"**Information Credibility and Responses to Corruption:**
A Replication and Extension in Argentina"

Matthew S. Winters
Rebecca Weitz-Shapiro
Online Appendix

Treatment Conditions

The complete text included in the 12 different versions of the vignette is presented below. There were four versions that made no mention of partisanship: one each of the control, explicitly clean, more credible corruption, and less credible corruption conditions. In the versions where the mayor was associated with a political party, he was described as a Peronist in four versions and a Radical in four. In all "more credible" conditions, an NGO was the source of corruption information. In the "less credible" corruption vignette which did not identify the mayor's party, corruption information is attributed to the "opposition." In less credible conditions which provided the mayor's party ID, it is the other party – the Radicals or the Peronists correspondingly – who make the accusation.

Experimental Vignettes in English
Imagine that you live in a neighborhood similar to your own but in a different city, and the mayor of that city is named Rodríguez. [**V1a**: no text OR **V1b**: Mayor Rodriguez is a Peronist. OR **V1c**: Mayor Rodriguez is a Radical.] Imagine that Mayor Rodriguez is running for reelection. During the four years that he has been mayor, the municipality improved: it had good economic growth, and health and transportation services improved.
V2a: In addition, it is well-known that Mayor Rodriguez has not accepted bribes to award public contracts. OR
V2b: In addition, according to an independent NGO, Mayor Rodriguez has accepted bribes to award public contracts. OR
V2c: In addition, according to [**V1a**: the opposition OR **V1b**: the Radical party OR **V1c**: the Peronist party], Mayor Rodriguez has accepted bribes to award public contracts.
V2d: No text

Experimental Vignette as Administered in Spanish

Imagínese que vive en un barrio como el suyo pero en otra ciudad y el intendente de dicha ciudad se llama Rodríguez. [**V1a**: [sin texto] / **V1b**: El intendente Rodríguez es peronista / **V1c**: El intendente Rodríguez es radical.] Imagine que el intendente Rodríguez se presenta a reelección. Durante los cuatro años de su mandato, el municipio mejoró: tuvo buen crecimiento económico, y mejoraron los servicios de salud y transporte.
V2a: Además, se sabe que el intendente Rodríguez no ha aceptado coimas para otorgar contratos de concesiones públicas.
V2b: Además, según una ONG independiente, el intendente Rodríguez ha aceptado coimas para otorgar contratos de concesiones públicas.
V2c: Además, según [**V1a**: la oposición / **V1b**: el radicalismo / **V1c**: el peronismo], el intendente Rodríguez ha aceptado coimas para otorgar contratos de concesiones públicas.
V2d: [sin texto]

Measurement of political knowledge

We measure political knowledge using seven factual questions about politics and current affairs, listed below. All questions were multiple choice; in the interest of space, we do not list all options below. "Don't know" responses were coded as incorrect. For the purposes of our analysis, we consider respondents to have high levels of political knowledge if they answered 4 or more questions correctly. This corresponds to 25% of the sample.

Q1: Do you know what year the law establishing gay marriage was approved? (Correct answer: 2010)

Q2: Counting the city of Buenos Aires as one of the provinces, how many provinces does Argentina have? (Correct answer: 24)

Q3: Who is the Minister of the Economy of the nation? (Correct answer: Axel Kiciloff)

Q4: Who is the current president of Brazil? (Correct answer: Dilma Rousseff)

Q5: From what you remember, which of these was reformed during the last four years? (Correct answer: The Civil Code)

Q6: There were elections for governor of the province of Mendoza on June 21st. Do you remember which candidate got the most votes? (Correct answer: Alfredo Cornejo)

Q7: There were elections for governor of the province of Rio Negro on June 14th. Do you remember which candidate got the most votes? (Correct answer: Alberto Weretilneck)

Replication of Weitz-Shapiro and Winters (2017) Results

How likely are you to vote for the mayor?	Overall	Completed High School or Less	Some Tertiary Education or More	Less Politically Knowledge-able	Most Politically Knowledge-able	Less Political Discussion	Most Political Discussion
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Control	3.38	3.35	3.51	3.37	3.41	3.34	3.47
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.15)	(0.06)	(0.13)	(0.07)	(0.11)
	N=280	N=241	N=39	N=231	N=49	N=208	N=72
Explicitly Clean Mayor	3.39	3.39	3.42	3.36	3.58	3.32	3.62
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.13)	(0.06)	(0.13)	(0.07)	(0.08)
	N=280	N=235	N=45	N=240	N=40	N=215	N=61
Less Credible Accusations	2.37	2.35	2.44	2.31	2.60	2.30	2.60
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.12)	(0.05)	(0.11)	(0.05)	(0.10)
	N=547	N=457	N=90	N=443	N=104	N=419	N=124
More Credible Accusations	2.08	2.10	1.97	2.08	2.09	2.06	2.16
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.12)	(0.05)	(0.11)	(0.05)	(0.11)
	N=553	N=477	N=76	N=459	N=94	N=440	N=104
Difference between Credible and Less Credible	0.29	0.25	0.47	0.23	0.51	0.24	0.43
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.17)	(0.07)	(0.16)	(0.07)	(0.15)
p-value on H_0: No Difference	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	[0.01]	[0.01]	[0.01]	[0.01]	[0.01]	[0.01]	[0.01]
Difference between CATEs		0.22		0.28		0.19	
p-value on H_0: No Difference between CATEs		0.23		0.10		0.25	

Appendix Table 1: Respondent Sophistication and Responsiveness to Source Credibility in Brazil. Replication of results from Weitz-Shapiro and Winters (2017). First panel presents condition- and subgroup-specific means for the outcome variable with standard errors in parentheses and N of non-missing responses. p-values for the null hypothesis on the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) for each group and for the null hypothesis of different reactions to each treatment across the two groups are based on difference-in-means t-tests and Wilcoxon rank sum tests (in brackets). p-values for differences across the CATEs are based on the randomization inference tests described in Gerber and Green (2012).

Results with a Dichotomous Outcome Variable

How likely are you to vote for the mayor?	Overall	Completed High School or Less	Some Tertiary Education or More	Less Politically Knowledge-able	Most Politically Knowledge-able	No Political Discussion	Political Discussion
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Control	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.83	0.80	0.78	0.85
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.03)
	N=272	N=200	N=71	N=197	N=75	N=126	N=144
Explicitly Clean Mayor	0.82	0.81	0.88	0.82	0.82	0.84	0.82
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)
	N=290	N=226	N=64	N=217	N=73	N=129	N=157
Less Credible Accusations	0.46	0.44	0.53	0.48	0.41	0.49	0.44
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
	N=274	N=208	N=66	N=206	N=68	N=119	N=153
More Credible Accusations	0.38	0.39	0.35	0.38	0.38	0.35	0.40
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)
	N=270	N=206	N=62	N=199	N=71	N=114	N=156
Difference between Credible and Less Credible	0.08	0.05	0.18	0.10	0.03	0.14	0.05
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.06)
p-value on H_0: No Difference	0.06	0.32	0.05	0.05	0.71	0.04	0.41

Appendix Table 2: Respondent Sophistication and Responsiveness to Source Credibility in Argentina (0/1 Outcome). First panel presents condition- and subgroup-specific means for a dichotomized outcome variable with standard errors in parentheses and N of non-missing responses. p-values for the null hypothesis on the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) for each group are based on difference-in-mean t-tests.

How likely are you to vote for the mayor?	Copartisan with Mayor	Copartisan with Opposition Party	No Partisan Match	Vignettes without Partisanship Information
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Control	0.89	0.79	0.78	0.86
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.04)	(0.04)
	N=28	N=29	N=117	N=98
Explicitly Clean Mayor	0.93	0.84	0.85	0.74
	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.04)
	N=30	N=38	N=124	N=98
Less Credible Accusations	0.60	0.41	0.48	0.39
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.04)	(0.06)
	N=30	N=41	N=133	N=70
More Credible Accusations	0.55	0.36	0.34	0.37
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.04)	(0.05)
	N=29	N=33	N=122	N=86
Difference between Credible and Less Credible	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.01
	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.06)	(0.08)
p-value on H_0: No Difference	0.72	0.67	0.03	0.87

Appendix Table 1: Copartisanship as a Moderator of Reactions to Source Credibility in Argentina (0/1 Outcome). First panel presents condition- and subgroup-specific means for a dichotomized outcome variable with standard errors in parentheses and N of non-missing responses. p-values for the null hypothesis on the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) for each group are based on difference-in-means t-tests.

How likely are you to vote for the mayor?	Copartisan with Mayor	Copartisan with Opposition Party	No Partisan Match	Vignettes without Partisanship Information
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Control	3.54	3.14	3.15	3.36
	(0.15)	(0.18)	(0.09)	(0.10)
	N=28	N=29	N=117	N=98
Explicitly Clean Mayor	3.57	3.18	3.31	3.08
	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.08)	(0.10)
	N=30	N=38	N=124	N=98
Less Credible Accusations	2.80	2.22	2.35	2.16
	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.09)	(0.13)
	N=30	N=41	N=133	N=70
More Credible Accusations	2.48	1.91	1.99	2.13
	(0.21)	(0.17)	(0.09)	(0.11)
	N=29	N=33	N=122	N=86
Difference between Credible and Less Credible	0.32	0.31	0.35	0.03
	(0.31)	(0.24)	(0.13)	(0.17)
p-value on H_0: No Difference	0.31	0.21	0.01	0.87
	[0.25]	[0.23]	[0.01]	[0.91]
Difference between CATE and Copartisan CATE		-0.01	0.04	-0.29
p-value on H_0: No Difference between CATEs		0.99	0.90	0.40

Appendix Table 4: Copartisanship as a Moderator of Reactions to Source Credibility in Argentina. This is a replication of Table 2 in the main text with an additional, final column that presents results for vignettes with no partisan information. First panel presents condition- and subgroup-specific means for the outcome variable with standard errors in parentheses and N of non-missing responses. p-values for the null hypothesis on the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) for each group and for the null hypothesis of different reactions to each treatment across the two groups are based on difference-in-means t-tests and Wilcoxon rank sum tests (in brackets). p-values for differences across the CATEs are based on the randomization inference tests described in Gerber and Green (2012).

Discussion: In the final column, we report the results from the vignettes that did not include information about the mayor's partisan identity. In these vignettes, we observe the expected decrease in support for corrupt mayors, but we find no evidence that respondents differentiate between more and less credible accusations. These results are surprising because it is this version of the experiment that most closely mirrors the original WSW experiment in Brazil. Also in these non-partisan treatments, vote intention for the mayor in the control condition is slightly higher than in the condition where the mayor is explicitly described as not corrupt.

These results appear to be due in part to less attentiveness or comprehension among respondents who heard prompts that did not include mayoral partisanship. Along a number of dimensions, post-treatment questions show worse recall among respondents in vignettes that did not assign the mayor a party. We can only speculate about why recall was worse in these conditions, but perhaps the use of partisan heuristics in Argentina is stronger than in Brazil, and as a result, survey respondents are less likely to process the information contained in the prompts when not provided with an initial description of partisanship that draws their attention or situates their understanding of the prompt.