | Cohen’s d   | 95% CI   |
|--------------------------|-------------|------|------|------|----------|------------|-------------|----------|
| Manipulative-Confidence  | Student’s t | 0.721| 1084 | 0.471| 0.05     | -0.08, 0.18| 0.04        | -0.08, 0.16|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.0879| 3.99E-04|      |          |            |             |          |
| Neutral-Confidence       | Student’s t | -2.266| 1082 | 0.024| -0.15    | -0.27, -0.02| -0.14       | -0.26, -0.02|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.8515| 3.88E-05|      |          |            |             |          |
| Discrimment-Confidence   | Student’s t | 3.9   | 1082 | <.001| 0.19     | 0.10, 0.29 | 0.24        | 0.12, 0.36|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 117.5321| 2.57E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| StockMarket-Confidence   | Student’s t | 0.249| 543  | 0.804| 0.03     | -0.22, 0.28 | 0.02        | -0.15, 0.19|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.0984| 5.40E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| StockMarket-C-Confidence | Student’s t | -1.05| 539  | 0.294| -0.13    | -0.38, 0.12 | -0.09       | -0.26, 0.08|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.164| 2.88E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| Morality-Confidence      | Student’s t | 1.972| 543  | 0.049| 0.24     | 0.00, 0.48 | 0.17        | 0.00, 0.34|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.6305| 7.86E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| Morality-C-Confidence    | Student’s t | -0.423| 539  | 0.672| -0.05    | -0.28, 0.18 | -0.04       | -0.20, 0.13|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1044| 4.87E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| TanningBeds-Confidence   | Student’s t | -2.287| 543  | 0.023| -0.29    | -0.54, -0.04 | -0.20       | -0.36, -0.03|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 1.2079| 3.91E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| TanningBeds-C-Confidence | Student’s t | -2.201| 539  | 0.028| -0.29    | -0.54, -0.03 | -0.19       | -0.36, -0.02|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 1.0039| 4.48E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| VideoGames-Confidence    | Student’s t | -0.312| 542  | 0.755| -0.04    | -0.28, 0.20 | -0.03       | -0.19, 0.14|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1001| 5.34E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| VideoGames-C-Confidence  | Student’s t | -1.643| 540  | 0.101| -0.21    | -0.47, 0.04 | -0.14       | -0.31, 0.03|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.355| 1.37E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| TrueOrFalse-Confidence   | Student’s t | 3.9   | 540  | <.001| 0.45     | 0.22, 0.68 | 0.34        | 0.16, 0.51|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 144.3469| 2.54E-09|      |          |            |             |          |
| TrueOrFalse-C-Confidence | Student’s t | -2.977| 542  | 0.003| -0.37    | -0.61, -0.13 | -0.26       | -0.42, -0.09|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 6.9478| 6.28E-08|      |          |            |             |          |
| Consensus-Confidence     | Student’s t | -1.989| 542  | 0.047| -0.25    | -0.50, 0.00 | -0.17       | -0.34, 0.00|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.6523| 7.43E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| Consensus-C-Confidence   | Student’s t | -0.243| 540  | 0.808| -0.03    | -0.29, 0.23 | -0.02       | -0.19, 0.15|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.0985| 5.18E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| Predictions-Confidence   | Student’s t | 0.94  | 543  | 0.347| 0.12     | -0.13, 0.37 | 0.08        | -0.09, 0.25|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1466| 3.63E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| Predictions-C-Confidence | Student’s t | -0.719| 539  | 0.472| -0.09    | -0.33, 0.15 | -0.06       | -0.23, 0.11|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1231| 4.07E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| Temperatures-Confidence  | Student’s t | 0.736 | 543  | 0.462| 0.09     | -0.15, 0.34 | 0.06        | -0.11, 0.23|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1241| 4.33E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| Temperatures-C-Confidence| Student’s t | -0.44 | 539  | 0.66  | -0.05    | -0.30, 0.19 | -0.04       | -0.21, 0.13|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1052| 4.79E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| DataPrivacy-Confidence    | Student’s t | 1.713 | 541  | 0.087| 0.23     | -0.03, 0.48 | 0.15        | -0.02, 0.32|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.3976| 1.24E-06|      |          |            |             |          |
| DataPrivacy-C-Confidence  | Student’s t | -3.074| 541  | 0.002| -0.38    | -0.63, -0.14 | -0.26       | -0.43, -0.09|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 9.2291| 4.59E-08|      |          |            |             |          |
| Beliefs-Confidence        | Student’s t | 2.036 | 541  | 0.042| 0.24     | 0.01, 0.48 | 0.17        | 0.01, 0.34|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.7143| 6.68E-07|      |          |            |             |          |
| Beliefs-C-Confidence      | Student’s t | -1.145| 541  | 0.253| -0.15    | -0.40, 0.11 | -0.10       | -0.27, 0.07|
|                          | BF_{10}     | 0.1808| 2.82E-06|      |          |            |             |          |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S9.
Study 2 (incoherence): trustworthiness measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Trustworthiness          | Statistic   | ±%  | df  | p       | $\Delta_{\text{eff}}$ | 95% CI       | Cohen’s $d$ | 95% CI       |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|---------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Manipulative-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -4.724 | 1084 | <.001  | -0.33                  | -0.47, -0.19 | -0.29       | -0.41, -0.17 |
|                          | BF$_{10}$   | 3712.974 | 7.83e-0-9 | 1082 | 0.134   | -0.10                  | -0.22, 0.03  | -0.09       | -0.21, 0.03  |
| Neutral-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t | -1.499 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.206 | 1.65e-0-4 | 1082 | 0.002 | 0.24 | 0.09, 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.07, 0.31 |
|                          | BF$_{10}$   | 3.11 | 7.876 | 4.03e-0-6 | 543 <.001 | -0.49 | -0.77, -0.22 | -0.30       | -0.47, -0.13 |
| Discernment-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -3.54 | BF$_{10}$ | 40.336 | 9.92e-0-9 | 539 <.005 | -0.38 | -0.65, -0.12 | -0.24 | -0.41, -0.07 |
| StockMarket-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -2.834 | BF$_{10}$ | 4.673 | 8.54e-0-8 | 543 <.001 | -0.70 | -0.99, -0.41 | -0.41 | -0.58, -0.24 |
| StockMarket-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -4.793 | BF$_{10}$ | 5661.492 | 5.95E-11 | 539 <.001 | -0.55 | -0.83, -0.26 | -0.33 | -0.50, -0.16 |
| Morality-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -3.799 | BF$_{10}$ | 99.881 | 3.67e-0-9 | 543 0.277 | 0.15  | -0.12, 0.43 | 0.09 | -0.08, 0.26 |
| TanningBeds-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | 1.089 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.17 | 3.06e-0-6 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.125 | 3.99e-0-6 | 539 | 0.457 | -0.10, 0.36, 0.16 | -0.06 | -0.23, 0.10 |
| VideoGames-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -3.128 | BF$_{10}$ | 10.827 | 3.95e-0-8 | 542 0.002 | -0.43 | -0.70, -0.16 | -0.27 | -0.44, -0.10 |
| VideoGames-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | 1.425 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.257 | 1.92e-0-6 | 540 0.155 | 0.20 | -0.08, 0.49 | 0.12 | -0.05, 0.29 |
| TrueOrFalse-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -1.235 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.201 | 2.48e-0-6 | 540 0.217 | -0.18 | -0.47, 0.11 | -0.11 | -0.27, 0.06 |
| TrueOrFalse-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -1.433 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.259 | 1.97e-0-6 | 542 0.152 | -0.21 | -0.51, 0.08 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
| Consensus-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | 0.519 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.109 | 4.87e-0-6 | 542 0.604 | 0.08 | -0.22, 0.38 | 0.04 | -0.12, 0.21 |
| Consensus-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -3.714 | BF$_{10}$ | 73.605 | 5.04e-0-9 | 540 <.001 | -0.56 | -0.86, -0.26 | -0.32 | -0.49, -0.15 |
| Predictions-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -2.39 | BF$_{10}$ | 1.522 | 3.13e-0-7 | 543 0.017 | -0.32 | -0.58, -0.06 | -0.20 | -0.37, -0.04 |
| Predictions-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | 0.805 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.131 | 3.80e-0-6 | 539 0.421 | 0.11 | -0.15, 0.37 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
| Temperatures-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -0.585 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.113 | 4.79e-0-6 | 543 0.559 | -0.08 | -0.33, 0.18 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.12 |
| Temperatures-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -0.325 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.101 | 5.01e-0-6 | 539 0.745 | 0.05 | -0.34, 0.24 | -0.03 | -0.20, 0.14 |
| DataPrivacy-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -7.856 | BF$_{10}$ | 6.64E-11 | 6.03E-19 | 541 <.001 | -1.21 | -1.51, -0.91 | -0.67 | -0.85, -0.50 |
| DataPrivacy-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -0.426 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.104 | 5.03e-0-6 | 541 0.67 | 0.06 | -0.35, 0.22 | -0.04 | -0.20, 0.13 |
| Beliefs-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -2.093 | BF$_{10}$ | 0.801 | 5.92e-0-7 | 541 0.037 | -0.27 | -0.52, -0.02 | -0.18 | -0.35, -0.01 |
| Beliefs-C-Trustworthiness | Student’s t | 2.935 | BF$_{10}$ | 6.168 | 6.99e-0-8 | 541 0.003 | 0.41 | 0.14, 0.69 | 0.25 | 0.08, 0.42 |

* Levene’s test is significant ($p < .05$), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S10.
Study 2 (incoherence): sharing intentions measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note:* Bayesan prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). "-C-" denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Sharing               | Statistic | ±%  | df   | p    | M_{diff} | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----|------|------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Sharing  | Student’s t | -1.1953 | 1084 | 0.232 | -0.09 | -0.23 | 0.06 | -0.07 | -0.19 | 0.05 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1375 | 2.53E-04 | | | | | |
| Neutral-Sharing       | Student’s t | 0.0464 | 1082 | 0.963 | 0.00 | -0.16 | 0.17 | 0.00 | -0.12 | 0.12 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.0681 | 5.08E-04 | | | | | |
| Discernment-Sharing   | Student’s t | 1.6036 | 1082 | 0.109 | 0.10 | -0.02 | 0.22 | 0.10 | -0.02 | 0.22 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.2417 | 1.40E-04 | | | | | |
| StockMarket-Sharing   | Student’s t | 0.7448 | 543  | 0.457 | 0.10 | -0.17 | 0.38 | 0.06 | -0.10 | 0.23 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1251 | 4.19E-06 | | | | | |
| StockMarket-C-Sharing | Student’s t | -1.4887 | 539  | 0.137 | 0.20 | -0.47 | 0.06 | -0.13 | -0.30 | 0.04 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.2817 | 1.63E-06 | | | | | |
| Morality-Sharing      | Student’s t | -1.7183 | 543  | 0.086 | -0.25 | -0.53 | 0.04 | -0.15 | -0.32 | 0.02 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.4004 | 1.27E-06 | | | | | |
| Morality-C-Sharing    | Student’s t | -2.1472 | 539  | 0.032 | -0.32 | -0.62 | -0.03 | -0.18 | -0.35 | -0.02 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.8966 | 5.08E-07 | | | | | |
| TanningBeds-Sharing   | Student’s t | 0.2995 | 543  | 0.765 | 0.04 | -0.22 | 0.31 | 0.03 | -0.14 | 0.19 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.0997 | 5.36E-06 | | | | | |
| TanningBeds-C-Sharing | Student’s t | 0.6516 | 539  | 0.515 | 0.11 | -0.22 | 0.44 | 0.06 | -0.11 | 0.22 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1777 | 4.26E-06 | | | | | |
| VideoGames-Sharing    | Student’s t | -1.3248 | 542  | 0.186 | -0.17 | -0.43 | 0.08 | -0.11 | -0.28 | 0.05 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.2241 | 2.29E-06 | | | | | |
| VideoGames-C-Sharing  | Student’s t | 0.9795 | 540  | 0.328 | 0.14 | -0.14 | 0.42 | 0.08 | -0.08 | 0.25 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1525 | 3.32E-06 | | | | | |
| TrueOrFalse-Sharing   | Student’s t | -1.3688 | 540  | 0.172 | -0.19 | -0.46 | 0.08 | -0.12 | -0.29 | 0.05 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.2378 | 2.08E-06 | | | | | |
| TrueOrFalse-C-Sharing | Student’s t | -0.0649 | 542  | 0.948 | -0.01 | -0.32 | 0.30 | -0.01 | -0.17 | 0.16 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.0956 | 5.61E-06 | | | | | |
| Consensus-Sharing     | Student’s t | -0.6266 | 542  | 0.531 | -0.09 | -0.35 | 0.18 | -0.05 | -0.22 | 0.11 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1155 | 4.57E-06 | | | | | |
| Consensus-C-Sharing   | Student’s t | -1.4069 | 540  | 0.16 | -0.24 | -0.57 | 0.09 | -0.12 | -0.29 | 0.05 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.2505 | 1.94E-06 | | | | | |
| Predictions-Sharing   | Student’s t | -0.6986 | 543  | 0.485 | -0.09 | -0.34 | 0.16 | -0.06 | -0.23 | 0.11 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1209 | 4.45E-06 | | | | | |
| Predictions-C-Sharing | Student’s t | 2.2643 | 539  | 0.024 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.71 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.36 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 1.1512 | 3.88E-07 | | | | | |
| Temperatures-Sharing  | Student’s t | -1.6652 | 543  | 0.096 | -0.19 | -0.42 | 0.03 | -0.14 | -0.31 | 0.03 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.3671 | 1.39E-06 | | | | | |
| Temperatures-C-Sharing | Student’s t | -0.2643 | 539  | 0.792 | -0.04 | -0.38 | 0.29 | -0.02 | -0.19 | 0.15 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.0992 | 5.11E-06 | | | | | |
| DataPrivacy-Sharing   | Student’s t | -2.2909 | 541  | 0.022 | -0.33 | -0.62 | -0.05 | -0.20 | -0.37 | -0.03 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 1.2186 | 3.82E-07 | | | | | |
| DataPrivacy-C-Sharing | Student’s t | 1.0127 | 541  | 0.312 | 0.16 | -0.15 | 0.46 | 0.09 | -0.08 | 0.26 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1573 | 3.27E-06 | | | | | |
| Beliefs-Sharing       | Student’s t | -1.1102 | 541  | 0.267 | -0.12 | -0.33 | 0.09 | -0.10 | -0.26 | 0.07 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.1742 | 2.94E-06 | | | | | |
| Beliefs-C-Sharing     | Student’s t | 1.7352 | 541  | 0.083 | 0.22 | -0.03 | 0.46 | 0.15 | -0.02 | 0.32 |
|                       | BF_{10}   | 0.4126 | 1.19E-06 | | | | | |

*Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances*
Table S11.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): technique recognition measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| False dichotomy            | Statistic       | ±%     | df  | p     | M(aw) | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Dichotomy     | Student’s t     | 13.369 |    |       | 1092  | <.001  | 1.01      | 0.86   | 1.16   | 0.81   | 0.68   | 0.94   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 3.95E-40 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Neutral-Dichotomy          | Student’s t     | -1.502 |    |       | 1091  | 0.133  | -0.10     | -0.24  | 0.03   | -0.09  | -0.21  | 0.03   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.78E-4 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Discernment-Dichotomy      | Student’s t     | 11.287 |    |       | 1091  | <.001  | 1.10      | 0.91   | 1.29   | 0.68   | 0.56   | 0.81   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.81E-30 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Business-Dichotomy         | Student’s t     | 6.592  |    |       | 546   | <.001  | 1.00      | 0.70   | 1.30   | 0.56   | 0.39   | 0.74   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 3.38E-15 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Business-C-Dichotomy       | Student’s t     | -0.859 |    |       | 545   | 0.391  | -0.13     | -0.42  | 0.17   | -0.07  | -0.24  | 0.09   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 4.05E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Coffee-Dichotomy           | Student’s t     | 6.988  |    |       | 544   | <.001  | 1.06      | 0.76   | 1.36   | 0.60   | 0.42   | 0.77   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.46E-16 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Coffee-C-Dichotomy         | Student’s t     | -1.503 |    |       | 547   | 0.134  | -0.21     | -0.48  | 0.06   | -0.13  | -0.30  | 0.04   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.91E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Combat-Dichotomy           | Student’s t     | 6.683  |    |       | 545   | <.001  | 1.04      | 0.73   | 1.34   | 0.57   | 0.40   | 0.75   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.90E-15 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Combat-C-Dichotomy         | Student’s t     | 1.439  |    |       | 546   | 0.151  | 0.22      | -0.08  | 0.53   | 0.12   | -0.05  | 0.29   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.09E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Education-Dichotomy        | Student’s t     | 5.087  |    |       | 540   | <.001  | 0.84      | 0.51   | 1.16   | 0.44   | 0.26   | 0.61   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.31E-11 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| Education-C-Dichotomy      | Student’s t     | -1.948 |    |       | 551   | 0.052  | -0.29     | -0.59  | 0.00   | -0.17  | -0.33  | 0.00   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 9.42E-7 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| JohnLewis-Dichotomy        | Student’s t     | 4.516  |    |       | 544   | <.001  | 0.72      | 0.41   | 1.03   | 0.39   | 0.22   | 0.56   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.10E-10 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| JohnLewis-C-Dichotomy      | Student’s t     | -3.341 |    |       | 547   | <.001  | -0.48     | -0.77  | -0.20  | -0.29  | -0.45  | -0.12  |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.18E-8 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Party-Dichotomy            | Student’s t     | 6.945  |    |       | 545   | <.001  | 1.13      | 0.81   | 1.45   | 0.59   | 0.42   | 0.77   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 5.37E-16 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| Party-C-Dichotomy          | Student’s t     | 6.43E-8 |    |       | 546   | 0.55   | 0.09      | -0.21  | 0.39   | 0.05   | -0.12  | 0.22   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 4.93E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Potatoes-Dichotomy         | Student’s t     | 6.654  |    |       | 546   | <.001  | 1.03      | 0.73   | 1.33   | 0.57   | 0.39   | 0.74   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.25E-15 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| Potatoes-C-Dichotomy       | Student’s t     | -0.186 |    |       | 545   | 0.852  | -0.03     | -0.34  | 0.28   | -0.02  | -0.18  | 0.15   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 5.43E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Problem-Dichotomy          | Student’s t     | 10.273 |    |       | 545   | <.001  | 1.62      | 1.31   | 1.93   | 0.88   | 0.69   | 1.06   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.77E-24 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| Problem-C-Dichotomy        | Student’s t     | 3.528  |    |       | 546   | <.001  | 0.55      | 0.24   | 0.86   | 0.30   | 0.13   | 0.47   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.13E-8 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| SocServ-Dichotomy          | Student’s t     | 3.625  |    |       | 540   | <.001  | 0.62      | 0.28   | 0.96   | 0.31   | 0.14   | 0.48   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 6.99E-9 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| SocServ-C-Dichotomy        | Student’s t     | -1.457 |    |       | 551   | 0.146  | -0.23     | -0.55  | 0.08   | -0.12  | -0.29  | 0.04   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 2.20E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |
| Surveillance-Dichotomy     | Student’s t     | 6.123  |    |       | 545   | <.001  | 0.97      | 0.66   | 1.28   | 0.52   | 0.35   | 0.70   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 5.68E-14 |   |       |       |        |           |        |
| Surveillance-C-Dichotomy   | Student’s t     | 4.84E-6 |    |       | 546   | 0.099  | 0.26      | -0.05  | 0.57   | 0.14   | -0.03  | 0.31   |
|                            | BF₁₀            | 1.48E-6 |    |       |       |        |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S12.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): confidence measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Confidence                  | Statistic | ±%    | df    | p     | M_{diff} | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Manipluative-Conidence      | Student’s t | 7.919 | 1092  | <.001 | 0.52     | 0.39, 0.65 | 0.48 | 0.36, 0.60 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 8.41E+11 | 2.80E-17 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Neutral-Conidence           | Student’s t | 4.024 | 1091  | <.001 | 0.38     | 0.15, 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.12, 0.36 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 4.22  | 1.72e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Discernment-Conidence       | Student’s t | 4.059 | 1091  | <.001 | 0.23     | 0.12, 0.34 | 0.25 | 0.13, 0.37 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 217.04 | 1.50e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Business-Conidence          | Student’s t | 5.348 | 546   | <.001 | 0.67     | 0.43, 0.92 | 0.46 | 0.29, 0.64 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 124228.696 | 2.54E-12 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Business-C-Conidence        | Student’s t | 0.779 | 545   | 0.436 | 0.10     | -0.15, 0.35 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.23 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 0.128 | 4.33e-06 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Coffee-Conference           | Student’s t | 4.754 | 544   | <.001 | 0.62     | 0.36, 0.87 | 0.41 | 0.24, 0.58 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 4768.04 | 6.96E-11 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Coffee-C-Conidence          | Student’s t | 2.131 | 547   | 0.034 | 0.28     | 0.02, 0.53 | 0.18 | 0.01, 0.35 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 0.861 | 6.02e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Combat-Conidence            | Student’s t | 5.128 | 545   | <.001 | 0.68     | 0.42, 0.94 | 0.44 | 0.27, 0.61 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 26937.439 | 1.23E-11 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Combat-C-Conidence          | Student’s t | 1.719 | 546   | 0.086 | 0.22     | -0.03, 0.48 | 0.15 | -0.02, 0.32 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 0.4   | 1.33e-06 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Education-Conidence         | Student’s t | 2.333 | 540   | 0.02   | 0.30     | 0.05, 0.55 | 0.20 | 0.03, 0.37 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 1.339 | 3.32e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| JohnLewis-Conidence         | Student’s t | 2.406 | 551   | 0.016 | 0.31     | 0.06, 0.56 | 0.20 | 0.04, 0.37 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 1.571 | 3.45e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| JohnLewis-C-Conidence       | Student’s t | 3.008 | 544   | 0.003 | 0.38     | 0.13, 0.63 | 0.26 | 0.09, 0.43 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 7.588 | 5.85e-08 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Party-Conference            | Student’s t | 4.22  | 547   | <.001 | 0.57     | 0.30, 0.83 | 0.36 | 0.19, 0.53 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 4946.001 | 8.13E-10 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Party-C-Conference          | Student’s t | 3.313 | 545   | <.001 | 0.43     | 0.17, 0.68 | 0.28 | 0.11, 0.45 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 19.125 | 2.31e-08 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Potatoes-Conference         | Student’s t | 2.433 | 546   | 0.015 | 0.32     | 0.06, 0.58 | 0.21 | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 1.681 | 2.92e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Potatoes-C-Conference       | Student’s t | 4.028 | 546   | <.001 | 0.48     | 0.25, 0.71 | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.51 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 234.221 | 1.68e-09 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Problem-Conference          | Student’s t | 2.652 | 545   | 0.008 | 0.35     | 0.09, 0.60 | 0.23 | 0.06, 0.40 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 2.882 | 1.55e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Problem-C-Conidence         | Student’s t | 5.919 | 545   | <.001 | 0.70     | 0.47, 0.94 | 0.51 | 0.33, 0.68 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 1.56e+06 | 1.83E-13 |       |          |        |           |        |
| SocServ-Conference          | Student’s t | 2.456 | 546   | 0.014 | 0.32     | 0.06, 0.58 | 0.21 | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 1.774 | 2.80e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| SocServ-C-Conference        | Student’s t | 3.039 | 540   | 0.002 | 0.38     | 0.13, 0.63 | 0.26 | 0.09, 0.43 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 8.334 | 4.92e-08 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Surveillance-Conference     | Student’s t | 2.82  | 551   | 0.005 | 0.38     | 0.11, 0.64 | 0.24 | 0.07, 0.41 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 4452.170 | 1.17e-07 |       |          |        |           |        |
| Surveillance-C-Conference   | Student’s t | 3.088 | 545   | 0.002 | 0.40     | 0.14, 0.65 | 0.26 | 0.09, 0.43 |
|                             | BF_{10}   | 9.57  | 4.75e-08 |       |          |        |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances
**Table S13.**  
Study 3 (false dichotomies): trustworthiness measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “<C>” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Trustworthiness                  | Statistic | ±% | df   | p     | M_{int} | 95% CI | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----|------|-------|---------|--------|------------|--------|
| Manipulative - Trustworthiness   | Student’s t | -3.931 | 1092 | < .001 | -0.29   | -0.44, -0.15 | -0.24   | -0.36, -0.12 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 131.965 | 2.50e-7 | | | | | |
| Neutral - Trustworthiness        | Student’s t | 1.192 | 1091 | 0.233 | 0.08 | -0.05, 0.20 | 0.07 | -0.05, 0.19 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.137 | 2.70e-4 | | | | | |
| Discrimment - Trustworthiness    | Student’s t | 5.293 | 1091 | < .001 | 0.37 | 0.24, 0.51 | 0.32 | 0.20, 0.44 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 58111.555 | 5.11E-10 | | | | | |
| Business - Trustworthiness       | Student’s t | -1.98 | 546 | 0.048 | 0.28 | -0.56, 0.00 | -0.17 | -0.34, -0.0009 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.638 | 8.07e-7 | | | | | |
| Business-C - Trustworthiness     | Student’s t | 0.608 | 545 | 0.543 | 0.08 | -0.17, 0.32 | 0.05 | -0.12, 0.22 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.114 | 4.89e-6 | | | | | |
| Coffee - Trustworthiness         | Student’s t | -1.227 | 544 | 0.22 | -0.17 | -0.44, 0.10 | -0.11 | -0.27, 0.06 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.199 | 2.60e-6 | | | | | |
| Coffee-C - Trustworthiness       | Student’s t | -1.377 | 547 | 0.169 | -0.16 | -0.39, 0.07 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.239 | 2.30e-6 | | | | | |
| Combat - Trustworthiness         | Student’s t | -2.927 | 545 | 0.004 | -0.42 | -0.70, -0.14 | -0.25 | -0.42, -0.08 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 6.014 | 7.69e-8 | | | | | |
| Combat-C - Trustworthiness       | Student’s t | -1.889 | 546 | 0.059 | -0.24 | -0.50, 0.01 | -0.16 | -0.33, 0.01 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.538 | 9.75e-7 | | | | | |
| Education - Trustworthiness      | Student’s t | -2.11 | 540 | 0.035 | -0.31 | -0.59, -0.02 | -0.18 | -0.35, -0.01 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.831 | 5.48e-7 | | | | | |
| Education-C - Trustworthiness    | Student’s t | 0.986 | 551 | 0.325 | 0.12 | -0.12, 0.36 | 0.08 | -0.08, 0.25 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.152 | 3.95e-6 | | | | | |
| John Lewis - Trustworthiness     | Student’s t | -1.947 | 544 | 0.052 | -0.26 | -0.53, 0.00 | -0.17 | -0.34, 0.00 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.601 | 8.30e-7 | | | | | |
| John Lewis-C - Trustworthiness   | Student’s t | 1.357 | 547 | 0.175 | 0.18 | -0.08, 0.44 | 0.12 | -0.05, 0.28 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.233 | 2.38e-6 | | | | | |
| Party - Trustworthiness          | Student’s t | -0.906 | 545 | 0.365 | -0.13 | -0.41, 0.15 | -0.08 | -0.25, 0.09 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.142 | 3.88e-6 | | | | | |
| Party-C - Trustworthiness        | Student’s t | 1.121 | 546 | 0.263 | 0.15 | -0.12, 0.42 | 0.10 | -0.07, 0.26 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.175 | 3.12e-6 | | | | | |
| Potatoes - Trustworthiness       | Student’s t | -2.359 | 546 | 0.019 | -0.33 | -0.60, -0.06 | -0.20 | -0.37, -0.03 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 1.418 | 3.45e-7 | | | | | |
| Potatoes-C - Trustworthiness     | Student’s t | 3.113 | 545 | 0.002 | 0.41 | 0.15, 0.66 | 0.27 | 0.10, 0.44 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 10.345 | 4.07e-8 | | | | | |
| Problem - Trustworthiness        | Student’s t | -5.175 | 545 | < .001 | -0.79 | -1.09, -0.49 | -0.44 | -0.61, -0.27 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 33816.269 | 9.72E-12 | | | | | |
| Problem-C - Trustworthiness      | Student’s t | -0.578 | 546 | 0.563 | -0.08 | -0.34, 0.19 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.12 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.112 | 5.05e-6 | | | | | |
| Soc Serv - Trustworthiness       | Student’s t | -1.492 | 540 | 0.136 | -0.24 | -0.55, 0.07 | -0.13 | -0.30, 0.04 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.282 | 1.71e-6 | | | | | |
| Soc Serv-C - Trustworthiness     | Student’s t | 3.25 | 551 | 0.001 | 0.41 | 0.16, 0.65 | 0.28 | 0.11, 0.44 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 15.613 | 3.16e-8 | | | | | |
| Surveillance - Trustworthiness   | Student’s t | -0.777 | 545 | 0.438 | -0.11 | -0.39, 0.17 | -0.07 | -0.23, 0.10 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.128 | 4.34e-6 | | | | | |
| Surveillance-C - Trustworthiness | Student’s t | -0.364 | 546 | 0.716 | -0.04 | -0.28, 0.19 | -0.03 | -0.20, 0.14 |
|                                  | BF_{10}   | 0.101 | 5.56e-6 | | | | | |

* Levene’s test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S14.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): sharing intentions measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note*: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C.-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Sharing            | Statistic | ±%  | df  | p     | Mdiff | 95% CI     | Cohen’s d | 95% CI     |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Manipulative-Sharing | Student's t | -2.178 | 1092 | 0.03 | -0.19 | -0.35, -0.02 | -0.13 | -0.25, -0.01 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.7001 | 5.16E-05 |
| Neutral-Sharing | Student's t | 0.444 | 1091 | 0.657 | 0.04 | -0.14, 0.22 | 0.03 | -0.09, 0.15 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.0747 | 4.99E-04 |
| Discernment-Sharing | Student's t | 3.602 | 1091 | <.001 | 0.22 | 0.10, 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.10, 0.34 |
| BF₁₀ | 39.4482 | 8.47E-07 |
| Business-Sharing | Student's t | -1.817 | 546 | 0.07 | -0.26 | -0.53, 0.02 | -0.16 | -0.32, 0.01 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.4732 | 1.11E-06 |
| Business-C-Sharing | Student's t | 0.225 | 545 | 0.822 | 0.04 | -0.27, 0.34 | 0.02 | -0.15, 0.19 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.0975 | 5.75E-06 |
| Coffee-Sharing | Student's t | -0.741 | 544 | 0.459 | -0.11 | -0.39, 0.18 | -0.06 | -0.23, 0.10 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1246 | 4.24E-06 |
| Coffee-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.823 | 547 | 0.411 | -0.14 | -0.49, 0.20 | -0.07 | -0.24, 0.10 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1322 | 4.28E-06 |
| Combat-Sharing | Student's t | -0.81 | 545 | 0.418 | -0.11 | -0.38, 0.16 | -0.07 | -0.24, 0.10 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1311 | 4.21E-06 |
| Combat-C-Sharing | Student's t | -1.608 | 546 | 0.108 | -0.22 | -0.49, 0.05 | -0.14 | -0.31, 0.03 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.3344 | 1.60E-06 |
| Education-Sharing | Student's t | -0.173 | 540 | 0.863 | -0.03 | -0.35, 0.29 | -0.01 | -0.18, 0.15 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.0971 | 5.24E-06 |
| Education-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.624 | 551 | 0.533 | -0.11 | -0.46, 0.24 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.11 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1145 | 5.31E-06 |
| JohnLewis-Sharing | Student's t | -0.789 | 544 | 0.43 | -0.11 | -0.40, 0.17 | -0.07 | -0.24, 0.10 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1291 | 4.16E-06 |
| JohnLewis-C-Sharing | Student's t | 0.477 | 547 | 0.633 | 0.06 | -0.20, 0.33 | 0.04 | -0.13, 0.21 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1061 | 5.42E-06 |
| Party-Sharing | Student's t | -0.797 | 545 | 0.426 | -0.11 | -0.39, 0.16 | -0.07 | -0.24, 0.10 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1297 | 4.27E-06 |
| Party-C-Sharing | Student's t | 1.005 | 546 | 0.315 | 0.16 | -0.15, 0.46 | 0.09 | -0.08, 0.25 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1556 | 3.53E-06 |
| Potatoes-Sharing | Student's t | -2.576 | 546 | 0.01 | -0.38 | -0.67, -0.09 | -0.22 | -0.39, -0.05 |
| BF₁₀ | 2.3377 | 2.01E-07 |
| Potatoes-C-Sharing | Student's t | 0.695 | 545 | 0.487 | 0.11 | -0.20, 0.41 | 0.06 | -0.11, 0.23 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1208 | 4.31E-06 |
| Problem-Sharing | Student's t | -2.643 | 545 | 0.008 | -0.44 | -0.77, -0.11 | -0.23 | -0.39, -0.06 |
| BF₁₀ | 2.8099 | 1.70E-07 |
| Problem-C-Sharing | Student's t | -0.963 | 546 | 0.336 | -0.15 | -0.45, 0.15 | -0.08 | -0.25, 0.09 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1494 | 3.73E-06 |
| SocServ-Sharing | Student's t | -1.262 | 540 | 0.207 | -0.20 | -0.51, 0.11 | -0.11 | -0.28, 0.06 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.2077 | 2.37E-06 |
| SocServ-C-Sharing | Student's t | 1.953 | 551 | 0.051 | 0.34 | 0.00, 0.68 | 0.17 | 0.00, 0.33 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.6042 | 9.35E-07 |
| Surveillance-Sharing | Student's t | -0.697 | 545 | 0.486 | -0.11 | -0.41, 0.20 | -0.06 | -0.23, 0.11 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1206 | 4.61E-06 |
| Surveillance-C-Sharing | Student's t | 0.505 | 546 | 0.614 | 0.08 | -0.24, 0.40 | 0.04 | -0.12, 0.21 |
| BF₁₀ | 0.1077 | 5.22E-06 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S15.
Study 4 (scapegoating): technique recognition measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Scapegoating         | Statistic | ±%  | df  | p     | M_{diff} | 95% CI      | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|----------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|----------|-------------|------------|--------|
| Manipulative-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 1.23E+08 | 1076 | <.001 | 0.46 | 0.33, 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.28, 0.53 |
| Neutral-Scapegoating  | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.0751 | 1077 | 0.658 | -0.03 | -0.17, 0.11 | -0.03 | -0.15, 0.09 |
| Discernment-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 4.525 | 1077 | <.001 | 0.47 | 0.27, 0.68 | 0.28 | 0.15, 0.40 |
| Fiscal-Scapegoating   | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 2.874 | 537  | 0.004 | 0.35 | 0.11, 0.59  | 0.25 | 0.08, 0.42 |
| Fiscal-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.1091 | 539  | 0.607 | 0.08 | -0.23, 0.39 | 0.04 | -0.12, 0.21 |
| Freemill-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 4.612 | 531  | <.001 | 0.62 | 0.36, 0.89  | 0.40 | 0.23, 0.57 |
| Freemill-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 1.541 | 545  | 0.124 | -0.20 | -0.45, 0.05 | -0.13 | -0.30, 0.04 |
| Gamers-Scapegoating   | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 4.008 | 535  | <.001 | 0.52 | 0.27, 0.78  | 0.35 | 0.17, 0.52 |
| Gamers-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ -0.647 | 541  | 0.518 | -0.09 | -0.38, 0.19 | -0.06 | -0.22, 0.11 |
| Morality-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 2.24E+08 | 538  | <.001 | 0.83 | 0.59, 1.07  | 0.58 | 0.40, 0.75 |
| Morality-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 2.17E+08 | 538  | 0.014 | 0.42 | 0.08, 0.75  | 0.21 | 0.04, 0.38 |
| Nuclear-Scapegoating  | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 2.67E+08 | 543  | <.001 | 0.50 | 0.21, 0.79  | 0.29 | 0.12, 0.46 |
| Nuclear-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ -0.332 | 533  | 0.74  | -0.05 | -0.32, 0.22 | -0.03 | -0.20, 0.14 |
| Politicians-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.11E+08 | 535  | <.001 | 0.65 | 0.39, 0.90  | 0.43 | 0.25, 0.60 |
| Politicians-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.038 | 541  | 0.764 | 0.04 | -0.23, 0.32 | 0.03 | -0.14, 0.19 |
| Professors-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.187 | 540  | <.001 | 0.71 | 0.44, 0.98  | 0.45 | 0.27, 0.62 |
| Professors-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 5.35E-12 | 536  | 0.297 | -0.15 | -0.44, 0.13 | -0.09 | -0.26, 0.08 |
| Referees-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.12E-06 | 542  | <.001 | 0.56 | 0.30, 0.83  | 0.35 | 0.18, 0.52 |
| Referees-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.13E-06 | 534  | 0.103 | -0.24 | -0.53, 0.05  | -0.14 | -0.31, 0.03 |
| Struggle-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 0.38E-06 | 541  | 0.708 | -0.06 | -0.38, 0.26  | -0.03 | -0.20, 0.14 |
| Struggle-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 1.02E-06 | 535  | 0.106 | -0.24 | -0.53, 0.05  | -0.14 | -0.31, 0.03 |
| Turnout-Scapegoating  | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 2.28E-06 | 539  | 0.022 | 0.31 | 0.04, 0.57  | 0.20 | 0.03, 0.37 |
| Turnout-C-Scapegoating | Student’s t: BF_{10}: \ 1.30E-06 | 537  | 0.164 | -0.20 | -0.47, 0.08  | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S16.
Study 4 (scapegoating): confidence measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Confidence          | Statistic | ±%  | df  | p     | Mdiff | 95% CI     | Cohen’s d | 95% CI  |
|---------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|-------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Manipulative-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 5.801 | 1076 | <.001 | 0.39 | 0.26, 0.52 | 0.35 | 0.23, 0.47 |
| Neutral-Confidence  | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 1.891 | 1077 | 0.059 | 0.13 | -0.01, 0.27 | 0.12 | 0.00, 0.24 |
| Discernment-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 3.504 | 1077 | <.001 | 0.23 | 0.10, 0.36 | 0.21 | 0.09, 0.33 |
| Fiscal-Confidence   | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 1.008 | 537  | 0.314 | 0.12 | -0.11, 0.35 | 0.09 | -0.08, 0.26 |
| Fiscal-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 2.58  | 539  | 0.01  | 0.31 | 0.07, 0.55  | 0.22 | 0.05, 0.39 |
| Freewill-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 4.175 | 531  | <.001 | 0.54 | 0.29, 0.80  | 0.36 | 0.19, 0.53 |
| Freewill-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.755 | 545  | 0.451 | 0.10 | -0.17, 0.38 | 0.06 | -0.10, 0.23 |
| Gamers-Confidence   | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 3.919 | 535  | <.001 | 0.50 | 0.25, 0.76  | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.51 |
| Gamers-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.147 | 541  | 0.884 | 0.02 | -0.23, 0.27 | 0.01 | -0.16, 0.18 |
| Morality-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 5.792 | 538  | <.001 | 0.64 | 0.42, 0.86  | 0.50 | 0.32, 0.67 |
| Morality-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 1.115 | 538  | 0.265 | 0.15 | -0.12, 0.42 | 0.10 | -0.07, 0.27 |
| Nuclear-Confidence  | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 3.514 | 543  | <.001 | 0.43 | 0.19, 0.66  | 0.30 | 0.13, 0.47 |
| Nuclear-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 36.9024 | 533 | 0.226 | 0.16 | -0.10, 0.43 | 0.10 | -0.07, 0.27 |
| Politicians-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.1965 | 535 | <.001 | 0.42 | 0.19, 0.66  | 0.30 | 0.13, 0.47 |
| Politicians-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 1.179 | 541 | 0.239 | 0.15 | -0.10, 0.40 | 0.10 | -0.07, 0.27 |
| Professors-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 4.136 | 540 | <.001 | 0.50 | 0.26, 0.74  | 0.36 | 0.18, 0.53 |
| Professors-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.646 | 536 | 0.518 | 0.09 | -0.18, 0.35 | 0.06 | -0.11, 0.23 |
| Referees-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 4.376 | 542 | <.001 | 0.54 | 0.30, 0.78  | 0.38 | 0.20, 0.55 |
| Referees-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.795 | 534 | 0.427 | 0.11 | -0.16, 0.38 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
| Struggle-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 0.1308 | 541 | 0.215 | 0.17 | -0.10, 0.44 | 0.11 | -0.06, 0.28 |
| Struggle-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 1.243 | 535 | 0.724 | 0.05 | -0.21, 0.30 | 0.03 | -0.14, 0.20 |
| Turnout-Confidence  | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 2.587 | 539 | 0.01  | 0.31 | 0.07, 0.54  | 0.22 | 0.05, 0.39 |
| Turnout-C-Confidence | Student’s t BF₁₀ | 2.496 | 537 | 0.043 | 0.26 | 0.01, 0.52  | 0.18 | 0.01, 0.34 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S17.
Study 4 (scapegoating): trustworthiness measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Trustworthiness             | Statistic | z%  | df   | p     | Mdiff | 95% CI     | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|------|-------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Trustworthiness| Student’s t| -1.888 | 1076 | 0.059 | -0.15 | -0.31, 0.01 | -0.12 | -0.23, 0.00 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.395 | 8.03E-05 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Neutral-Trustworthiness     | Student’s t| -0.469 | 1077 | 0.643 | -0.03 | -0.17, 0.10 | -0.03 | -0.15, 0.09 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.0758 | 4.36E-04 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Discrimment-Trustworthiness | Student’s t| 1.6479 | 1077 | 0.1   | 0.13  | -0.02, 0.28 | 0.10 | -0.02, 0.22 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.26  | 1.24E-04 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Fiscal-Trustworthiness      | Student’s t| -0.1252 | 537 | 0.9  | -0.02 | -0.30, 0.26 | -0.01 | -0.18, 0.16 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.0968 | 4.84E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Fiscal-C-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -1.1721 | 539 | 0.242 | -0.16 | -0.42, 0.11 | -0.10 | -0.27, 0.07 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.187  | 2.54E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Freewill-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -1.804 | 531 | 0.072 | -0.26 | -0.54, 0.02 | -0.16 | -0.33, 0.01 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.4682 | 8.65E-07 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Freewill-C-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t| 1.203  | 545 | 0.229 | 0.16  | -0.10, 0.42 | 0.10 | -0.07, 0.27 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1925 | 2.80E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Gamers-Trustworthiness      | Student’s t| -0.4895 | 535 | 0.625 | -0.07 | -0.35, 0.21 | -0.04 | -0.21, 0.13 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1079 | 4.40E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Gamers-C-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -0.4869 | 541 | 0.627 | -0.06 | -0.32, 0.19 | -0.04 | -0.21, 0.13 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1072 | 4.89E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Morality-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -1.3496 | 538 | 0.178 | -0.20 | -0.50, 0.09 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.2322 | 2.06E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Morality-C-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t| -0.6229 | 538 | 0.534 | -0.09 | -0.36, 0.19 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.12 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1157 | 4.30E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Nuclear-Trustworthiness     | Student’s t| -1.5917 | 543 | 0.112 | -0.24 | -0.53, 0.06 | -0.14 | -0.30, 0.03 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.3267 | 1.57E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Nuclear-C-Trustworthiness   | Student’s t| -1.1135 | 533 | 0.266 | -0.14 | -0.40, 0.11 | -0.10 | -0.27, 0.07 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1759 | 2.53E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Politicians-Trustworthiness | Student’s t| -1.3501 | 535 | 0.178 | -0.20 | -0.50, 0.09 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.2331 | 1.93E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Politicians-C-Trustworthiness| Student’s t| -1.1959 | 541 | 0.232 | -0.15 | -0.40, 0.10 | -0.10 | -0.27, 0.07 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.1917 | 2.62E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Professors-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t| -1.9394 | 540 | 0.053 | -0.27 | -0.54, 0.00 | -0.17 | -0.34, 0.00 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.5953 | 7.59E-07 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Professors-C-Trustworthiness| Student’s t| -0.0308 | 536 | 0.975 | 0.00  | -0.26, 0.25 | 0.00 | -0.17, 0.17 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.0963 | 4.74E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Referees-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -1.8168 | 542 | 0.07  | -0.25 | -0.51, 0.02 | -0.16 | -0.32, 0.01 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.4745 | 1.04E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Referees-C-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t| 0.2698  | 534 | 0.787 | 0.03  | -0.21, 0.28 | 0.02 | -0.15, 0.19 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.0996 | 4.67E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Struggle-Trustworthiness    | Student’s t| -2.5026 | 541 | 0.013 | -0.36 | -0.64, -0.08 | -0.21 | -0.38, -0.05 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 1.9891 | 2.28E-07 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Struggle-C-Trustworthiness  | Student’s t| 1.605  | 535 | 0.109 | 0.21  | -0.05, 0.48 | 0.14 | -0.03, 0.31 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.3359 | 1.32E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Turnout-Trustworthiness     | Student’s t| 1.333  | 539 | 0.183 | 0.20  | -0.09, 0.50 | 0.11 | -0.05, 0.28 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.227  | 2.15E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |
| Turnout-C-Trustworthiness   | Student’s t| 0.2388 | 537 | 0.811 | 0.03  | -0.22, 0.28 | 0.02 | -0.15, 0.19 |
|                            | BF_{10}   | 0.0985 | 5.01E-06 |       |       |            |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S18.
Study 4 (scapegoating): sharing intentions measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note:* Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Sharing          | Statistic     | ±%  | df  | p   | Mdiff | 95% CI       | Cohen’s d | 95% CI  |
|------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|--------------|-----------|---------|
| Manipulative-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.479 | 1076 | 0.632 | -0.04  | -0.21, 0.13  | -0.03     | -0.15, 0.09 |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0764 | 4.29E-04 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Neutral-Sharing  | Student’s t   | 0.758 | 1077 | 0.449 | 0.07  | -0.11, 0.25  | 0.05      | -0.07, 0.17  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0906 | 3.64E-04 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Discernment-Sharing | Student’s t   | 1.834 | 1077 | 0.067 | 0.12  | -0.01, 0.25  | 0.11      | -0.01, 0.23  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.3579 | 8.97E-05 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Fiscal-Sharing   | Student’s t   | -0.397 | 537  | 0.691 | -0.05 | -0.32, 0.21  | -0.03     | -0.20, 0.14  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1038 | 4.50E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Fiscal-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.813 | 539  | 0.416 | -0.12 | -0.42, 0.17  | -0.07     | -0.24, 0.10  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1323 | 3.66E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Freewill-Sharing | Student’s t   | -1.153 | 531  | 0.25  | -0.16 | -0.43, 0.11  | -0.10     | -0.27, 0.07  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1839 | 2.32E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Freewill-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | 1.997 | 545  | 0.046 | 0.32  | 0.01, 0.64   | 0.17      | 0.00, 0.34  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.6607 | 7.68E-07 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Gamers-Sharing   | Student’s t   | 0.653 | 535  | 0.514 | 0.09  | -0.19, 0.37  | 0.06      | -0.11, 0.23  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1182 | 4.00E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Gamers-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | 0.122 | 541  | 0.903 | 0.02  | -0.29, 0.33  | 0.01      | -0.16, 0.18  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0962 | 5.48E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Morality-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.632 | 538  | 0.528 | -0.09 | -0.37, 0.19  | -0.05     | -0.22, 0.11  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1163 | 4.26E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Morality-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.106 | 538  | 0.916 | -0.02 | -0.32, 0.29  | -0.01     | -0.18, 0.16  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0963 | 5.22E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Nuclear-Sharing  | Student’s t   | -0.755 | 543  | 0.451 | -0.11 | -0.40, 0.18  | -0.06     | -0.23, 0.10  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1258 | 4.27E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Nuclear-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.267 | 533  | 0.79  | -0.04 | -0.35, 0.26  | -0.02     | -0.19, 0.15  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0996 | 4.61E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Politicians-Sharing | Student’s t  | -1.45 | 535  | 0.148 | -0.23 | -0.55, 0.08  | -0.13     | -0.29, 0.04  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.2669 | 1.68E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Politicians-C-Sharing | Student’s t  | 0.447 | 541  | 0.655 | 0.07  | -0.25, 0.40  | 0.04      | -0.13, 0.21  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1053 | 4.91E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Professors-Sharing | Student’s t  | -0.216 | 540  | 0.829 | -0.03 | -0.31, 0.24  | -0.02     | -0.19, 0.15  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0989 | 5.07E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Professors-C-Sharing | Student’s t  | 0.125 | 536  | 0.901 | 0.02  | -0.30, 0.34  | 0.01      | -0.16, 0.18  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.0979 | 4.71E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Referees-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.645 | 542  | 0.519 | -0.09 | -0.38, 0.19  | -0.06     | -0.22, 0.11  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1169 | 4.53E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Referees-C-Sharing | Student’s t  | 1.383 | 534  | 0.167 | 0.21  | -0.09, 0.50  | 0.12      | -0.05, 0.29  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.2435 | 1.82E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Struggle-Sharing | Student’s t   | -1.262 | 541  | 0.208 | -0.17 | -0.44, 0.09  | -0.11     | -0.28, 0.06  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.2073 | 2.44E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Struggle-C-Sharing | Student’s t  | 1.978 | 535  | 0.048 | 0.33  | 0.00, 0.65   | 0.17      | 0.00, 0.34  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.6424 | 6.66E-07 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Turnout-Sharing  | Student’s t   | 1.635 | 539  | 0.103 | 0.25  | -0.05, 0.54  | 0.14      | -0.03, 0.31  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.3509 | 1.36E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |
| Turnout-C-Sharing | Student’s t   | -0.674 | 537  | 0.5   | -0.11 | -0.42, 0.21  | -0.06     | -0.23, 0.11  |
|                  | BF₁₀          | 0.1196 | 4.08E-06 |     |       |              |           |         |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S19.
Study 5 (ad hominem): technique recognition measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-“C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Ad hominem             | Statistic | ±% | df | p    | Mpost | 95% CI       | Cohen's d | 95% CI |
|------------------------|-----------|----|----|------|-------|--------------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-AdHominem | Student's t| 3.1577 | 1079 | 0.002 | 0.23  | 0.09, 0.37   | 0.19      | 0.07, 0.31 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 9.1358 | 3.37e-06 |      |       |              |           |        |
| Neutral-AdHominem      | Student's t| -7.3523 | 1079 | <.001 | -0.54 | -0.68, -0.39 | -0.45     | -0.57, -0.32 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.43E+10 | 1.52E-15 | |       |             |           |        |
| Discernment-AdHominem  | Student's t| 7.3603 | 1079 | <.001 | 0.76  | 0.56, 0.96   | 0.45      | 0.33, 0.57 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.51E+10 | 1.43E-15 | |       |             |           |        |
| Academia-AdHominem     | Student's t| 4.4393 | 536  | <.001 | 0.58  | 0.32, 0.84   | 0.38      | 0.21, 0.55 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1220.0418 | 2.50E-10 | |       |             |           |        |
| Academia-C-AdHominem   | Student's t| -4.739 | 543  | <.001 | -0.75 | -1.06, -0.44 | -0.41     | -0.58, -0.23 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 4456.0114 | 7.49E-11 | |       |             |           |        |
| Crime-AdHominem        | Student's t| -2.5525 | 542  | 0.111 | -0.39 | -0.70, -0.09 | -0.22     | -0.39, -0.05 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 2.2459 | 2.01E-07 | |       |             |           |        |
| Crime-C-AdHominem      | Student's t| -5.4475 | 537  | <.001 | -0.87 | -1.18, -0.55 | -0.47     | -0.64, -0.30 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 129952.599 | 1.97E-12 | |       |             |           |        |
| Dumped-AdHominem       | Student's t| 1.2617 | 542  | 0.208 | 0.17  | -0.10, 0.44  | 0.11      | -0.06, 0.28 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.2071 | 2.47E-06 | |       |             |           |        |
| Dumped-C-AdHominem     | Student's t| -2.4763 | 537  | 0.014 | -0.36 | -0.65, -0.08 | -0.21     | -0.38, -0.04 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.8745 | 2.20E-07 | |       |             |           |        |
| Education-AdHominem    | Student's t| 2.489  | 537  | 0.013 | 0.34  | 0.07, 0.61   | 0.21      | 0.04, 0.38 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.9305 | 2.18E-07 | |       |             |           |        |
| Education-C-AdHominem  | Student's t| -3.3545 | 542  | <.001 | -0.48 | -0.76, -0.20 | -0.29     | -0.46, -0.12 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 21.8608 | 1.90E-08 | |       |             |           |        |
| Fired-AdHominem        | Student's t| 1.8518 | 540  | 0.065 | 0.25  | -0.02, 0.51  | 0.16      | -0.01, 0.33 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.507  | 8.89E-07 | |       |             |           |        |
| Fired-C-AdHominem      | Student's t| -3.6584 | 539  | <.001 | -0.57 | -0.88, -0.26 | -0.32     | -0.49, -0.14 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 60.6879 | 5.95E-09 | |       |             |           |        |
| Freud-AdHominem        | Student's t| 1.1091 | 540  | 0.268 | 0.16  | -0.12, 0.44  | 0.10      | -0.07, 0.26 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1741 | 2.83E-06 | |       |             |           |        |
| Freud-C-AdHominem      | Student's t| -4.1693 | 539  | <.001 | -0.67 | -0.99, -0.36 | -0.36     | -0.53, -0.19 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 406.0377 | 8.41E-10 | |       |             |           |        |
| Heartland-AdHominem    | Student's t| 3.4483 | 540  | <.001 | 0.45  | 0.19, 0.71   | 0.30      | 0.13, 0.47 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 29.7023 | 1.32E-08 | |       |             |           |        |
| Heartland-C-AdHominem  | Student's t| -0.6682 | 539  | 0.504 | -0.10 | -0.40, 0.20  | -0.06     | -0.23, 0.11 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1189 | 4.25E-06 | |       |             |           |        |
| Marriage-AdHominem     | Student's t| 2.8661 | 543  | 0.004 | 0.40  | 0.13, 0.68   | 0.25      | 0.08, 0.41 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 5.0845 | 8.84E-08 | |       |             |           |        |
| Marriage-C-AdHominem   | Student's t| -2.835 | 536  | 0.005 | -0.44 | -0.75, -0.14 | -0.24     | -0.41, -0.07 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 4.6905 | 8.46E-08 | |       |             |           |        |
| Presidential-AdHominem | Student's t| 3.0642 | 535  | 0.002 | 0.46  | 0.17, 0.76   | 0.26      | 0.09, 0.44 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 8.9888 | 4.18E-08 | |       |             |           |        |
| Presidential-C-AdHominem| Student's t| -1.4597 | 544  | 0.145 | -0.22 | -0.51, 0.08  | -0.13     | -0.29, 0.04 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.2687 | 1.93E-06 | |       |             |           |        |
| Twitterbio-AdHominem   | Student's t| 0.0518 | 539  | 0.959 | 0.01  | -0.28, 0.30  | 0.00      | -0.16, 0.17 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.0959 | 5.21E-06 | |       |             |           |        |
| Twitterbio-C-AdHominem | Student's t| -4.0019 | 540  | <.001 | -0.62 | -0.92, -0.31 | -0.34     | -0.51, -0.17 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 212.0356 | 1.69E-09 | |       |             |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
### Table S20.
Study 5 (ad hominem): confidence measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note:* Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-” denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Confidence             | Statistic | ±% (95% CI) | df | p  | Mdiff (95% CI) | Cohen’s d (95% CI) |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------|----|----|----------------|-------------------|
| Manipulative-Confidence| Student’s t | 4.0087 | 1079 < .001 | 0.31 | 0.16, 0.46 | 0.24 | 0.12, 0.36 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 179.0774 | 1.63e0-7 | | | | |
| Neutral-Confidence     | Student’s t | 5.9184 | 1079 < .001 | 0.44 | 0.30, 0.59 | 0.36 | 0.24, 0.48 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.69E+06 | 1.48E-11 | | | | |
| Discernment-Confidence | Student’s t | -2.1449 | 1079 | 0.032 | -0.14 | -0.26, -0.01 | -0.13 | -0.25, -0.01 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.6566 | 4.92e-5 | | | | |
| Academia-Confidence    | Student’s t | 2.9467 | 536 | 0.003 | 0.40 | 0.13, 0.66 | 0.25 | 0.08, 0.42 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 6.3997 | 6.08e-8 | | | | |
| Academia-C-Confidence  | Student’s t | 4.4111 | 543 < .001 | 0.64 | 0.36, 0.93 | 0.38 | 0.21, 0.55 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1082.9442 | 3.26E-10 | | | | |
| Crime-Confidence       | Student’s t | 0.3874 | 542 | 0.699 | 0.05 | -0.20, 0.29 | 0.03 | -0.14, 0.20 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1027 | 5.13e-6 | | | | |
| Crime-C-Confidence     | Student’s t | 4.4962 | 537 < .001 | 0.65 | 0.36, 0.93 | 0.39 | 0.22, 0.56 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1550.3363 | 2.00E-10 | | | | |
| Dumped-Confidence      | Student’s t | 2.328 | 542 | 0.02 | 0.31 | 0.05, 0.58 | 0.20 | 0.03, 0.37 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.2322 | 3.53e-7 | | | | |
| Dumped-C-Confidence    | Student’s t | 1.8418 | 537 | 0.066 | 0.26 | -0.02, 0.53 | 0.16 | -0.01, 0.33 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.4985 | 8.87e-7 | | | | |
| Education-Confidence   | Student’s t | 2.2162 | 537 | 0.027 | 0.29 | 0.03, 0.56 | 0.19 | 0.02, 0.36 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1.0387 | 4.19e-7 | | | | |
| Education-C-Confidence | Student’s t | 4.4996 | 542 < .001 | 0.67 | 0.38, 0.96 | 0.39 | 0.21, 0.56 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 1571.25 | 2.21E-10 | | | | |
| Fired-Confidence       | Student’s t | 0.8065 | 540 | 0.42 | 0.11 | -0.16, 0.38 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1316 | 3.68e-6 | | | | |
| Fired-C-Confidence     | Student’s t | 3.0262 | 539 | 0.003 | 0.41 | 0.14, 0.67 | 0.26 | 0.09, 0.43 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 8.0322 | 4.93e-8 | | | | |
| Freud-Confidence       | Student’s t | 0.784 | 540 | 0.433 | 0.11 | -0.17, 0.39 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1291 | 3.88e-6 | | | | |
| Freud-C-Confidence     | Student’s t | 3.2223 | 539 | 0.001 | 0.43 | 0.17, 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.11, 0.45 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 14.4419 | 2.74e-8 | | | | |
| Heartland-Confidence   | Student’s t | 4.1071 | 540 < .001 | 0.55 | 0.29, 0.82 | 0.35 | 0.18, 0.52 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 317.8889 | 1.11e-9 | | | | |
| Heartland-C-Confidence | Student’s t | 0.0574 | 539 | 0.954 | 0.01 | -0.25, 0.27 | 0.00 | -0.16, 0.17 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.9598 | 5.33e-6 | | | | |
| Marriage-Confidence    | Student’s t | 2.1216 | 543 | 0.034 | 0.29 | 0.02, 0.55 | 0.18 | 0.01, 0.35 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.8479 | 5.76e-7 | | | | |
| Marriage-C-Confidence  | Student’s t | 2.568 | 536 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.09, 0.64 | 0.22 | 0.05, 0.39 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 2.3423 | 1.75e-7 | | | | |
| Presidential-Confidence | Student’s t | 3.9868 | 535 < .001 | 0.56 | 0.28, 0.84 | 0.34 | 0.17, 0.52 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 200.6357 | 1.62e-9 | | | | |
| Presidential-C-Confidence | Student’s t | 0.7912 | 544 | 0.429 | 0.10 | -0.15, 0.36 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.1293 | 4.16e-6 | | | | |
| Twitterbio-Confidence  | Student’s t | 1.5773 | 539 | 0.115 | 0.21 | -0.05, 0.47 | 0.14 | -0.03, 0.30 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 0.321 | 1.46e-6 | | | | |
| Twitterbio-C-Confidence | Student’s t | 4.3092 | 540 < .001 | 0.62 | 0.34, 0.90 | 0.37 | 0.20, 0.54 |
|                        | BF₁₀      | 711.8482 | 4.78E-10 | | | | |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S21.
Study 5 (ad hominem): trustworthiness measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). Note: Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Trustworthiness       | Statistic | ±% | df  | p    | Mdiff | 95% CI     | Cohen’s d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------|-----------|----|-----|------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|
| Manipulative-Tr.      | Student’s t | -1.752 | 1079 | 0.08 | -0.13 | -0.28, 0.02 | -0.11 | -0.23, 0.01 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.3094 | 1.06E-04 | 1.82E-04 | 0.158 | -0.04, 0.23 | 0.09 | -0.03, 0.21 |
| Neutral-Tr.           | Student’s t | 1.411 | 1079 | 0.10 | 0.22 | 0.08, 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.07, 0.31 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1819 | 8.7818 | 3.50E-06 | 0.002 | -0.50, 0.01 | -0.16 | -0.33, 0.01 |
| Discernment-Tr.       | Student’s t | -1.885 | 536 | 0.25 | -0.25 | -0.50, 0.01 | -0.16 | -0.33, 0.01 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.5389 | 8.18E-07 |
| Academia-Tr.          | Student’s t | 0.882 | 543 | 0.12 | 0.40 | -0.09, 0.24 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1394 | 3.78E-06 |
| Academia-C-Tr.        | Student’s t | 0.107 | 542 | 0.14 | -0.14 | -0.40, 0.11 | -0.09 | -0.26, 0.08 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1697 | 3.02E-06 |
| Crime-Tr.             | Student’s t | 1.697 | 537 | 0.22 | 0.22 | -0.04, 0.48 | 0.15 | -0.02, 0.32 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.3887 | 1.18E-06 |
| Crime-C-Tr.           | Student’s t | -0.63 | 542 | 0.08 | -0.08 | -0.34, 0.18 | -0.05 | -0.22, 0.11 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1158 | 4.55E-06 |
| Dumped-Tr.            | Student’s t | 1.929 | 537 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.00, 0.49 | 0.17 | 0.00, 0.34 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.5844 | 7.50E-07 |
| Dumped-C-Tr.          | Student’s t | -1.37 | 537 | -0.18 | -0.44 | -0.08, 0.12 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.2388 | 1.97E-06 |
| Education-Tr.         | Student’s t | 1.438 | 542 | 0.17 | 0.17 | -0.06, 0.40 | 0.12 | -0.05, 0.29 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.261 | 1.95E-06 |
| Education-C-Tr.       | Student’s t | -1.414 | 540 | 0.17 | 0.17 | -0.41, 0.07 | -0.12 | -0.29, 0.05 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.2536 | 1.84E-06 |
| Fired-Tr.             | Student’s t | -0.676 | 539 | 0.10 | -0.10 | -0.38, 0.18 | -0.06 | -0.23, 0.11 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1197 | 4.10E-06 |
| Fired-C-Tr.           | Student’s t | -0.452 | 540 | 0.06 | 0.06 | -0.32, 0.20 | -0.04 | -0.21, 0.13 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1057 | 4.79E-06 |
| Freud-Tr.             | Student’s t | 0.919 | 539 | 0.12 | 0.12 | -0.14, 0.38 | 0.08 | -0.09, 0.25 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1444 | 3.44E-06 |
| Heartland-Tr.         | Student’s t | -1.54 | 540 | 0.20 | 0.20 | -0.46, 0.06 | -0.13 | -0.30, 0.04 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.303 | 1.61E-06 |
| Heartland-C-Tr.       | Student’s t | -1.743 | 539 | 0.23 | 0.23 | -0.49, 0.03 | -0.15 | -0.32, 0.02 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.419 | 1.13E-06 |
| Marriage-Tr.          | Student’s t | -1.172 | 543 | 0.17 | 0.17 | -0.45, 0.11 | -0.10 | -0.27, 0.07 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1859 | 2.83E-06 |
| Marriage-C-Tr.        | Student’s t | -0.14 | 536 | 0.25 | 0.25 | -0.29, 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.18, 0.16 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.0968 | 5.02E-06 |
| Presidential-Tr.      | Student’s t | -2.146 | 535 | 0.29 | -0.29 | -0.55, -0.02 | -0.19 | -0.36, -0.02 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.8981 | 4.70E-07 |
| Presidential-C-Tr.    | Student’s t | 0.85 | 544 | 0.11 | 0.11 | -0.15, 0.37 | 0.07 | -0.10, 0.24 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1355 | 3.96E-06 |
| Twitterbio-Tr.        | Student’s t | 0.307 | 539 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -0.22, 0.30 | 0.03 | -0.14, 0.20 |
|                       | BF₁₀      | 0.1003 | 4.97E-06 |
| Twitterbio-C-Tr.      | Student’s t | 1.869 | 540 | 0.26 | -0.26 | -0.01, 0.53 | 0.16 | -0.01, 0.33 |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S22.
Study 5 (ad hominem): sharing measure item-level results (independent samples and Bayesian t-tests). *Note:* Bayesian prior used is 0.707 (representing an 80% chance that the effect size is between -2 and 2). “-C-“ denotes a manipulative post’s matched neutral control.

| Sharing                     | Statistic  | ±%   | df |  p   | M_{diff} | 95% CI     | Cohen's d | 95% CI |
|-----------------------------|------------|------|----|------|----------|------------|-----------|--------|
| Maniplative-Sharing        | Student's t| -1.8785 | 0.061 | -0.15 | -0.30, 0.01 | -0.11, -0.23 | -0.01, -0.23 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.3876 | 8.41E-05 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Neutral-Sharing            | Student's t| 0.6023 | 0.0815 | 0.05 | -0.12, 0.22 | 0.04, 0.08 | 0.16, 0.24 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 10.1227 | 4.13E-04 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Discernment-Sharing        | Student's t| 3.1907 | 0.001 | 0.20 | 0.08, 0.32 | 0.19, 0.07 | 0.31, 0.24 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 5.69E-07 | 3.03E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Academia-Sharing           | Student's t| -2.0655 | 0.039 | -0.25 | -0.49, -0.01 | -0.18, -0.35 | -0.01, -0.18 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.761 | 8.41E-05 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Academia-C-Sharing         | Student's t| -0.1042 | 0.917 | -0.02 | -0.36, 0.32 | -0.01, 0.18 | -0.16, 0.18 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.0959 | 5.59E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Crime-Sharing              | Student's t| -1.7067 | 0.088 | -0.24 | -0.51, 0.04 | -0.15, -0.31 | -0.02, 0.12 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.3934 | 1.25E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Crime-C-Sharing            | Student's t| 1.9234 | 0.055 | 0.28 | -0.01, 0.56 | 0.17, 0.00 | 0.34, 0.12 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.578 | 7.75E-07 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Dumped-Sharing             | Student's t| -0.817 | 0.414 | -0.10 | -0.34, 0.14 | -0.07, -0.24 | 0.10, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1321 | 3.96E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Dumped-C-Sharing           | Student's t| 0.1199 | 0.905 | 0.02 | -0.30, 0.34 | 0.01, 0.16 | 0.18, 0.11 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.0966 | 5.00E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Education-Sharing          | Student's t| -1.8818 | 0.06 | -0.24 | -0.49, 0.01 | -0.16, -0.33 | -0.01, 0.01 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.5353 | 8.41E-07 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Education-C-Sharing        | Student's t| 1.4028 | 0.161 | 0.22 | -0.09, 0.53 | 0.12, 0.05 | 0.29, 0.12 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.2485 | 2.06E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Fired-Sharing              | Student's t| -0.5651 | 0.572 | -0.07 | -0.32, 0.18 | -0.05, -0.22 | -0.12, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.112 | 4.36E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Fired-C-Sharing            | Student's t| 0.8106 | 0.418 | -0.13 | -0.45, 0.19 | -0.07, -0.24 | 0.10, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1319 | 3.70E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Freud-Sharing              | Student's t| -0.5985 | 0.55 | -0.08 | -0.33, 0.18 | -0.05, -0.22 | 0.12, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1139 | 4.36E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Freud-C-Sharing            | Student's t| 0.6405 | 0.522 | 0.09 | -0.19, 0.38 | 0.06, 0.11 | 0.22, 0.11 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1169 | 4.30E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Heartland-Sharing          | Student's t| -1.1391 | 0.255 | -0.15 | -0.40, 0.11 | -0.10, -0.27 | 0.07, 0.11 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1798 | 2.78E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Heartland-C-Sharing        | Student's t| -1.4622 | 0.144 | -0.19 | -0.45, 0.07 | -0.13, -0.29 | 0.04, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.2706 | 1.79E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Marriage-Sharing           | Student's t| -1.3292 | 0.184 | -0.18 | -0.45, 0.09 | -0.11, -0.28 | 0.05, 0.19 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.2252 | 2.31E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Marriage-C-Sharing         | Student's t| -0.2148 | 0.83 | -0.03 | -0.35, 0.28 | -0.02, -0.19 | 0.15, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.0981 | 4.95E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Presidential-Sharing       | Student's t| -1.7379 | 0.083 | -0.23 | -0.49, 0.03 | -0.15, -0.32 | 0.02, 0.15 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.4166 | 1.05E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Presidential-C-Sharing     | Student's t| 0.0989 | 0.921 | 0.01 | -0.26, 0.29 | 0.01, 0.16 | 0.18, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.0958 | 5.70E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Twitterbio-Sharing         | Student's t| 0.6514 | 0.515 | 0.08 | -0.17, 0.34 | 0.06, 0.11 | 0.22, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1178 | 4.20E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |
| Twitterbio-C-Sharing       | Student's t| 0.3627 | 0.717 | 0.05 | -0.24, 0.34 | 0.03, 0.14 | 0.20, 0.06 |
|                            | BF_{10}    | 0.1019 | 5.04E-06 |      |          |            |           |        |

* Levene's test is significant (p < .05), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S23.
Study 1 (emotional language): linear regression per outcome variable, with covariates. Significant predictors are marked in bold.

| Predictor                | Technique recognition | Confidence | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|---------|
|                          | b         | SE   | t    | p     | b   | SE  | t    | p     | b   | SE  | t    | p     |
| Intercept a              | 1.6762    | 0.441 | 3.805 | < .001 | 0.45661 | 0.29 | 1.577 | 0.115 | 0.47679 | 0.369 | 1.291 | 0.197 | 0.16702 | 0.353 | 0.473 | 0.636 |
| Condition:               |           |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |
| Inoculation – Control    | 0.710     | 0.083 | 8.594 | < .001 | 0.314     | 0.054 | 5.791 | < .001 | 0.289   | 0.069 | 4.178 | < .001 | 0.243 | 0.066 | 3.667 | < .001 |
| Gender                   | 0.313     | 0.086 | 3.639 | < .001 | 0.016     | 0.057 | 0.279 | 0.78   | 0.156   | 0.072 | 2.166 | 0.031 | 0.053 | 0.069 | 0.775 | 0.439 |
| Age                      | -0.022    | 0.032 | -0.7  | 0.485  | -0.005    | 0.021 | -0.27 | 0.791  | 0.008   | 0.026 | 0.299 | 0.765 | 0.017 | 0.025 | 0.686 | 0.493 |
| Education                | -0.087    | 0.047 | -1.85 | 0.064  | 0.030     | 0.031 | 0.972 | 0.332  | -0.043  | 0.04 | -1.085 | 0.278 | 0.004 | 0.038 | 0.109 | 0.913 |
| Political-Ideology       | -0.034    | 0.025 | -1.37 | 0.171  | -0.006    | 0.016 | -0.4  | 0.692  | -0.056  | 0.021 | -2.703 | 0.007 | -0.054 | 0.02 | -2.72 | 0.007 |
| News-Check               | 0.123     | 0.05  | 2.458 | 0.014  | 0.013     | 0.033 | 0.399 | 0.69   | 0.115   | 0.042 | 2.735 | 0.006 | 0.088 | 0.04 | 2.198 | 0.028 |
| Social-Media-Use         | -0.031    | 0.045 | -0.69 | 0.493  | 0.004     | 0.029 | 0.121 | 0.904  | -0.027  | 0.037 | -0.725 | 0.469 | 0.018 | 0.036 | 0.511 | 0.61  |
| Populism                 | -0.025    | 0.076 | -0.34 | 0.738  | -0.052    | 0.05  | -1.04 | 0.298  | -0.006  | 0.064 | -0.087 | 0.931 | -0.116 | 0.061 | -1.92 | 0.056 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity     | -0.261    | 0.05  | -5.29 | < .001 | -0.110    | 0.033 | -3.38 | < .001 | -0.076  | 0.042 | -1.842 | 0.066 | 0.036 | 0.04 | 0.898 | 0.369 |
| Conspiracy-Belief        | -0.255    | 0.232 | -1.1  | 0.273  | 0.086     | 0.153 | 0.565 | 0.572  | -0.185  | 0.195 | -0.951 | 0.342 | -0.125 | 0.186 | -0.67 | 0.502 |
| Analytical-Thinking      | 0.111     | 0.039 | 2.864 | 0.004  | 0.046     | 0.025 | 1.809 | 0.071  | 0.101   | 0.032 | 3.122 | 0.002 | -0.012 | 0.031 | -0.39 | 0.70  |
| Numerical-Thinking       | 0.173     | 0.045 | 3.87  | < .001 | -0.004    | 0.029 | -0.15 | 0.884  | 0.164   | 0.038 | 4.375 | < .001 | 0.101 | 0.036 | 2.803 | 0.005 |

* Represents reference level
Table S24.
Study 2 (incoherence): linear regression per outcome variable, with covariates. Significant predictors are marked in bold.

| Predictor                  | Technique recognition | Confidence | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|---------|
|                            | b         | SE        | t       | p       | b         | SE        | t       | p       | b         | SE        | t       | p       | b         | SE        | t       | p       |
| Intercept *         | 2.007     | 0.485     | 4.143   | <.001   | 0.35028   | 0.278     | 1.2586  | 0.208   | 2.11531   | 0.391     | 5.4068  | <.001   | 1.02273   | 0.331     | 3.086   | 0.002   |
| Condition:       |           |           |         |         |           |           |         |         |           |           |         |         |           |           |         |         |
| Control – Inoculation | -0.881    | 0.088     | -10.04  | <.001   | -0.190    | 0.051     | -3.757  | <.001   | -0.207    | 0.071     | -2.922  | 0.004   | -0.086    | 0.06      | -1.44   | 0.151   |
| Gender          | -0.074    | 0.091     | -0.818  | 0.413   | -0.023    | 0.052     | -0.445  | 0.656   | -0.116    | 0.073     | -1.583  | 0.114   | -0.130    | 0.062     | -2.1    | 0.036   |
| Age             | -0.073    | 0.035     | -2.063  | 0.039   | 0.002     | 0.02      | 0.0966  | 0.923   | -0.003    | 0.029     | -0.101  | 0.92    | 0.004     | 0.024      | 0.181   | 0.856   |
| Education       | -0.063    | 0.051     | -1.23   | 0.219   | -0.010    | 0.029     | -0.335  | 0.738   | -0.084    | 0.041     | -2.036  | 0.042   | -0.114    | 0.035      | -3.27   | 0.001   |
| Political-Ideology | -0.112    | 0.027     | -4.121  | <.001   | -0.006    | 0.016     | -0.379  | 0.704   | -0.192    | 0.022     | -8.755  | <.001   | -0.098    | 0.019      | -5.25   | <.001   |
| News-Check      | 0.055     | 0.054     | 1.003   | 0.316   | 0.027     | 0.031     | 0.8666  | 0.386   | 0.062     | 0.044     | 1.4197  | 0.156   | 0.062     | 0.037      | 1.668   | 0.096   |
| Social-Media-Use | -0.016    | 0.047     | -0.342  | 0.733   | -0.044    | 0.027     | -1.655  | 0.098   | -0.025    | 0.038     | -0.663  | 0.508   | -0.035    | 0.032      | -1.11   | 0.267   |
| Populism        | 0.056     | 0.081     | 0.687   | 0.492   | 0.010     | 0.047     | 0.2172  | 0.828   | 0.001     | 0.066     | 0.0184  | 0.985   | -0.042    | 0.056      | 0.76    | 0.45    |
| Bullshit-Receptivity | -0.198    | 0.053     | -3.726  | <.001   | -0.020    | 0.031     | -0.666  | 0.506   | -0.106    | 0.043     | -2.457  | 0.014   | 0.102     | 0.036      | 2.788   | 0.005   |
| Conspiracy-Belief | -0.085    | 0.237     | -0.356  | 0.722   | -0.044    | 0.136     | -0.321  | 0.749   | -0.384    | 0.192     | -2.030  | 0.045   | -0.141    | 0.162      | -0.87   | 0.385   |
| Analytical-Thinking | 0.067     | 0.05      | 1.33    | 0.184   | -0.041    | 0.029     | -1.407  | 0.16    | 0.035     | 0.041     | 0.8691  | 0.385   | -0.007    | 0.034      | -0.21   | 0.833   |
| Numerical-Thinking | 0.224     | 0.05      | 4.495   | <.001   | 0.016     | 0.029     | 0.5459  | 0.585   | 0.187     | 0.04      | 4.6594  | <.001   | 0.117     | 0.034      | 3.436   | <.001   |

* Represents reference level
Table S25.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): linear regression per outcome variable, with covariates. Significant predictors are marked in bold.

| Predictor               | Technique recognition b (SE) t p | Confidence b (SE) t p | Trustworthiness b (SE) t p | Sharing b (SE) t p |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Intercept *             | 3.15614 (0.487) 6.4809 <.001     | 0.27272 (0.315) 0.86459 0.387 | 1.75007 (0.374) 4.677 <.001 | 0.6304 (0.342) 1.841 0.066 |
| Condition:             |                                   |                       |                           |                   |
| Control – Inoculation   | -1.164 (0.089) -13.137 <.001     | -0.236 (0.057) -4.1193 <.001 | -0.397 (0.068) -5.83 <.001 | -0.242 (0.062) -3.89 <.001 |
| Gender                  | 0.158 (0.093) 1.7009 0.089        | 0.062 (0.06) 1.03602 0.3   | 0.056 (0.071) 0.788 0.431  | 0.020 (0.065) 0.31 0.757 |
| Age                     | -0.065 (0.035) -1.8411 0.066     | -0.053 (0.023) -2.3236 0.02 | 0.004 (0.027) 0.14 0.889   | 0.032 (0.025) 1.279 0.201 |
| Education               | -0.067 (0.052) -1.3037 0.193     | 0.044 (0.034) 1.30249 0.193 | -0.055 (0.04) -1.39 0.166  | -0.082 (0.036) -2.26 0.024 |
| Political-Ideology      | -0.098 (0.027) -3.6329 <.001     | -9.4e-4 (0.017) -0.0544 0.957 | -0.081 (0.021) -3.92 <.001 | -0.054 (0.019) -2.86 0.004 |
| News-Check              | 0.039 (0.053) 0.7281 0.467        | 0.005 (0.035) 0.14324 0.886 | 0.031 (0.041) 0.763 0.445  | 0.016 (0.038) 0.428 0.668 |
| Social-Media-Use        | 0.052 (0.047) 1.1044 0.27         | -0.020 (0.03) -0.6498 0.516 | 0.062 (0.036) 1.712 0.087  | 0.045 (0.033) 1.378 0.168 |
| Populism                | -0.007 (0.083) -0.0852 0.932     | 0.044 (0.053) 0.82315 0.411 | -0.094 (0.063) -1.48 0.14  | 0.050 (0.058) 0.867 0.386 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity    | -0.385 (0.053) -7.3352 <.001     | 0.009 (0.034) 0.27225 0.785 | -0.123 (0.04) -3.05 0.002  | 0.025 (0.037) 0.665 0.506 |
| Conspiracy-Belief       | -0.775 (0.234) -3.3063 <.001     | -0.242 (0.152) -1.9594 0.111 | -0.502 (0.18) -2.79 0.005  | -0.423 (0.165) -2.57 0.01 |
| Analytical-Thinking     | 0.133 (0.051) 2.686 0.009         | 0.000 (0.033) 0.0055 0.996  | 0.105 (0.039) 2.691 0.007  | 0.029 (0.036) 0.823 0.411 |
| Numerical-Thinking      | 0.287 (0.051) 5.6051 <.001        | 0.018 (0.033) 0.53452 0.593  | 0.096 (0.039) 2.446 0.015  | 0.027 (0.036) 0.761 0.447 |

* Represents reference level
Table S26.
Study 4 (scapegoating): linear regression per outcome variable, with covariates. Significant predictors are marked in bold.

| Predictor                   | Technique recognition | Confidence | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|---------|
|                             | b         | SE       | t    | p     | b         | SE       | t    | p     | b         | SE       | t    | p     |
| Interception a               | 3.2073   | 0.515   | 6.231 | < .001 | 0.66618   | 0.347   | 1.921 | 0.055 | 1.65941   | 0.399   | 4.163 | < .001 | 0.87836 | 0.344   | 2.552 | 0.01 |
| Condition                   |           |          |      |       |           |          |      |       |           |          |      |       |           |          |      |       |
| Control – Inoculation       | -0.420   | 0.1     | -4.22 | < .001 | -0.231    | 0.067   | -3.44  | < .001 | -0.091    | 0.077   | -1.183 | 0.237  | -0.119   | 0.067   | -1.79  | 0.08 |
| Gender                      | 0.369    | 0.105   | 3.516 | < .001 | -0.043    | 0.071   | -0.6   | 0.546 | 0.240     | 0.081   | 2.9528 | 0.003  | 0.056    | 0.07    | 0.796  | 0.43 |
| Age                         | 0.079    | 0.041   | 1.949 | 0.052  | -0.010    | 0.027   | -0.35  | 0.726 | 0.054     | 0.032   | 1.7279 | 0.084  | 0.030    | 0.027   | 1.102  | 0.27 |
| Education                   | -0.299   | 0.057   | -5.27 | < .001 | 0.045     | 0.038   | 1.181  | 0.238 | -0.163    | 0.044   | -3.714 | < .001 | -0.061   | 0.038   | -1.61  | 0.11 |
| Political-Ideology          | -0.045   | 0.03    | -1.53 | 0.126  | 0.009     | 0.02    | 0.445  | 0.656 | -0.022    | 0.023   | -0.96  | 0.337  | -0.018   | 0.02    | -0.92  | 0.36 |
| News-Check                  | -0.020   | 0.066   | -0.3  | 0.766  | -0.064    | 0.045   | -1.43  | 0.153 | 0.072     | 0.051   | 1.408  | 0.159  | -0.009   | 0.044   | -0.2   | 0.84 |
| Social-Media-Use            | 0.088    | 0.05    | 1.761 | 0.079  | -0.010    | 0.034   | -0.3   | 0.763 | 0.002     | 0.039   | 0.0619 | 0.951  | 0.027    | 0.033   | 0.823  | 0.41 |
| Populism                    | 0.238    | 0.092   | 2.575 | 0.01   | -0.032    | 0.062   | -0.52  | 0.607 | 0.009     | 0.072   | 0.1232 | 0.902  | -0.094   | 0.062   | -1.53  | 0.13 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity        | -0.312   | 0.058   | -5.34 | < .001 | 0.022     | 0.039   | 0.552  | 0.581 | -0.111    | 0.045   | -2.453 | 0.014  | 0.033    | 0.039   | 0.836  | 0.40 |
| Conspiracy-Belief           | -1.224   | 0.274   | -4.47 | < .001 | -0.104    | 0.184   | -0.56  | 0.573 | -0.821    | 0.212   | -3.878 | < .001 | -0.130   | 0.183   | -0.71  | 0.48 |
| Analytical-Thinking         | 0.047    | 0.056   | 0.824 | 0.41   | -0.033    | 0.038   | -0.88  | 0.379 | 0.035     | 0.044   | 0.8015 | 0.423  | 0.040    | 0.038   | 1.065  | 0.29 |
| Numerical-Thinking          | 0.270    | 0.057   | 4.749 | < .001 | 0.016     | 0.038   | 0.406  | 0.685 | 0.156     | 0.044   | 3.542  | < .001 | 0.058    | 0.038   | 1.516  | 0.13 |

* Represents reference level
Table S27.
Study 5 (ad hominem): linear regression per outcome variable, with covariates. Significant predictors are marked in bold.

| Predictor                  | Technique recognition b | SE  | t   | p   | Confidence b | SE  | t   | p   | Trustworthiness b | SE  | t   | p   | Sharing b | SE  | t   | p   |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| Intercept                 | 3.3013                  | 0.517 | 6.384 | < .001 | 0.7233       | 0.346 | 2.09 | 0.04 | 0.7872           | 0.373 | 2.109 | 0.035 | 0.00621 | 0.335 | 0.0185 | 0.99 |
| Condition:                |                         |     |     |     |             |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |           |     |     |     |
| Control – Inoculation     | -0.724                  | 0.096 | -7.51 | < .001 | 0.163        | 0.065 | 2.521 | 0.01 | -0.184           | 0.07 | -2.65 | 0.008 | -0.170 | 0.062 | -2.724 | 0.01 |
| Gender                    | 0.257                   | 0.1   | 2.576 | 0.01  | 0.062        | 0.067 | 0.925 | 0.36 | 0.194            | 0.072 | 2.702 | 0.007 | 0.062    | 0.065 | 0.9672 | 0.33 |
| Age                       | -0.094                  | 0.042 | -2.25 | 0.024 | -0.048       | 0.028 | -1.73 | 0.09 | 0.043            | 0.03 | 1.429 | 0.153 | 0.050    | 0.027 | 1.8496 | 0.07 |
| Education                 | -0.094                  | 0.055 | -1.69 | 0.091 | -0.038       | 0.037 | -1.02 | 0.31 | 0.010            | 0.04 | 0.245 | 0.072 | -0.026   | 0.036 | -0.726 | 0.47 |
| Political-Ideology        | -0.101                  | 0.03  | -3.42 | < .001 | -0.031       | 0.02  | -1.55 | 0.12 | -0.071           | 0.021 | -3.34 | < 0.001 | -0.034   | 0.019 | -1.782 | 0.08 |
| News-Check                | 0.120                   | 0.056 | 2.134 | 0.033 | 0.031        | 0.038 | 0.83  | 0.41 | 0.061            | 0.041 | 1.495 | 0.135 | 0.083    | 0.036 | 2.287 | 0.02 |
| Social-Media-Use          | 0.091                   | 0.051 | 1.782 | 0.075 | -0.022       | 0.034 | -0.64 | 0.52 | 0.079            | 0.037 | 2.141 | 0.033 | 0.103    | 0.033 | 3.1179 | 0.002 |
| Populism                  | 0.020                   | 0.092 | 0.219 | 0.827 | -0.098       | 0.061 | -1.59 | 0.11 | 0.050            | 0.066 | 0.759 | 0.448 | 0.020    | 0.059 | 0.3322 | 0.74 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity      | -0.464                  | 0.057 | -8.13 | < .001 | -0.019       | 0.038 | -0.49 | 0.63 | -0.155           | 0.041 | -3.77 | < 0.001 | 0.042    | 0.037 | 1.142 | 0.25 |
| Conspiracy-Belief         | -0.630                  | 0.272 | -2.32 | 0.021 | 0.116        | 0.182 | 0.64  | 0.52 | -0.433           | 0.196 | -2.21 | 0.027 | -0.396   | 0.176 | -2.251 | 0.03 |
| Analytical-Thinking       | 0.084                   | 0.055 | 1.527 | 0.127 | -0.015       | 0.037 | -0.41 | 0.68 | 0.015            | 0.04  | 0.375 | 0.708 | -0.063   | 0.036 | -1.77 | 0.08 |
| Numerical-Thinking        | 0.243                   | 0.054 | 4.53  | < .001 | 0.051        | 0.036 | 1.412 | 0.16 | 0.114            | 0.039 | 2.929 | 0.003 | 0.066    | 0.035 | 1.9001 | 0.06 |

* Represents reference level
**Table S28.**

Study 1 (emotional language): linear regression at the rating level for technique recognition, trustworthiness discernment and sharing discernment, with robust standard errors clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral). Outcome variable of interest is “discernmentxinoculation”.

| Variables                      | Technique recognition | Trustworthiness discernment | Sharing discernment |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| discernment                   | -1.336***             | 0.786***                     | 0.322**             |
| (0.206)                       | (0.178)               | (0.130)                      |
| inoculation                   | 0.649***              | -0.00954                     | 0.0432              |
| (0.150)                       | (0.0942)              | (0.102)                      |
| discernmentxinoculation       | -0.635***             | 0.280***                     | 0.162*              |
| (0.170)                       | (0.0973)              | (0.0946)                     |
| Constant                      | 4.868***              | 3.331***                     | 2.546***            |
| (0.140)                       | (0.127)               | (0.0960)                     |

Observations: 11,018  
R-squared: 0.187  
Robust standard errors in parentheses  
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

**Table S29.**

Study 2 (incoherence): linear regression at the rating level for technique recognition, trustworthiness discernment and sharing discernment, with robust standard errors clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral). Outcome variable of interest is “discernmentxinoculation”.

| Variables                      | Technique recognition | Trustworthiness discernment | Sharing discernment |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| discernment                   | -0.796***             | 1.114***                     | 0.553***            |
| (0.208)                       | (0.263)               | (0.149)                      |
| inoculation                   | 1.426***              | -0.329**                     | -0.0930             |
| (0.125)                       | (0.132)               | (0.0774)                     |
| discernmentxinoculation       | -0.834***             | 0.215                        | 0.135*              |
| (0.172)                       | (0.156)               | (0.0817)                     |
| Constant                      | 3.664***              | 2.867***                     | 2.025***            |
| (0.152)                       | (0.171)               | (0.0794)                     |

Observations: 11,141  
R-squared: 0.187  
Robust standard errors in parentheses  
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table S30.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): linear regression at the rating level for technique recognition, trustworthiness discernment and sharing discernment, with robust standard errors clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral). Outcome variable of interest is “discernmentxinoculation”.

| Variables                | Technique recognition | Trustworthiness discernment | Sharing discernment |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| discernment              | -1.170***             | 0.716***                    | 0.375**             |
|                          | (0.145)               | (0.169)                     | (0.179)             |
| inoculation              | 0.980***              | -0.246***                   | -0.0980             |
|                          | (0.0961)              | (0.0847)                    | (0.0852)            |
| discernmentxinoculation  | -0.984***             | 0.361***                    | 0.177**             |
|                          | (0.137)               | (0.0967)                    | (0.0722)            |
| Constant                 | 4.293***              | 3.560***                    | 2.414***            |
|                          | (0.100)               | (0.119)                     | (0.0948)            |

Observations: 11,239
R-squared: 0.190

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table S31.
Study 4 (scapegoating): linear regression for technique recognition, trustworthiness discernment and sharing discernment, with robust standard errors clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral). Outcome variable of interest is “discernmentxinoculation”.

| Variables                | Technique recognition | Trustworthiness discernment | Sharing discernment |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| discernment              | -2.241***             | 1.150***                    | 0.540***            |
|                          | (0.192)               | (0.118)                     | (0.0823)            |
| inoculation              | 0.476***              | -0.133                      | -0.0210             |
|                          | (0.0932)              | (0.0879)                    | (0.0871)            |
| discernmentxinoculation  | -0.479***             | 0.132                       | 0.131*              |
|                          | (0.130)               | (0.0889)                    | (0.0762)            |
| Constant                 | 5.195***              | 2.989***                    | 2.168***            |
|                          | (0.109)               | (0.0926)                    | (0.0759)            |

Observations: 11,030
R-squared: 0.190

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table S32.
Study 5 (ad hominem): linear regression for technique recognition, trustworthiness discernment and sharing discernment, with robust standard errors clustered on study participants and stimuli (manipulative vs neutral). Outcome variable of interest is “discernmentxinoculation”.

| Variables                  | Technique recognition | Trustworthiness discernment | Sharing discernment |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| discernment                | -1.695***             | 1.016***                     | 0.580***            |
|                            | (0.213)               | (0.151)                      | (0.117)             |
| inoculation                | 0.251**               | -0.146**                     | -0.131*             |
|                            | (0.103)               | (0.0718)                     | (0.0763)            |
| discernmentxinoculation    | -0.765***             | 0.240***                     | 0.175***            |
|                            | (0.140)               | (0.0751)                     | (0.0673)            |
| Constant                   | 5.237***              | 2.836***                     | 2.070***            |
|                            | (0.0745)              | (0.0841)                     | (0.0701)            |

Observations: 11,133
R-squared: 0.257, 0.114, 0.038

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table S33.
Studies 1-5: ANOVA table for technique recognition, with “study” as the between-groups variable, control participants only.

| ANOVA          | Sum of Sq. | df | Mean Sq. | F    | p   | η²   |
|----------------|------------|----|----------|------|-----|------|
| Overall model  | 817        | 4  | 204.17   | 84.8 | <.001 | 0.109 |
| Study          | 817        | 4  | 204.17   | 84.8 | <.001 | 0.109 |
| Residuals      | 6710       | 2787 | 2.41    |      |      |      |

| Study         | Study                  | Mdiff | SE  | df  | t   | p   | η²   | Cohen’s d | 95% CI  |
|---------------|------------------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----------|---------|
| Ad hominem    | Emotional language     | 0.38  | 0.09| 2787| 4.1 | <.001 | 0.25 | 0.13, 0.36|
|               | False dichotomies      | 0.59  | 0.09| 2787| 6.41 | <.001 | 0.38 | 0.26, 0.50|
|               | Incoherence            | 1.04  | 0.09| 2787| 11.24| <.001 | 0.67 | 0.55, 0.79|
|               | Scapegoating           | -0.55 | 0.09| 2787| -5.96| <.001 | -0.36| -0.47, -0.24|
| Emotional language | False dichotomies | 0.21  | 0.09| 2787| 2.27 | 0.154 | 0.14 | 0.02, 0.25|
|               | Incoherence            | 0.66  | 0.09| 2787| 7.09 | <.001 | 0.43 | 0.31, 0.54|
|               | Scapegoating           | -0.94 | 0.09| 2787| -10.02| <.001 | -0.60| -0.72, -0.48|
| False dichotomies | Incoherence            | 0.45  | 0.09| 2787| 4.85 | <.001 | 0.29 | 0.17, 0.41|
|               | Scapegoating           | -1.15 | 0.09| 2787| -12.37| <.001 | -0.74| -0.86, -0.62|
| Incoherence    | Scapegoating           | -1.60 | 0.09| 2787| -17.19| <.001 | -1.03| -1.15, -0.91|

Note. Comparisons are based on estimated marginal means.
Table S4.
Studies 1-5: ANOVA table for trustworthiness discernment, with “study” as the between-groups variable, control participants only.

| ANOVA                  | Sum of Sq | df | Mean Sq | F     | p     | η²   |
|------------------------|-----------|----|---------|-------|-------|------|
| Overall model          | 73.3      | 4  | 18.33   | 13.8  | <.001 | 0.019|
| Study                  | 73.3      | 4  | 18.33   | 13.8  | <.001 | 0.019|
| Residuals              | 3711.6    | 2787 | 1.33     |       |       |      |

| Study | Study                | M_{diff} | SE   | df  | t     | p_{tukey} | Cohen's d | 95% CI |
|-------|----------------------|----------|------|-----|-------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| Ad hominem | Emotional language  | 0.171    | 0.069 | 2787 | 2.46  | 0.099     | 0.15      | 0.03, 0.27 |
|         | False dichotomies   | 0.294    | 0.069 | 2787 | 4.28  | <.001     | 0.26      | 0.14, 0.37 |
|         | Incoherence         | -0.074   | 0.069 | 2787 | -1.08 | 0.818     | -0.06     | -0.18, 0.05 |
|         | Scapegoating        | -0.147   | 0.069 | 2787 | -2.12 | 0.210     | -0.13     | -0.24, -0.01 |
| Emotional language | False dichotomies   | 0.124    | 0.069 | 2787 | 1.79  | 0.381     | 0.11      | -0.01, 0.22 |
|         | Incoherence         | -0.245   | 0.069 | 2787 | -3.54 | 0.004     | -0.21     | -0.33, -0.09 |
|         | Scapegoating        | -0.318   | 0.070 | 2787 | -4.57 | <.001     | -0.28     | -0.39, -0.16 |
| False dichotomies     | Incoherence         | -0.369   | 0.069 | 2787 | -5.36 | <.001     | -0.32     | -0.44, -0.20 |
|         | Scapegoating        | -0.441   | 0.069 | 2787 | -6.4  | <.001     | -0.38     | -0.50, -0.26 |
| Incoherence           | Scapegoating       | -0.073   | 0.069 | 2787 | -1.05 | 0.831     | -0.06     | -0.18, 0.05 |

Note. Comparisons are based on estimated marginal means
Table S35.
Studies 1-5: Student’s and Bayesian $t$-tests for technique recognition, confidence (manipulative and neutral posts), trustworthiness discernment, and sharing discernment, by study, with “never sharers” excluded.

| Study             | Variable                  | Type           | Statistic | ±%       | df  | $p$     | $M_{diff}$ | 95% CI         | Cohen’s $d$ | 95% CI |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|-----|--------|------------|---------------|-------------|--------|
| 1 Emotional       | Technique rec.            | Student's t    | 7.04      | .001     | 931 | <.001 | 0.48, 0.84 | 0.46, 0.59    |
| language          | CONFIDENCE (MANIPULATIVE) | Student's t    | 1.60E+09  | 5.82E-16 | 7.47 | <.001 | 0.41, 0.69 | 0.37, 0.64    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)      | Student's t    | 3.65      | .001     | 49.8 | <.001 | 0.12, 0.39 | 0.24, 0.37    |
|                   | TRUSTWORTHINESS DISC.     | Student's t    | 3.67      | .001     | 52.7 | <.001 | 0.13, 0.44 | 0.24, 0.37    |
|                   | SHARING DISC.             | Student's t    | 3.53      | .001     | 32.2 | <.001 | 0.12, 0.41 | 0.23, 0.36    |
| 2 Incoherence     | Technique rec.            | Student's t    | 8.56      | .001     | 872  | <.001 | 0.67, 1.07 | 0.58, 0.72    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (MANIPULATIVE) | Student's t    | 1.27      | 0.204    | 874  | 0.09  | -0.05, 0.24 | -0.05, 0.22   |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)      | Student's t    | -1.42     | 0.157    | 872  | -0.10 | -0.24, 0.04 | -0.23, 0.04   |
|                   | TRUSTWORTHINESS DISC.     | Student's t    | 2.9       | 0.004    | 872  | 0.25  | 0.08, 0.41 | 0.20, 0.33    |
|                   | SHARING DISC.             | Student's t    | 2.332     | 0.02     | 872  | 0.17  | 0.03, 0.31 | 0.16, 0.29    |
| 3 False           | Technique disc.           | Student’s t    | 9.86      | <.001    | 906  | 1.05  | 0.84, 1.25 | 0.66, 0.79    |
| dichotomies       | CONFIDENCE (MANIPULATIVE) | Student’s t    | 7.09      | <.001    | 907  | 0.51  | 0.37, 0.65 | 0.47, 0.60    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)      | Student’s t    | 3.81      | <.001    | 906  | 0.29  | 0.14, 0.44 | 0.25, 0.38    |
|                   | TRUSTWORTHINESS DISC.     | Student’s t    | 5.31      | <.001    | 906  | 0.41  | 0.26, 0.57 | 0.35, 0.48    |
|                   | SHARING DISC.             | Student’s t    | 3.95      | <.001    | 906  | 0.29  | 0.15, 0.43 | 0.26, 0.39    |
| 4 Scapegoating    | Technique rec.            | Student’s t    | 3.98      | <.001    | 850  | 0.47  | 0.24, 0.70 | 0.27, 0.41    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (MANIPULATIVE) | Student’s t    | 5.09      | <.001    | 849  | 0.38  | 0.23, 0.53 | 0.35, 0.49    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)      | Student’s t    | 1.56      | 0.118    | 850  | 0.12  | -0.03, 0.28 | -0.03, 0.24   |
|                   | TRUSTWORTHINESS DISC.     | Student’s t    | 1.92      | 0.055    | 850  | 0.17  | 0.00, 0.35 | 0.13, 0.27    |
|                   | SHARING DISC.             | Student’s t    | 1.84      | 0.067    | 850  | 0.15  | -0.01, 0.30 | -0.01, 0.26   |
| 5 Ad hominem      | Technique rec.            | Student’s t    | 6.05      | <.001    | 882  | 0.70  | 0.47, 0.93 | 0.41, 0.54    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (MANIPULATIVE) | Student’s t    | 3.64E+06  | 1.21E-11 | 882  | 0.34  | 0.19, 0.50 | 0.29, 0.43    |
|                   | CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)      | Student’s t    | 5.74      | <.001    | 882  | 0.45  | 0.30, 0.60 | 0.39, 0.52    |
|                   | TRUSTWORTHINESS DISC.     | Student’s t    | 3.51      | <.001    | 882  | 0.28  | 0.12, 0.44 | 0.24, 0.37    |
|                   | SHARING DISC.             | Student’s t    | 3.08      | 0.002    | 882  | 0.22  | 0.08, 0.36 | 0.21, 0.34    |

* Levene’s test is significant ($p < .05$), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S36.
Studies 1-5: Linear regressions with “Fake-Confidence” (confidence in technique recognition for the manipulative/misinformation stimuli) as dependent variable and perceived use of a manipulation technique in manipulative stimuli (Fake-Manipulativeness, Fake-Incoherence, Fake-Dichotomy, Fake-Scapegoating and Fake-AdHominem) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Note that in all 5 studies, the perceived use of a technique in manipulative social media content is significantly and positively correlated with participants’ confidence in recognizing these techniques, when controlling for the condition that participants were assigned to.

| Study                  | Model fit measures | Overall Model Test |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                        | R  | R²  | F   | df1 | df2 | p      |
| 1 Emotional language   | 0.543 | 0.295 | 224  | 2   | 1068 | <.001  |
| 2 Incoherence          | 0.241 | 0.0579 | 33.3 | 2   | 1083 | <.001  |
| 3 False dichotomies    | 0.464 | 0.215 | 150  | 2   | 1091 | <.001  |
| 4 Scapegoating         | 0.695 | 0.483 | 502  | 2   | 1075 | <.001  |
| 5 Ad hominem           | 0.65  | 0.423 | 395  | 2   | 1078 | <.001  |

Model coefficients - Fake-Confidence

| Study                  | Predictor                  | b      | SE    | t     | p    |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| 1 Emotional language   | Intercept                   | 3.097  | 0.1224| 25.29 | <.001|
|                        | Condition:                 |        |       |       |      |
|                        | Inoculation – Control      | 0.228  | 0.0588| 3.87  | <.001|
|                        | Fake-Manipulativeness      | 0.45   | 0.0237| 18.94 | <.001|
| 2 Incoherence          | Intercept                   | 4.888  | 0.0995| 49.11 | <.001|
|                        | Condition:                 |        |       |       |      |
|                        | Inoculation – Control      | -0.238 | 0.0738| -3.23 | 0.001|
|                        | Fake-Incoherence           | 0.199  | 0.0245| 8.12  | <.001|
| 3 False dichotomies    | Intercept                   | 3.526  | 0.1119| 31.5  | <.001|
|                        | Condition:                 |        |       |       |      |
|                        | Inoculation – Control      | 0.159  | 0.065 | 2.44  | 0.015|
|                        | Fake-Dichotomy             | 0.36   | 0.0241| 14.96 | <.001|
| 4 Scapegoating         | Intercept                   | 1.9492 | 0.1163| 16.76 | <.001|
|                        | Condition:                 |        |       |       |      |
|                        | Inoculation – Control      | 0.0847 | 0.0498| 1.7   | 0.089|
|                        | Fake-Scapegoating          | 0.6525 | 0.0213| 30.67 | <.001|
| 5 Ad hominem           | Intercept                   | 1.615  | 0.1371| 11.78 | <.001|
|                        | Condition:                 |        |       |       |      |
|                        | Inoculation – Control      | 0.151  | 0.0586| 2.57  | 0.01 |
|                        | Fake-AdHominem             | 0.685  | 0.0248| 27.62 | <.001|

ᵃ Represents reference level
Table S37.
Studies 1-5: Linear regressions with “Control-Confidence” (confidence in technique recognition for the non-manipulative/neutral stimuli) as dependent variable and perceived use of a manipulation technique in non-manipulative stimuli (Control-Manipulativeness, Control-Incoherence, Control-Dichotomy, Control-Scapegoating and Control-AdHominem) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Note that in all 5 studies, the perceived use of a technique in non-manipulative social media content is significantly and negatively correlated with participants’ confidence in recognizing these techniques, when controlling for the condition that participants were assigned to.

| Study                      | R    | R²   | F    | df1 | df2 | p      |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|--------|
| 1 Emotional language      | 0.131| 0.0171| 9.26 | 2   | 1068 | <.001  |
| 2 Incoherence              | 0.14 | 0.0196| 10.8 | 2   | 1081 | <.001  |
| 3 False dichotomies        | 0.224| 0.0503| 28.9 | 2   | 1090 | <.001  |
| 4 Scapegoating             | 0.256| 0.0656| 37.8 | 2   | 1076 | <.001  |
| 5 Ad hominem               | 0.242| 0.0584| 33.4 | 2   | 1078 | <.001  |

Model coefficients - Control-Confidence

| Study                      | Predictor                  | b       | SE    | t      | p      |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|-------|--------|--------|
| 1 Emotional language      | Intercept                 | 5.3354  | 0.1076| 49.6   | <.001  |
|                           | Condition:                |         |       |        |        |
|                           | Inoculation – Control     | 0.2199  | 0.0651| 3.37   | <.001  |
|                           | Control-Manipulativeness  | -0.0735 | 0.0277| -2.65  | 0.008  |
| 2 Incoherence              | Intercept                 | 5.9273  | 0.089 | 66.56  | <.001  |
|                           | Condition:                |         |       |        |        |
|                           | Inoculation – Control     | -0.091  | 0.0661| -1.38  | 0.169  |
|                           | Control-Incoherence       | -0.1077 | 0.0265| -4.06  | <.001  |
| 3 False dichotomies        | Intercept                 | 5.599   | 0.1087| 51.49  | <.001  |
|                           | Condition:                |         |       |        |        |
|                           | Inoculation – Control     | 0.264   | 0.0694| 3.8    | <.001  |
|                           | Control-Dichotomy         | -0.198  | 0.0309| -6.4   | <.001  |
| 4 Scapegoating             | Intercept                 | 5.868   | 0.0957| 61.33  | <.001  |
|                           | Condition:                |         |       |        |        |
|                           | Inoculation – Control     | 0.125   | 0.068 | 1.84   | 0.066  |
|                           | Control-Scapegoating      | -0.242  | 0.0286| -8.47  | <.001  |
| 5 Ad hominem               | Intercept                 | 5.477   | 0.1202| 45.56  | <.001  |
|                           | Condition:                |         |       |        |        |
|                           | Inoculation – Control     | 0.352   | 0.0759| 4.64   | <.001  |
|                           | Control-AdHominem         | -0.172  | 0.031 | -5.56  | <.001  |

* Represents reference level
Table S38.
Studies 1-5: ANOVAs for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted political ideology variable (left – moderate – right) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Significant interactions between political ideology and condition are marked in bold. See also Figure S2 and Table S39 for the Tukey post-hoc tests.

| Study       | ANOVA - Diff-Technique | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       | p   | η²p |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-----|-----|
| 1 Emotional language | Condition               | 86.3           | 1   | 86.32       | 44.16   | <.01| 0.04|
|             | Political-Ideology-converted | 64.6           | 2   | 32.29       | 16.52   | <.01| 0.03|
|             | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 12             | 2   | 6           | 3.07    | 0.047| 0.006|
|             | Residuals               | 2079.8         | 1064| 1.95        |         |     |     |
| 2 Incoherence | Condition               | 187.02         | 1   | 187.02      | 86.82   | <.01| 0.075|
|             | Political-Ideology-converted | 80.06          | 2   | 40.03       | 18.58   | <.01| 0.033|
|             | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 6.37           | 2   | 3.18        | 1.48    | 0.229| 0.003|
|             | Residuals               | 2322.14        | 1078| 2.15        |         |     |     |
| 3 False dichotomies | Condition              | 312.37         | 1   | 312.37      | 123.836 | <.01| 0.102|
|             | Political-Ideology-converted | 100.28         | 2   | 50.139      | 19.877  | <.01| 0.035|
|             | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 1.92           | 2   | 0.96        | 0.38   | 0.683| 0.001|
|             | Residuals               | 2742.14        | 1087| 2.522       |         |     |     |
| 4 Scapegoating | Condition              | 50.06          | 1   | 50.06       | 16.963  | <.01| 0.016|
|             | Political-Ideology-converted | 28.39          | 2   | 14.19       | 4.81    | 0.008| 0.009|
|             | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 2.87           | 2   | 1.44        | 0.487   | 0.615| 0.001|
|             | Residuals               | 3166.34        | 1073| 2.95        |         |     |     |
| 5 Ad hominem | Condition              | 154            | 1   | 154.03      | 55.59   | <.01| 0.049|
|             | Political-Ideology-converted | 126.5          | 2   | 63.25       | 22.83   | <.01| 0.041|
|             | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 10.7           | 2   | 5.34        | 1.93    | 0.146| 0.004|
|             | Residuals               | 2978.7         | 1075| 2.77        |         |     |     |
Table S39.
Tukey post-hoc tests for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted political ideology variable (left – moderate – right) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Relevant $p$-values for differences between inoculation and control conditions for the same political ideology are marked in bold. Note that the only non-significant difference between inoculation and control condition is for moderates for the “emotional language” study, and for moderates and right-wingers for the “scapegoating” study. See also Figure S2 and Table S38.

| Study            | Condition | Pol.Ideol.-converted | Condition | Pol.Ideol.-converted | Mean | SE | df | $t$  | $p_{tukey}$ | Cohen's $d$ |
|------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|------|----|----|------|------------|-------------|
| 1 Emotional language | Control   | Left                 | - Control | Moderate             | 0.2989 | 0.154 | 1064 | 1.935 | 0.381       | 0.2138      |
|                   |           |                      | - Control | Right                | 0.3548 | 0.145 | 1064 | 2.449 | 0.141       | 0.2538      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -0.838 | 0.118 | 1064 | -7.114 | $<.001$   | -0.5994     |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | 0.0169 | 0.163 | 1064 | 0.104 | 1          | 0.0121      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.3759 | 0.139 | 1064 | -2.71  | 0.074       | -0.2689     |
|                   | Moderate  |                      | - Control   | Right               | 0.0559 | 0.177 | 1064 | 0.315 | 1          | 0.0399      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.1369 | 0.156 | 1064 | -7.293 | $<.001$   | 0.8132      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -0.282 | 0.192 | 1064 | -1.468 | 0.085     | -0.2017     |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.6748 | 0.172 | 1064 | -3.917 | 0.001      | -0.4827     |
|                   | Right     |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.1928 | 0.146 | 1064 | -8.149 | $<.001$   | 0.8532      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -0.3379 | 0.184 | 1064 | -1.832 | 0.045      | 0.2417      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.7307 | 0.164 | 1064 | -4.464 | $<.001$   | -0.5226     |
| Inoculation       | Left      |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | 0.8549 | 0.164 | 1064 | 5.212  | $<.001$   | 0.6115      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | 0.4621 | 0.14  | 1064 | 3.293  | 0.013      | 0.3035      |
|                   | Moderate  |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.3928 | 0.18  | 1064 | -2.187 | 0.245      | -0.281      |
| 2 Incoherence     | Control   | Left                 | - Control   | Moderate             | 0.611 | 0.16  | 1078 | 3.83   | 0.002      | 0.416       |
|                   |           |                      | - Control   | Right                | 0.381 | 0.151 | 1078 | 2.52   | 0.12       | 0.26        |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -0.962 | 0.122 | 1078 | -7.87  | $<.001$   | -0.656      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -0.461 | 0.161 | 1078 | -2.86  | 0.05       | -0.314      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.274 | 0.155 | 1078 | -1.77  | 0.487      | -0.186      |
|                   | Moderate  |                      | - Control   | Right               | -0.23  | 0.183 | 1078 | -1.26  | 0.807      | -0.157      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.573 | 0.159 | 1078 | -9.87  | $<.001$   | 1.072       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -1.072 | 0.191 | 1078 | -5.61  | $<.001$   | -0.731      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.884 | 0.185 | 1078 | -4.77  | $<.001$   | -0.603      |
|                   | Right     |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.343 | 0.151 | 1078 | -8.89  | $<.001$   | 0.915       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -0.842 | 0.184 | 1078 | -4.57  | $<.001$   | 0.574       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.654 | 0.178 | 1078 | -3.67  | 0.003      | -0.446      |
| Inoculation       | Left      |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | 0.501 | 0.161 | 1078 | 3.11   | 0.024      | 0.341       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | 0.689 | 0.155 | 1078 | 4.46   | $<.001$   | 0.469       |
|                   | Moderate  |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | 0.188 | 0.187 | 1078 | 1      | 0.917      | 0.128       |
| 3 False dichotomies | Control   | Left                 | - Control   | Moderate             | 0.377 | 0.182 | 1087 | 2.07   | 0.306      | 0.237       |
|                   |           |                      | - Control   | Right                | 0.818 | 0.161 | 1087 | 5.07   | $<.001$   | 0.515       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.068 | 0.133 | 1087 | -8.06  | $<.001$   | -0.673      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -0.767 | 0.167 | 1087 | -4.59  | $<.001$   | -0.483      |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.451 | 0.159 | 1087 | -2.84  | 0.052      | -0.284      |
|                   | Moderate  |                      | - Control   | Right               | 0.441 | 0.208 | 1087 | 2.12   | 0.277      | 0.278       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.445 | 0.186 | 1087 | -7.75  | $<.001$   | 0.91        |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -1.143 | 0.212 | 1087 | -5.38  | $<.001$   | -0.72       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -0.828 | 0.206 | 1087 | -4.02  | $<.001$   | -0.521      |
|                   | Right     |                      | - Inoculation | Left               | -1.886 | 0.166 | 1087 | -11.36 | $<.001$   | 1.188       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Moderate           | -1.584 | 0.195 | 1087 | -8.14  | $<.001$   | 0.998       |
|                   |           |                      | - Inoculation | Right              | -1.269 | 0.188 | 1087 | -6.76  | $<.001$   | -0.799      |
| Inoculation | 4 Scapegoating | 5 Ad hominem |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| Right       |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.617 0.163 1087 3.78 0.002 0.389 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.316 0.192 1087 1.64 0.572 0.199 |
| Left        |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.26012 0.193 1073 1.3472 0.758 0.15143 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.25669 0.175 1073 1.4683 0.685 0.14943 |
| - Inoculation | Left          | 0.52865 0.144 1073 -3.6766 **-0.30774** |
| - Inoculation | Moderate       | 0.30332 0.192 1073 -1.5761 0.615 0.17657 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.05046 0.175 1073 -0.288 1 0.02937 |
| Left        |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.00343 0.218 1073 -0.0158 1 0.002 |
| - Inoculation | Left          | 0.78877 0.194 1073 -4.0712 <.001 0.45917 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.56344 0.232 1073 -2.4269 **0.148** -0.328 |
| Left        |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.31058 0.218 1073 -1.4241 0.712 0.1808 |
| - Inoculation | Left          | 0.78533 0.176 1073 4.4737 <.001 0.45717 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.56001 0.217 1073 -2.5783 0.103 0.326 |
| Right       |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.22533 0.193 1073 1.1668 0.853 0.13117 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.47819 0.176 1073 2.7178 0.073 0.27837 |
| Left        |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.5593 0.137 1073 5.397 <.001 0.599 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.0392 0.179 1073 0.219 1 0.0236 |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.30715 0.202 1073 -1.5198 **0.652** -0.1788 |
| Left        |                |              |
| Moderate    |                |              |
| - Inoculation | Right         | 0.25286 0.218 1073 1.1624 0.855 0.1472 |

Note: Comparisons are based on estimated marginal means
Table S40.
Studies 1-5: ANOVAs for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted “bullshit receptivity” variable (high - low) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Significant interactions between “bullshit receptivity” and condition are marked in bold. See also Figure S3 and Table S41 for the Tukey post-hoc tests.

| Study | ANOVA - Diff/Technique | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | p      | η²p   |
|-------|------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| 1 Emotional language | Condition | 127.58 | 1 | 127.58 | 66.866 | < .001 | 0.059 |
|  | Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 117.827 | 1 | 117.827 | 61.754 | < .001 | 0.055 |
|  | Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 0.214 | 1 | 0.214 | 0.112 | 0.737 | 0.000 |
|  | Residuals | 2035.83 | 1067 | 1.908 |
| 2 Incoherence | Condition | 216.6 | 1 | 216.57 | 100.8 | < .001 | 0.085 |
|  | Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 59.3 | 1 | 59.26 | 27.6 | < .001 | 0.025 |
|  | Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 28.4 | 1 | 28.36 | 13.2 | < .001 | 0.012 |
|  | Residuals | 2321.4 | 1080 | 2.15 |
| 3 False dichotomies | Condition | 368.61 | 1 | 368.61 | 153.371 | < .001 | 0.123 |
|  | Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 226.59 | 1 | 226.59 | 94.28 | < .001 | 0.08 |
|  | Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 1.25 | 1 | 1.25 | 0.521 | 0.471 | 0.000 |
|  | Residuals | 2617.28 | 1089 | 2.4 |
| 4 Scapegoating | Condition | 52.1359 | 1 | 52.1359 | 18.5227 | < .001 | 0.017 |
|  | Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 171.6785 | 1 | 171.6785 | 60.9934 | < .001 | 0.054 |
|  | Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 0.0358 | 1 | 0.0358 | 0.0127 | 0.91 | 0.000 |
|  | Residuals | 3025.809 | 1075 | 2.8147 |
| 5 Ad hominem | Condition | 154 | 1 | 154.03 | 55.59 | < .001 | 0.049 |
|  | Political-Ideology-converted | 126.5 | 2 | 63.25 | 22.83 | < .001 | 0.041 |
|  | Condition × Political-Ideology-converted | 10.7 | 2 | 5.34 | 1.93 | 0.146 | 0.004 |
|  | Residuals | 2978.7 | 1075 | 2.77 |
|  | Condition | 155.89339 | 1 | 155.89339 | 59.11762 | < .001 | 0.052 |
|  | Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 275.11676 | 1 | 275.11676 | 104.3293 | < .001 | 0.088 |
|  | Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted | 0.00514 | 1 | 0.00514 | 0.00195 | 0.965 | 0.000 |
|  | Residuals | 2840.05313 | 1077 | 2.637 |
Table S41.
Studies 1-5: Tukey post-hoc tests for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted “bullshit receptivity” variable (high - low) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Relevant $p$-values for differences between inoculation and control conditions for the same levels of “bullshit receptivity” are marked in bold. Note that technique recognition is significantly higher for the inoculation condition in all studies for both high- and low levels of “bullshit receptivity”. See also Figure S3 and Table S40.

Post Hoc Comparisons - Condition × Bullshit-receptivity-converted

| Study                     | Condition | BS-Recep-converted | Condition | BS-Recep-converted | $M_{diff}$ | SE     | df    | $t$     | $p_{p.adj}$ | Cohen's d |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------|
| 1 Emotional language      | Control   | High                | Low       |                     | -0.6968    | 0.119  | 1067  | -5.834  | <.001       | -0.5045   |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.7239    | 0.113  | 1067  | -6.419  | <.001       | -0.5241   |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.3637    | 0.121  | 1067  | -11.295 | <.001       | -0.9873   |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.0271    | 0.12   | 1067  | -0.226  | 0.996       | 0.0196    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -0.6669    | 0.127  | 1067  | -5.238  | <.001       | -0.4828   |
| Inoculation              | High       |                     | Low       |                     | -0.6398    | 0.121  | 1067  | -5.284  | <.001       | -0.4632   |
| 2 Incoherence            | Control   | High                | Low       |                     | -0.144     | 0.126  | 1080  | -1.15   | 0.658       | -0.0985   |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.572     | 0.13   | 1080  | -4.4    | <.001       | -0.3898   |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.364     | 0.126  | 1080  | -10.85  | <.001       | -0.9304   |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.427     | 0.127  | 1080  | -3.37   | 0.004       | 0.2913    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.22      | 0.122  | 1080  | -9.97   | <.001       | -0.8319   |
| Inoculation              | High       |                     | Low       |                     | -0.793     | 0.127  | 1080  | -6.25   | <.001       | -0.5406   |
| 3 False dichotomies      | Control   | High                | Low       |                     | -0.845     | 0.132  | 1089  | -6.41   | <.001       | -0.545    |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -1.096     | 0.132  | 1089  | -8.28   | <.001       | -0.707    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -2.077     | 0.137  | 1089  | -15.12  | <.001       | -1.34     |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.251     | 0.128  | 1089  | -1.96   | 0.025       | 0.162     |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.232     | 0.134  | 1089  | -9.23   | <.001       | -0.795    |
| Inoculation              | High       |                     | Low       |                     | -0.981     | 0.134  | 1089  | -7.32   | <.001       | -0.633    |
| 4 Scapegoating           | Control   | High                | Low       |                     | -0.787     | 0.144  | 1075  | -5.46   | <.001       | -0.469    |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.429     | 0.144  | 1075  | -2.98   | 0.016       | -0.255    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.239     | 0.141  | 1075  | -8.76   | <.001       | -0.738    |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | 0.359      | 0.148  | 1075  | 2.43    | 0.073       | -0.214    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -0.452     | 0.145  | 1075  | -3.11   | 0.01        | -0.269    |
| Inoculation              | High       |                     | Low       |                     | -0.81      | 0.145  | 1075  | -5.59   | <.001       | -0.483    |
| 5 Ad hominem             | Control   | High                | Low       |                     | -1.012     | 0.141  | 1077  | -7.16   | <.001       | -0.623    |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | -0.761     | 0.132  | 1077  | -5.76   | <.001       | -0.468    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -1.781     | 0.141  | 1077  | -12.64  | <.001       | -1.097    |
|                           | Inoculation | High                | Low       |                     | 0.251      | 0.141  | 1077  | 1.79    | 0.28        | -0.155    |
|                           | Inoculation | Low                 | Low       |                     | -0.769     | 0.149  | 1077  | -5.17   | <.001       | -0.474    |
| Inoculation              | High       |                     | Low       |                     | -1.021     | 0.14   | 1077  | -7.28   | <.001       | -0.629    |

Note: Comparisons are based on estimated marginal means.
Table S42.
Studies 1-5: ANOVAs for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted analytical thinking variable (high - low) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. See also Figure S4 and Table S42 for the Tukey post-hoc tests.

| Study          | ANOVA - Diff-Technique         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | p    | η²p |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|-----|
| 1 Emotional language | Condition                      | 128.99         | 1  | 128.99      | 66.16| <.001| 0.058|
|                | Analytic-Thinking-converted    | 70.56          | 1  | 70.56       | 36.19| <.001| 0.033|
|                | Condition × Analytic-Thinking-converted | 3.45       | 1  | 3.45        | 1.77 | 0.183| 0.002|
|                | Residuals                      | 2080.25        | 1067| 1.95        |      |      |     |
| 2 Incoherence  | Condition                      | 230.3          | 1  | 230.3       | 105  | <.001| 0.089|
|                | Analytic-Thinking-converted    | 35.53          | 1  | 35.53       | 16.2 | <.001| 0.015|
|                | Condition × Analytic-Thinking-converted | 4.04       | 1  | 4.04        | 1.84 | 0.175| 0.002|
|                | Residuals                      | 2368.77        | 1080| 2.19        |      |      |     |
| 3 False dichotomies | Condition                      | 302.58         | 1  | 302.58      | 119.975| <.001| 0.099|
|                | Analytic-Thinking-converted    | 95.68          | 1  | 95.68       | 37.938| <.001| 0.034|
|                | Condition × Analytic-Thinking-converted | 2.28       | 1  | 2.28        | 0.903| 0.342| 0.001|
|                | Residuals                      | 2746.47        | 1089| 2.52        |      |      |     |
| 4 Scapegoating | Condition                      | 61.193         | 1  | 61.193      | 20.865| <.001| 0.019|
|                | Analytic-Thinking-converted    | 44.137         | 1  | 44.137      | 15.049| <.001| 0.014|
|                | Condition × Analytic-Thinking-converted | 0.604   | 1  | 0.604       | 0.206| 0.65 | 0.000|
|                | Residuals                      | 3152.824       | 1075| 2.933       |      |      |     |
| 5 Ad hominem  | Condition                      | 149.11         | 1  | 149.11      | 52.55| <.001| 0.047|
|                | Analytic-Thinking-converted    | 55.31          | 1  | 55.31       | 19.49| <.001| 0.018|
|                | Condition × Analytic-Thinking-converted | 4.09   | 1  | 4.09        | 1.44 | 0.23 | 0.001|
|                | Residuals                      | 3055.85        | 1077| 2.84        |      |      |     |
Table S43.
Studies 1-5: Tukey post-hoc tests for technique recognition (Diff-Technique) with the converted analytical thinking variable (high - low) and condition (inoculation – control) as independent variables. Relevant $p$-values for differences between inoculation and control conditions for the same levels of analytical thinking are marked in bold. Note that technique recognition is significantly higher for the inoculation condition in all studies for both high and low levels of analytical thinking. See also Figure S4 and Table S42.

| Study | Condition | Analyt.Think.-converted | Condition | Analyt.Think.-converted | $M_{in}$ | SE | df | t  | $p_{tukey}$ | Cohen's $d$ |
|-------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|---------|----|-----|----|-------------|-------------|
| 1 Emotional language | Control | Low | - Inoculation | High | -0.814 | 0.129 | 1067 | -6.31 | <.001 | -0.583 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -0.182 | 0.123 | 1067 | -4.47 | <.001 | -0.131 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -1.217 | 0.121 | 1067 | -10.09 | <.001 | 0.872 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | -0.585 | 0.114 | 1067 | -5.14 | <.001 | -0.419 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | Low | 0.632 | 0.122 | 1067 | 5.18 | <.001 | 0.453 |
| 2 Incoherence | Control | High | - Control | Low | 0.242 | 0.128 | 1080 | 1.89 | 0.232 | 0.163 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | High | -1.051 | 0.135 | 1080 | -4.22 | <.001 | -0.71 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -0.564 | 0.129 | 1080 | -4.38 | <.001 | -0.381 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -1.293 | 0.128 | 1080 | -10.14 | <.001 | 0.873 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | -0.805 | 0.12 | 1080 | -6.69 | <.001 | -0.544 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | Low | 0.488 | 0.129 | 1080 | 3.79 | <.001 | 0.329 |
| 3 False dichotomies | Control | High | - Control | Low | 0.686 | 0.136 | 1089 | 5.04 | <.001 | 0.432 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | High | -0.965 | 0.141 | 1089 | -8.64 | <.001 | -0.608 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -0.463 | 0.141 | 1089 | -3.28 | 0.006 | -0.291 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -1.652 | 0.132 | 1089 | -12.52 | <.001 | 1.04 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | -1.149 | 0.132 | 1089 | -8.72 | <.001 | -0.723 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | Low | 0.503 | 0.137 | 1089 | 3.67 | 0.001 | 0.317 |
| 4 Scapegoating | Control | High | - Control | Low | 0.3577 | 0.147 | 1075 | 2.43 | 0.072 | 0.2089 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | High | 0.5244 | 0.152 | 1075 | -3.461 | 0.003 | -0.3062 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | 0.0719 | 0.148 | 1075 | -0.487 | 0.962 | -0.042 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -0.882 | 0.148 | 1075 | -5.974 | <.001 | 0.515 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | 0.4296 | 0.144 | 1075 | -2.989 | 0.015 | -0.2508 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | Low | 0.4525 | 0.148 | 1075 | 3.054 | 0.012 | 0.2642 |
| 5 Ad hominem | Control | High | - Control | Low | 0.582 | 0.147 | 1077 | 3.97 | <.001 | 0.346 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | High | -0.627 | 0.157 | 1077 | -3.98 | <.001 | -0.372 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | -0.294 | 0.145 | 1077 | -2.03 | 0.179 | -0.175 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | High | -1.21 | 0.148 | 1077 | -8.16 | <.001 | 0.718 |
|       | Inoculation | Low | - Inoculation | Low | -0.876 | 0.135 | 1077 | -6.49 | <.001 | -0.52 |
|       | Inoculation | High | - Inoculation | Low | 0.333 | 0.147 | 1077 | 2.27 | 0.105 | 0.198 |

Note: Comparisons are based on estimated marginal means.
Table S44.
Study 1 (emotional language): two-way interactions with technique discernment between condition and age, gender, education level, political ideology, populism, analytical thinking, bullshit receptivity, conspiracy belief, numerical thinking, social media use, and how often people check the news.

| Predictors                  | Age  | Gender          | Education | Political Ideology | Populism | Analytical Thinking |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|---------------------|
|                             | $b$  | 95% CI          | $p$       | $b$               | 95% CI   | $p$                 | $b$               | 95% CI   | $p$                 |
| (Intercept)                 | 1.36 | 1.07 – 1.65     | $<0.001$ | 1.25              | 1.07 – 1.43 | $<0.001$ | 1.86              | 1.34 – 2.38 | $<0.001$ | 1.71              | 1.46 – 1.96 | $<0.001$ | 1.65              | 0.91 – 2.40 | $<0.001$ | 1.11              | 0.94 – 1.28 | $<0.001$ |
| Condition                   | 0.55 | 0.14 – 0.97     | $0.009$   | 0.63              | 0.38 – 0.87 | $<0.001$ | 0.45              | -0.29 – 1.19 | 0.228      | 0.76              | 0.40 – 1.12 | $<0.001$ | 1.59              | 0.52 – 2.65 | $0.003$   | 0.55              | 0.30 – 0.79 | $<0.001$ |
| Age                         | 0    | -0.08 – 0.08    | 0.984     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Age*Condition               | 0.03 | -0.09 – 0.15    | 0.611     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Gender                      | 0.17 | -0.08 – 0.41    | 0.183     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Gender*Condition            | 0.12 | -0.23 – 0.46    | 0.505     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Education                   | -0.13| -0.26 – 0.00    | 0.057     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Education*Condition         | 0.05 | -0.14 – 0.24    | 0.596     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Political-Ideology          | -0.1 | -0.17 – -0.04   | $0.003$   |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Political-Ideology*Condition| -0.03| -0.12 – 0.07    | 0.593     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Populism                    | -0.08| -0.27 – 0.12    | 0.439     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Populism*Condition          | -0.24| -0.52 – 0.03    | 0.087     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Analytical-Thinking         | 0.2  | 0.10 – 0.30     | $<0.001$  |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Analytical-Thinking*Condition| 0.08 | -0.06 – 0.21    | 0.269     |                   |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Observations                | 1096 |                     |           | 1081              |                     |           | 1096              |                     |           | 1094              |                     |           | 1094              |                     |           |
| R2* R2 adj.                 | 0.050/0.047 |                     |           | 0.059/0.057       |                     |           | 0.053/0.051       |                     |           | 0.070/0.067       |                     |           | 0.060/0.057       |                     |           |

| Bullshit Receptivity        | $b$  | 95% CI          | $p$       | ¶ Bullshit Receptivity | $b$  | 95% CI          | $p$       | ¶ Bullshit Receptivity | $b$  | 95% CI          | $p$       | ¶ Bullshit Receptivity |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|
| (Intercept)                 | 2.5  | 2.15 – 2.86     | $<0.001$  | 2                      | 1.63 – 2.38 | $<0.001$ | 0.5                | 0.17 – 0.84 | $0.003$   | 1.35                | 0.87 – 1.82 | $<0.001$ | 1.27                | 0.75 – 1.79 | $<0.001$ |
| Condition                   | 0.67 | 0.17 – 1.17     | $0.009$   | 0.78                   | 0.25 – 1.30 | $0.004$  | 0.57               | 0.08 – 1.06 | $0.022$   | 1.29                | 0.60 – 1.97 | $<0.001$ | 0.28                | -0.47 – 1.02 | 0.466   |
| Bullshit-Receptivity        | -0.42| -0.54 – -0.30   | $0.009$   | 0.78                   | 0.25 – 1.30 | $0.004$  | 0.57               | 0.08 – 1.06 | $0.022$   | 1.29                | 0.60 – 1.97 | $<0.001$ | 0.28                | -0.47 – 1.02 | 0.466   |
| Bullshit-Receptivity*Condition| 0.01 | -0.16 – 0.18    | 0.929     |                       |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Conspiracy Belief           | -1.03| -1.60 – -0.46   | $<0.001$  |                       |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
| Conspiracy Belief*Condition | -0.17| -0.97 – 0.62    | 0.671     |                       |          |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |                     |                   |           |
|                          |      |     |     |         |         |         |
|--------------------------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|---------|
| Numerical-Thinking       | 0.29 | 0.19| 0.40| <0.001  |         |         |
| Numerical-Thinking*Condition | 0.03 | -0.13| -0.19| 0.713   |         |         |
| Social-Media-Use         | 0    | -0.11| -0.12| 0.944   |         |         |
| Social-Media-Use*Condition | 0.16 | -0.33| -0.01| 0.061   |         |         |
| News-Check               | 0.03 | -0.11| -0.16| 0.704   |         |         |
| News-Check*Condition     | 0.1  | -0.09| -0.29| 0.32    |         |         |
| Observations             | 1094 | 1094| 1094| 1095    | 1096    |         |
| R2 & R2 adj.             | 0.124| 0.076| 0.098| 0.055   | 0.052   | 0.049   |
Table S45.
Study 2 (incoherence): two-way interactions with technique discernment between condition and age, gender, education level, political ideology, populism, analytical thinking, bullshit receptivity, conspiracy belief, numerical thinking, social media use, and how often people check the news.

| Predictors | Age | Gender | Education | Political Ideology | Populism | Analytical Thinking |
|------------|-----|--------|-----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|
| (Intercept)| 1.18| 0.85 – 1.50 | 0.086| 0.68 – 1.03 | 0.040 | 0.86 | 0.68 – 1.03 | 0.026 | 0.6 | 0.41 – 0.79 | <0.001 |
| Condition | 0.46| -0.00 – 0.92 | 0.052| 0.77 | 0.52 – 1.02 | 1.46 | 0.67 – 2.25 | <0.001 | 1.11 | 0.74 – 1.49 | <0.001 | 1.29 | 0.22 – 2.36 | 0.018 | 0.69 | 0.42 – 0.96 | <0.001 |
| Age | -0.13| -0.22 – -0.05 | 0.003 | |
| Age * Condition | 0.13| 0.00 – 0.25 | 0.043 | |
| Gender | 0.26 | |
| Gender * Condition | 0.22 | -0.13 – 0.57 | 0.223 | |
| Education | 0.05 | -0.09 – 0.19 | 0.476 | |
| Education * Condition | 0.15 | -0.34 – 0.05 | 0.15 | |
| Political-Ideology | 0.11 | |
| Political-Ideology * Condition | 0.07 | -0.17 – 0.03 | 0.181 | |
| Populism | 0.04 | |
| Populism * Condition | 0.11 | -0.40 – 0.18 | 0.455 | |
| Analytical-Thinking | 0.18 | 0.00 – 0.36 | 0.047 | |
| Analytical-Thinking * Condition | 0.11 | -0.02 – 0.23 | 0.113 | |
| Observations | 1108 | 1095 | 1108 | 1107 | 1106 | 1106 | |
| R² / R² adjusted | 0.091 / 0.088 | 0.084 / 0.082 | 0.085 / 0.083 | 0.109 / 0.107 | 0.085 / 0.082 | 0.101 / 0.098 | |

| Predictors | Bullshit Receptivity | Conspiracy Belief | Numeracy | Soc. Media. Use | News Checking |
|------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| (Intercept)| 0.86 | 0.50 – 1.23 | 0.081| 0.46 – 1.16 | 0.025 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.03 – 0.95 | 0.036 | 0.38 | -0.17 – 0.94 | 0.176 |
| Condition | 2.05 | 1.54 – 2.56 | 1.5 | 1.01 – 1.99 | 1.4 | 0.93 – 2.27 | 0.112 | 0.33 – 1.90 | 0.005 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity | -0.06| -0.19 – 0.08 | 0.412 | |
| Bullshit-Receptivity * Condition | -0.45| -0.63 – -0.26 | <0.001 | |
| Conspiracy-Belief | -0.71 | -0.40 | 0.579 | |
| Conspiracy-Belief * Condition | -0.16 | -1.79 – -0.25 | 0.01 | |
| Numerical-Thinking | 0.16 | 0.04 – 0.28 | 0.009 | |
| Numerical-Thinking * Condition | 0.34 | 0.17 – 0.50 | <0.001 | |
| Social-Media-Use | 0.06 | -0.06 – 0.18 | 0.314 | |
|                                |          |          |          |          |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Social-Media-Use * Condition   | -0.35    | -0.01    | **0.034**|          |
|                               | 0.18     |          |          |          |
| News-Check                    | 0.09     | -0.05    | 0.23     | 0.228    |
|                               |          |          |          |          |
| News-Check * Condition        | 0.06     | -0.26    | 0.14     | 0.574    |
|                               |          |          |          |          |
| Observations                  | 1106     | 1106     | 1106     | 1107     |
|                               |          |          |          |          |
| R² / R² adjusted              | 0.130/0.127 | 0.098/0.096 | 0.140/0.138 | 0.087/0.084 | 0.084/0.082 |
Table S46.
Study 3 (false dichotomies): two-way interactions with technique discernment between condition and age, gender, education level, political ideology, populism, analytical thinking, bullshit receptivity, conspiracy belief, numerical thinking, social media use, and how often people check the news.

| Predictors          | Age       | Gender                  | Education          | Political Ideology | Populism | Analytical Thinking |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|
| (Intercept)         | b         | 95% CI                  | p                  | b                  | 95% CI   | p                   |
| Condition           | 1.45      | 1.10 – 1.81             | <0.001             | 1.09               | 0.50 – 1.69 | <0.001             | 1.91 | 1.63 – 2.20 | <0.001 | 2.38 | 1.53 – 3.23 | <0.001 | 0.73 | 0.53 – 0.94 | <0.001 |
| Age                 | 0.78      | 0.27 – 1.29             | 0.003              | 0.83               | 0.56 – 1.10 | <0.001             | 1.28 | 0.41 – 2.15 | 0.004 | 0.86 | 0.45 – 1.26 | <0.001 | 1.5  | 0.33 – 2.68 | 0.012 |
| Gender              |           | 0.09                    | 0.18 – 0.01        | -                  | 0.06 – 0.21 | 0.73              |
| Gender * Condition  | 0.08      | 0.07                    | 0.34 – 0.20        | 0.616              | 0.07      |
| Education           |           | 0.02                    | -                  | 0.838              |
| Education * Condition|         | 0.23 – 0.16             | 0.28 – 0.16        | 0.585              |
| Political-Ideology  |           | -                       | -0.31 – -          | <0.001             |
| Political-Ideology * Condition |       | 0.23                    | 0.15               |
| Populism            |           | 0.07                    | -                  | 0.17               | -0.17 – 0.17 | 0.209             |
| Populism * Condition|         | -                       | -0.56 – -0.10      | 0.004              |
| Analytical-Thinking |           | 0.37                    | 0.23 – 0.50        | <0.001             |
| Analytical-Thinking * Condition | | 0.05                    | 0.24 – 0.14        |
| Observations        | 1117      | 1109                    | 1117               | 1113               | 1112      |
| R² / R² adjusted    | 0.096 / 0.093 | 0.104 / 0.102 | 0.093 / 0.091 | 0.137 / 0.134 | 0.114 / 0.112 | 0.132 / 0.130 |

| Predictors          | Bullshit Receptivity | Conspiracy Belief | Numeracy | Soc. Media. Use | News Checking |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| (Intercept)         | b                    | 95% CI           | p        | b               | 95% CI        | p |
| Condition           | 2.5                  | 2.13 – 2.88      | <0.001   | 2.26            | 1.90 – 2.61   | <0.001   | -          | 0.043              | 1.28 | 0.76 – 1.80 | <0.001 | 0.97 | 0.39 – 1.56 | <0.001 |
| Bullshit-Receptivity| -0.65                | -                | -        | -               | -              | -0.26                |
| Bullshit-Receptivity * Condition |       | 0.51              | 0.38     |
| Conspiracy-Belief   | -1.9                 | -2.47 – -        | <0.001   | 1.33             |
| Conspiracy-Belief * Condition |       | 0.31 – 0.06      |
| Numerical-Thinking  | 0.08                 | -0.72 – 0.88     | 0.853    |
| Numerical-Thinking * Condition |       | 0.44              | 0.30 – 0.58 | <0.001 |
| Social-Media-Use    | 0.06 – 0.30          | -                | -0.17 – 0.10 | 0.632 |
|                      |                      | 0.03             |          |                 |               |
|                                |        |        |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Social-Media-Use * Condition   | 0.0    | -0.19  | 0.18   |
|                               |        |        | 0.975  |
| News-Check                    | 0.05   | -0.10  | -0.20  |
|                               |        |        | 0.533  |
| News-Check * Condition        | 0.09   | -0.13  | -0.30  |
|                               |        |        | 0.431  |
| Observations                  | 1112   | 1112   | 1112   |
|                               |        |        | 1113   |
| $R^2$ / $R^2$ adjusted        | 0.199  | 0.157  | 0.185  |
|                               | 0.197  | 0.155  | 0.183  |
|                               |        |        | 0.095  |
|                               |        |        | 0.093  |
|                               |        |        | 0.097  |
|                               |        |        | 0.095  |
Table S47.
Study 4 (scapegoating): two-way interactions with technique discernment between condition and age, gender, education level, political ideology, populism, analytical thinking, bullshit receptivity, conspiracy belief, numerical thinking, social media use, and how often people check the news.

| Predictors            | Age | Gender | Education | Political Ideology | Populism | Analytical Thinking |
|-----------------------|-----|--------|-----------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|
|                       | b   | 95% CI | p         | b                  | 95% CI   | p                   | b                  | 95% CI | p         | b                  | 95% CI | p         | b                  | 95% CI |
| (Intercept)           | 1.95| 1.59 – 2.31| **<0.001** | 2.15 | 1.95 – 2.36| **<0.001** | 3.33 | 2.68 – 3.98| **<0.001** | 2.57 | 2.27 – 2.87| **<0.001** | 2.43 | 1.56 – 3.30| **<0.001** | 2.11 | 1.88 – 2.33| **<0.001** |
| Condition             | 0.59| 0.06 – 1.11| **0.028** | 0.38 | 0.08 – 0.67| **0.013** | 0.33 | -0.57 – 1.23| 0.473 | 0.61 | 0.18 – 1.05| **0.006** | 0.54 | 0.76 – 1.83| 0.417 | 0.42 | 0.10 – 0.75| **0.01** |
| Age                   | 0.11| 0.01 – 0.22| **0.034** |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Age * Condition       | -   | -0.20 – 0.10| 0.494 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Gender                | 0.29| 0.00 – 0.58| 0.052 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Gender * Condition    | 0.09| -0.33 – 0.50| 0.68  |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Education             | 0.11| 0.01 – 0.22| **0.01** |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Education * Condition | -   | -0.20 – 0.25| 0.812 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Political-Ideology    | 0.08|           |         |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Political-Ideology * Condition | 0.03 | -0.16 – 0.00| 0.059 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Populism              | 0.06|           |         |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Populism * Condition  | -   | -0.26 – 0.25| 0.812 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Analytical-Thinking   | 0.17|           |         |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Analytical-Thinking * Condition | 0.01 | -0.20 – 0.22| 0.938 |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Observations          | 1097|         |         | 1097           |         |         |         | 1095    |         |         |         | 1093    |         |         |         |
| R² / R² adjusted      | 0.020 / 0.017 | 0.024 / 0.021 | 0.032 / 0.029 | 0.027 / 0.024 | 0.015 / 0.012 | 0.025 / 0.022 |

|                        | Bullshit Receptivity | Conspiracy Belief | Numeracy | Soc. Media. Use | News Checking |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------|----------------|---------------|
|                        | b                    | 95% CI           | p       | b              | 95% CI        | p       | b              | 95% CI        | p       | b              | 95% CI        | p       |
| (Intercept)            | 3.56                 | 3.13 – 4.00      | **<0.001** | 3.37 | 2.94 – 3.81| **<0.001** | 1.46 | 1.01 – 1.90| **<0.001** | 1.14 | 2.24 | 1.71 – 2.76| **<0.001** | 2.02 | 1.36 – 2.67| **<0.001** |
| Condition              | 0.48                 | -0.13 – 1.09     | 0.12    | 0.19 | -0.41 – 0.79| 0.535 | 0.32 | -0.32 – 0.96| 0.331 | 0.68 | -0.10 – 1.45| 0.086 | 0.84 | 0.14 – 1.82|
| Bullshit-Receptivity   | -0.61                | -                | **<0.001** |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Bullshit-Receptivity * | -0.24                | -                | 0.773   |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Condition              | 0.03                 | -                | **<0.001** |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Conspiracy-Belief      | -2.42                | -                | **<0.001** |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Conspiracy-Belief *    | 1.75                 | 1.08             |         |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Numerical-Thinking     | 0.37                 | -0.57 – 1.31     | 0.437   |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Numerical-Thinking *   | 0.03                 | -0.18 – 0.23     | 0.805   |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Social-Media-Use       | 0.02                 | -0.11 – 0.15     | 0.772   |              |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|                               |         |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Social-Media-Use * Condition | - 0.07  | -0.26 - 0.13 | 0.507  |         |         |
| News-Check                    | 0.08    | - 0.09 - 0.24 | 0.36   |         |         |
| News-Check * Condition        | -       | -       | 0.11    | 0.36 - 0.14 | 0.395  |
| Observations                  | 1093    | 1093    | 1093    | 1095    | 1095    |
| R² / R² adjusted              | 0.079 / 0.077 | 0.052 / 0.050 | 0.045 / 0.042 | 0.015 / 0.013 | 0.016 / 0.013 |
**Table S48.**

Study 5 (ad hominem): two-way interactions with technique discernment between condition and age, gender, education level, political ideology, populism, analytical thinking, bullshit receptivity, conspiracy belief, numerical thinking, social media use, and how often people check the news.

| Predictors                        | Gender | Education | Political Ideology | Populism | Analytical Thinking |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|
| (Intercept)                       | b      | 95% CI    | p                  | b        | 95% CI            | p      | b        | 95% CI    | p      | b        | 95% CI    | p      |
| Condition                         | -0.11  | -0.23 – 0.00 | 0.055             |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Age                               | 0.71   | 0.21 – 1.20 | **<0.001**         | 0.63     | 0.34 – 0.92        | **<0.001** | 0.71     | -0.20 – 1.61 | 0.127  | 0.52     | 0.09 – 0.95 | 0.018  | 0.45     | -0.87 – 1.76 | 0.506  | 0.9     | 0.59 – 1.21 | **<0.001** |
| Age * Condition                   | 0.02   | -0.14 – 0.18 | 0.769         |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Gender                            |        |           |                    | 0.01     | -0.28 – 0.30        | 0.941  |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Gender * Condition                | 0.25   | -0.16 – 0.66 | 0.237        |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Education                         | 0.01   | -0.21 – 0.24 | 0.907         |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Political-Ideology                | -0.30  | -0.59 – 0.00 | **<0.001**     | 0.06     | -0.05 – 0.18        | 0.28   |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Political-Ideology * Condition    |        |           |                    |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Populism                          | -0.25  | -0.49 – 0.00 | 0.05          |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Populism * Condition              | 0.08   | -0.26 – 0.42 | 0.654         |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Analytical-Thinking               | 0.36   | 0.21 – 0.50 | **<0.001**     |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Analytical-Thinking * Condition   | -0.12  | -0.33 – 0.09 | 0.267         |          |                    |        |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| Observations                      | 1101   | 1086      | 1103             | 1102     | 1101               | 1102   |          |          |        |          |          |        |
| R² / R² adjusted                  | 0.053  | 0.050 / 0.047 | 0.050 / 0.047  | 0.050 / 0.047 | 0.083 / 0.080 | 0.052 / 0.050 | 0.073 / 0.071 |
|                        | R | R^2         | R^2 adjusted |
|------------------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| **Social-Media-Use**   | 0.01 | -0.21 – 0.20 | 0.941        |
| Condition              |    |             |              |
| News-Check             | 0.17 | 0.02 – 0.33 | **0.031**    |
| **News-Check**         |    |             |              |
| Condition              | -0.11 | -0.33 – 0.11 | 0.307        |
| Observations           | 1101 | 1101        | 1102         | 1103         | 1103         |
| R^2 / R^2 adjusted     | 0.139 / 0.137 | 0.085 / 0.082 | 0.118 / 0.116 | 0.049 / 0.046 | 0.052 / 0.049 |
**Table S49.**
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): Student’s and Bayesian $t$-tests for technique recognition, trustworthiness, and sharing. *Note:* “Fake” denotes the averaged scores (per participant) for the manipulative stimuli; “Real” denotes the averaged scores per participant for the non-manipulative stimuli.

| Measure                     | Statistic   | ±%     | df   | $p$    | $M_{diff}$ | Cohen’s $d$ | 95% CI       |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------|------|--------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Discernment-Manipulativeness| Student's $t$ | -10.869 | 1066 | < .001 | -0.94      | -0.67       | [-0.79, -0.54] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 8.26E+22 | 1.39E-28 |        |            |             |              |
| Discernment-Trustworthiness | Student's $t$ | -7.213  | 1063 | < .001 | -0.49      | -0.44       | [-0.56, -0.32] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 5.45e0+9 | 3.34E-15 |        |            |             |              |
| Discernment-Sharing        | Student's $t$ | -5.547  | 1063 | < .001 | -0.37      | -0.34       | [-0.46, -0.22] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 219328.3771 | 9.90E-11 |        |            |             |              |
| Fake-Manipulativeness      | Student's $t$ | -12.359 | 1066 | < .001 | -0.93      | -0.76       | [-0.88, -0.63] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 3.45E+29 | 2.56E-35 |        |            |             |              |
| Real-Manipulativeness      | Student's $t$ | 0.274   | 1063 | 0.785  | 0.02       | 0.02        | [-0.10, 0.14]  |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 0.071 | 4.08e0-4 |        |            |             |              |
| Fake-Trustworthiness       | Student's $t$ | 3.97    | 1066 | < .001 | 0.20       | 0.24        | [0.12, 0.36]   |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 154.894 | 1.66e0-7 |        |            |             |              |
| Real-Trustworthiness       | Student's $t$ | -4.867  | 1063 | < .001 | -0.29      | -0.30       | [-0.42, -0.18] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 7246.488 | 3.19e0-9 |        |            |             |              |
| Fake-Sharing               | Student's $t$ | 1.248   | 1066 | 0.212  | 0.10       | 0.08        | [-0.04, 0.20]  |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 0.148 | 2.00e-04 |        |            |             |              |
| Real-Sharing               | Student's $t$ | -3.275  | 1063 | 0.001  | -0.28      | -0.20       | [-0.32, -0.08] |
|                            | BF$_{10}$   | 13.276 | 1.97e0-6 |        |            |             |              |

* Levene’s test is significant ($p < .05$), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S50.
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): ANOVAs for manipulativeness (technique recognition), trustworthiness, and sharing discernment as predicted by condition (control – inoculation) and outcome measure response order (manipulativeness – trustworthiness – sharing; trustworthiness – manipulativeness – sharing; or sharing – trustworthiness – manipulativeness).

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | p     |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------|
| **ANOVA - Discernment-Manipulativeness** |                |    |             |      |       |
| Condition                | 237.713        | 1  | 237.7127    | 117.7046 | <.001 |
| Order                    | 17.89          | 2  | 8.945       | 4.4292 | 0.012 |
| Condition × Order        | 0.191          | 2  | 0.0956      | 0.0473 | 0.954 |
| Residuals                | 2156.901       | 1068 | 2.0196 |        |       |

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | p     |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------|
| **ANOVA - Discernment-Trustworthiness** |                |    |             |      |       |
| Condition                | 61.35          | 1  | 61.35       | 50.46 | <.001 |
| Order                    | 5.94           | 2  | 2.97        | 2.44  | 0.088 |
| Condition × Order        | 2.55           | 2  | 1.27        | 1.05  | 0.351 |
| Residuals                | 1294.68        | 1065 | 1.22     |        |       |

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | p     |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------|
| **ANOVA - Discernment-Sharing** |                |    |             |      |       |
| Condition                | 34.883         | 1  | 34.883      | 29.27 | <.001 |
| Order                    | 5.742          | 2  | 2.871       | 2.409 | 0.09  |
| Condition × Order        | 0.968          | 2  | 0.484       | 0.406 | 0.666 |
| Residuals                | 1269.227       | 1065 | 1.192    |        |       |
Table S51.
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): Student’s and Bayesian \( t \)-tests for technique recognition, trustworthiness, and sharing, separated by outcome measure response order. Note: “Fake” denotes the averaged scores (per participant) for the manipulative stimuli; “Real” for the non-manipulative stimuli. MTS = manipulativeness–trustworthiness–sharing; TSM = trustworthiness–sharing–manipulativeness; SMT = sharing–manipulativeness–trustworthiness.

| MTN | Statistic | \( \alpha \)% | df | \( p \) | \( M_{\text{est}} \) | Cohen’s \( d \) | 95% CI |
|-----|-----------|----------------|-----|---------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -6.312 | 1.09E+07 | 5.90E-15 | 0.001 | -0.96 | -0.66 | [-0.88, -0.44] |
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.137 | 1.12E+08 | 0.002 | -0.37 | -0.33 | [-0.54, -0.12] |
| Discernment-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.023 | 1.57E+08 | 0.003 | -0.34 | -0.32 | [-0.52, -0.11] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -6.597 | 1.04E+15 | < 0.001 | -0.81 | -0.69 | [-0.91, -0.47] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 1.282 | 5.72E+07 | 0.201 | 0.15 | 0.13 | [-0.07, 0.34] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 0.77 | 9.39E+07 | 0.442 | 0.07 | 0.08 | [-0.12, 0.29] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.003 | 1.67E+08 | 0.003 | -0.30 | -0.31 | [-0.52, -0.11] |
| Fake-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 0.733 | 9.64E+07 | 0.464 | 0.09 | 0.08 | [-0.13, 0.28] |
| Real-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -1.721 | 3.06E+07 | 0.086 | -0.25 | -0.18 | [-0.39, 0.03] |

| TSM | Statistic | \( \alpha \)% | df | \( p \) | \( M_{\text{est}} \) | Cohen’s \( d \) | 95% CI |
|-----|-----------|----------------|-----|---------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -6.151 | 4.46E+06 | 1.44E-14 | < 0.001 | -0.91 | -0.64 | [-0.86, -0.43] |
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -5.369 | 7.97E+14 | 1.04E-12 | < 0.001 | -0.60 | -0.56 | [-0.78, -0.35] |
| Discernment-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.762 | 9.10E+13 | < 0.001 | -0.44 | -0.40 | [-0.60, -0.18] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -6.638 | 7.51E+16 | < 0.001 | -0.87 | -0.70 | [-0.91, -0.48] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 0.421 | 0.12E+06 | 0.674 | 0.05 | 0.04 | [-0.16, 0.25] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 2.895 | 2.23E+08 | 0.004 | 0.27 | 0.30 | [0.10, 0.51] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.403 | 4.61E+09 | < 0.001 | -0.34 | -0.36 | [-0.57, -0.15] |
| Fake-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 1.398 | 4.88E+07 | 0.163 | 0.18 | 0.15 | [-0.06, 0.35] |
| Real-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -1.827 | 2.50E+07 | 0.069 | -0.27 | -0.19 | [-0.40, 0.02] |

| SMT | Statistic | \( \alpha \)% | df | \( p \) | \( M_{\text{est}} \) | Cohen’s \( d \) | 95% CI |
|-----|-----------|----------------|-----|---------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -6.337 | 1.18E+07 | 8.06E-16 | < 0.001 | -0.96 | -0.69 | [0.91, -0.46] |
| Discernment-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -3.858 | 3.45E-10 | 0.047 | -0.42 | -0.47 | [-0.64, -0.20] |
| Discernment-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -2.581 | 2.66E-08 | 0.01 | -0.30 | -0.28 | [-0.49, -0.06] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 9.72E+12 | 3.83E+21 | < 0.001 | -1.15 | -0.92 | [-1.15, -0.69] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -1.665 | 1.98E+07 | 0.097 | -0.19 | -0.18 | [-0.39, 0.03] |
| Fake-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 3.139 | 5.33E+09 | 0.022 | 0.27 | 0.34 | [0.12, 0.55] |
| Real-Manipulativeness | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -1.923 | 1.23E+07 | 0.055 | -0.20 | -0.21 | [-0.42, 0.01] |
| Fake-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | 0.701 | 8.42E+07 | 0.097 | 0.02 | 0.01 | [-0.20, 0.23] |
| Real-Sharing | Student’s \( t \) BF\(_{\alpha}\) | -1.941 | 1.94E+07 | 0.069 | -0.29 | -0.21 | [-0.42, 0.00] |

* Levene's test is significant (\( p < .05 \)), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances.
Table S52.
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): linear regression for manipulativeness, trustworthiness and sharing discernment, as predicted by condition (control – inoculation) and the five personality dimensions from the 10-item Personality Inventory.

| Predictor          | Manipulativeness | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Intercept          | 1.1361           | 1.3744          | 0.0156  |
| Condition:         |                  |                 |         |
| Inoculation – Control | 0.9351          | 0.4828          | 0.3639  |
| Openness           | 0.0907           | 0.0286          | 0.0301  |
| Conscientiousness  | 0.0308           | 0.0079          | -0.0012 |
| Extraversion       | -0.0960          | -0.0462         | -0.0310 |
| Agreeableness      | 0.0440           | 0.0623          | 0.0327  |
| Neuroticism        | -0.0646          | -0.0400         | 0.0158  |

³ Represents reference level

| R      | R² |
|--------|----|
| 0.345  | 0.119 |

Table S53.
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): linear regression for manipulativeness, trustworthiness and sharing discernment, as predicted by condition (control – inoculation) and actively open-minded thinking (AOT). See also Figure S5.

| Predictor          | Manipulativeness | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Intercept          | -1.625           | 0.194           | -0.962  |
| Condition:         |                  |                 |         |
| Inoculation – Control | 0.971           | 0.467           | 0.305   |
| AOT                | 0.686            | 0.296           | 0.287   |

³ Represents reference level

| R      | R² |
|--------|----|
| 0.415  | 0.173 |

Table S54.
Study 6 (emotional language replication study): linear regression for manipulativeness, trustworthiness and sharing discernment, as predicted by condition (control – inoculation) and Veracity Discernment Ability (MIST20_VDA, i.e., ability to distinguish true from false headlines), as measured by the 20-item Misinformation Susceptibility Test (MIST). See also Figure S6.

| Predictor          | Manipulativeness | Trustworthiness | Sharing |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Intercept          | -1.993           | -0.303          | -1.257  |
| Condition:         |                  |                 |         |
| Inoculation – Control | 0.969           | 0.46            | 0.306   |
| MIST20_VDA         | 3.883            | 2.085           | 1.794   |

³ Represents reference level

| R      | R² |
|--------|----|
| 0.508  | 0.258 |

| R      | R² |
|--------|----|
| 0.335  | 0.112 |

| R      | R² |
|--------|----|
| 0.277  | 0.0766 |
Table S55.
Study 7 (YouTube field study): results from the field study for each item, showing the total number of YouTube users who saw each item, total samples sizes (number of survey responses) in the experimental (inoculation) and control conditions, number of correct responses in the experimental and control conditions, the proportion of correct responses in the experimental and control conditions, the results of two-sample z-tests, and the Cohen’s $h$ effect sizes.

| Study             | Total item views | Total N   | % correct,control | % correct,inoculation | SD control | SD inoculation | z      | p     | Cohen's $h$ |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|--------|-------|-------------|
| Emotional language|                  |           |                    |                       |            |                |        |       |             |
| Item 1 (airline)  | 645,000          | 4143      | 2083               | 2060                  | 1390       | 1384           | 21.51  | 0.672 | 0.31        | 0.757 | 0.01        |
| Item 2 (senior)   | 699,000          | 2393      | 1204               | 1189                  | 644        | 691            | 17.31  | 0.581 | 2.28        | 0.023 | 0.09        |
| Item 3 (TV show)  | 389,000          | 3725      | 1862               | 1863                  | 669        | 741            | 20.70  | 0.398 | 2.42        | 0.016 | 0.08        |
| Average (all 3 items) | 1,733,000      | 10261     | 5149               | 5112                  | 2703       | 2816           | 35.83  | 0.551 | 2.63        | 0.009 | 0.05        |
| False Dichotomies |                  |           |                    |                       |            |                |        |       |             |
| Item 1 (education)| 231,000          | 4186      | 2014               | 2172                  | 669        | 940            | 21.13  | 0.433 | 6.69        | < 0.001 | 0.21        |
| Item 2 (caffeine) | 378,000          | 4064      | 2035               | 2029                  | 852        | 906            | 22.26  | 0.447 | 1.79        | 0.073 | 0.06        |
| Item 3 (solution) | 330,000          | 4121      | 2002               | 2119                  | 757        | 950            | 21.70  | 0.448 | 4.57        | < 0.001 | 0.14        |
| Average (all 3 items) | 939,000        | 12371     | 6051               | 6320                  | 2278       | 2796           | 37.69  | 0.442 | 7.45        | < 0.001 | 0.13        |
| All items         |                  |           |                    |                       |            |                |        |       |             |
| Average (all 6 items) | 2,672,000     | 22632     | 11200              | 11432                 | 4981       | 5612           | 52.59  | 0.491 | 6.96        | < 0.001 | 0.09        |
Table S5.
Study 7 (YouTube field study): YouTube ad campaign budget, costs, view rates, median time between viewing the ad and responding to the survey question (solicitation gap), and costs per view, by campaign (emotional language video & false dichotomies video).

| Campaign            | Item          | Budget   | Cost     | Impressions | Views   | View rate | Median solicitation gap (hours) | Avg cost per view |
|---------------------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Emotional language  | 1 (airline)   | $10,000.00 | $6,003.30 | 995,219     | 140,651 | 14.13%    | 17.8                            | $0.04             |
|                     | 2 (senior)    | $11,000.00 | $8,732.82 | 127,531     | 163,892 | 12.85%    | 20.7                            | $0.05             |
|                     | 3 (TV show)   | $10,000.00 | $6,865.83 | 1,019,829   | 117,828 | 11.55%    | 18.7                            | $0.06             |
| **Total**           |               | $31,000.00 | $21,601.95| 3,290,367   | 422,371 | 12.84%    | 19.1                            | $0.05             |
| False dichotomies   | 1 (education) | $10,000.00 | $5,112.68 | 540,337     | 142,230 | 26.32%    | 15.4                            | $0.04             |
|                     | 2 (caffeine)  | $11,000.00 | $8,799.83 | 868,632     | 219,869 | 25.31%    | 20.1                            | $0.04             |
|                     | 3 (solution)  | $10,000.00 | $6,784.74 | 747,698     | 182,877 | 24.46%    | 17.6                            | $0.04             |
| **Total**           |               | $31,000.00 | $20,697.25| 2,156,667   | 544,976 | 25.36%    | 17.7                            | $0.04             |
| **Total**           |               | $62,000.00 | $42,299.20| 5,447,034   | 967,347 | 19.10%    | 18.4                            | $0.05             |
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