Supporting Information (SI)

## 1 Treatment Email



## ATENÇÃO!!!

A Folha de São Paulo está disponibilizando uma nova ferramenta para você checar se uma notícia é verdadeira ou falsa. Você pode usar sempre que quiser e ajudar o país a combater Fake News durante as eleições.

FOLHA INFORMAÇÕES ELEIÇÕES 2020

# Folha lança newsletter com checagem de fake news nas eleições; envie sua dúvida para verificação

Leitor receberá a Confirma, às terças e sextas, com conteúdo verificado e reportagens sobre tecnologia e segurança nas eleições



Clique aqui e saiba mais!

https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/poder/2020/10/folha-lancanewsletter-com-checagem-de-fake-news-nas-eleicoesenvie-sua-duvida-para-verificacao.shtml

LEIA AGORA

Como identificar uma fake news?

Há vários tipos da fake news: texto verdadeiro, mas título e subtítulos falsos; texto e título verdadeiros, mas foto falsa; tudo falso; entre outros. Nem sempre é fácil avaliar. Mas seguindo algumas dicas você pode avaliar a veracidade de uma notícia

antes de ir compartilhando nas redes sociais e em aplicativos de celular.

#### 8 passos para identificar fake news

Avalie a fonte, o site, o autor do conteúdo.

Muitos sites publicadores de fake News têm nomes parecidos com endereços de sites de noticias. Portanto, avalie o endereço e verifique se o site é conflável, missão. Também veja se outros conteúdos do site também são duvidosos.

Avalie a estrutura do texto

Site que divulgam fake News costumam apresentar erros de português, de formatação, letras em caixa alta e uso exagerado de pontuação.

Preste atenção na data da publicação

Veja se a notícia ainda é relevante e está atualizada.

Leia mais que só o título e o subtítulo

- Leia a notícia até o fim. Muitas vezes, o título e o subtítulo não condizem com o texto.
- Pesquise em outros sites de conteúdo

Duvide se você receber uma notícia bombástica que não esteja em outros sites de notícia.

Veja se não se trata de site de piadas

- Alguns sites de humor usam da ironia para fazer piada.
- Só compartilhe após checar se a informação é correta
- Não compartilhe conteúdo por impulso. Você é responsável pelo o que você compartilha.

21

#### Use o Saúde Sem Fake News

Here is the translated email: "Attention!!! Folha de São Paulo is making a new tool available to you to check if a piece of news is true or false. You can use it anytime and help our country fight Fake News during the elections.

"Folha has a newsletter with fact check in the elections; send your question for verification. [Readers will receive Confirma, Tuesdays and Fridays, with verified content and stories about technology and safety in the elections].

How to spot Fake news? There are several types of fake news: true text, but false headline and sub-caption; text and headlines true, but picture false; all false; etc. It is not always easy to evaluate. But if you follow a few steps you can evaluate the truthfulness of a piece of news before sharing on social media and via your phone.

8 steps to detect fake news

- 1. Evaluate the source, the site, and the author[Many websites with fake news have similar names to news websites. Therefore, see if the address is correct and check if the website is reliable. Take a look at other content in the website]
- 2. Evaluate the structure of the text [Websites with fake news often have grammar mistakes, formatting issues, uppercase, and an exaggerated use of punctuation]
- 3. Pay attention to the date [See if the story is still relevant and up-to-date]
- 4. Read more than the just the headline and sub-caption [Read the story until the end; often the headline and subcaption do not match with the text]
- 5. Look for information in other websites [Question it if you see a breaking story that is not featured elsewhere]
- 6. Check if it is not a joke [Some comedy websites use irony to create a joke]
- 7. Only share after checking it is true [Don't sure on an impulse. You are responsible by what you share.]
- 8. Use Health Without Fake News

## 2 Instrumentation - Study 1 (in English)

Note: In this section we include the main variables (treatment stimuli and dependent variables) and relevant covariates.

## Left-Right Identification: (Wave 1 only)

As already mentioned, when talking about politics, left and right are expressions normally used. According to your political ideas, where would you place yourself on the scale below, where 0 means "extreme left" and 10 means "extreme right"?

## Political Interest: (Wave 1 only)

How much are you interested in politics? You would say you are:

- Very interested
- Interested
- Not very interested
- Not interested at all

## Presidential Approval:

Generally speaking, how do you rate President Jair Bolsonaro's administration?

- Very good
- Good
- Regular positive
- Regular negative
- Bad
- Very bad

## Political Knowledge:

1. Which one of the candidates below is endorsed by President Jair Bolsonaro?

- Celso Russomano
- Joice Hasselmann
- Felipe Sabará
- Arthur do Val
- 2. Which candidate is the current mayor of São Paulo?
- Celso Russomano

- Joice Hasselmann
- Marcio França
- Bruno Covas

3. Who is the vice-candidate running along with Bruno Covas in São Paulo's mayoral election?

- Ricardo Nunes
- Carlos Zarattini
- Marcos da Costa
- Luiza Erundina
- 4. Which one of the candidates below is endorsed by Governor João Dória?
- Celso Russomano
- Joice Hasselmann
- Felipe Sabará
- Arthur do Val

## Media Trust:

On a scale where 0 means "no trust at all" and 10 means "a lot of trust", how much trust do you have in the Press / Major Media?

## Folha Subscription: (Wave 1 only)

Are you a subscriber of Folha de São Paulo?

- Yes
- No

## Fact-Checking Attitudes: (Wave 2 only)

1. Sites that do fact-checking are very useful to me. Do you agree of disagree with this statement?

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

2. How frequently do you visit fact-checking news sites during election campaign or to check candidates' statements?

- Never
- Rarely
- Frequently
- Always

3. In a scale where 0 means "no trust at all" and 10 means "a lot of trust," how much trust do you have in websites that fact check stories, such as Agência Lupa, Boatos.com, e-farsas e Aos Fatos?

## Rumor Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)

We would like to know how often people followed the news about the city of São Paulo and its elections during the campaign. Below, you will see some news headlines. Please indicate whether you consider the headline to be true or false.



Do you believe this to be true of false? Three arab countries own Rede Globo

- True
- False



Do you believe this to be true of false? *Gleisi told PT activists to refuse government help during the pandemic* 

- True
- False



Do you believe this to be true of false? Moro recebia propina para 'deter processos' de doleiro na Lava Jato

- True
- False

		Twitter
Felig @fe	pe Neto 📾 🏲 🧔 elipeneto	~
Criança é escondide	que nem doce, e o.	eu como
01.00 APL - 31	Play 20	40
188 Retweets	s 355 Likes	ende
9	the dets.	faqu
som g	entundo,	
Etenva	gabanalha.	
esse	Car	
😞 ڬ 443	27 comentários 855	compartilhamentos

Do you believe this to be true of false? Felipe Neto tweeted in support of sexual violence against children

- True
- False

## Rumor Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)

We would like to know how often people followed the news about the city of São Paulo and its elections during the campaign. Below, you will see some news headlines. Please indicate whether you consider the headline to be true or false.



Do you believe this to be true of false? Three arab countries own Rede Globo

• True

• False

## Polícia Federal descobre que Bolsonaro tem R\$ 200 milhões em conta na Suíça 🚥



Do you believe this to be true of false? The federal politice found out that Bolsonaro has 2000 million reais in a Swiss bank account

- True
- False



Do you believe this to be true of false? Luxury apartment where Mariele's assassin lived is part of Bolsonaro's tax return

- True
- False



Do you believe this to be true of false? Bolsonaro is elected the most honest politician in the world

- True
- False

#### End of Survey Message (Treatment Assignment): (Wave 1 only)

In partnership with Brazilian newspaper Folha de S. Paulo, some participants in our study are being raffled to have FREE access to Folha's online content and its news app for 6 months. Folha de São Paulo is the most widely circulated newspaper in Brazil and has covered national and municipal elections for decades.

Click on the link below and fill in some information to receive a free access voucher to Folha.

## 3 Instrumentation - Study 1 (in Portuguese)

Note: In this section we include the main variables (treatment stimuli and dependent variables) and relevant covariates. The full questionnaires for both waves will be made available online.

## Left-Right Identification: (Wave 1 only)

Quando se fala de política se utiliza normalmente as expressões esquerda e direita. Levando em conta as suas ideias políticas, onde o(a) Sr.(a) se posicionaria na escala seguinte, onde 0 significa "extrema esquerda" e 10 significa "extrema direita"?

#### Political Interest: (Wave 1 only)

Quanto você se interessa por política?  $O(a) \operatorname{sr}(a)$  diria que é:

- Muito interessado(a)
- Interessado(a)
- Pouco interessado(a)
- Nada interessado(a)

### **Presidential Approval:**

De maneira geral, como você avalia a administração Presidente Jair Bolsonaro?

- Ótima
- Boa
- Regular positiva
- Regular negativa
- Ruim
- Péssima

## Political Knowledge:

1. Qual dos candidatos abaixo é apoiado pelo Presidente Jair Bolsonaro?

- Celso Russomano
- Joice Hasselmann
- Felipe Sabará
- Arthur do Val
- 2. Qual dos candidatos é o atual prefeito de São Paulo?
  - Celso Russomano

- Joice Hasselmann
- Marcio França
- Bruno Covas
- 3. Quem é o candidato a vice na chapa de Bruno Covas?
  - Ricardo Nunes
  - Carlos Zarattini
  - Marcos da Costa
  - Luiza Erundina
- 4. Qual dos candidatos abaixo é apoiado pelo Governador João Dória?
  - Celso Russomano
  - Joice Hasselmann
  - Felipe Sabará
  - Arthur do Val

## Media Trust:

Em uma escala onde 0 significa "nenhuma confiança" e 10 significa "total confiança", quanta confiança você tem na Imprensa/Grande Mídia?

## Folha Subscription: (Wave 1 only)

Você é assinante da Folha de São Paulo?

- Sim
- Não

## Fact-Checking Attitudes: (Wave 2 only)

1. Sites que fazem checagem de notícias são úteis para mim. Você concorda ou discorda dessa frase?

- Discordo muito
- Discordo
- Não discordo nem concordo
- Concordo
- Concordo muito

2. Com que frequência você visita sites de checagem de notícias durante campanhas eleitorais ou para conferir alguma fala de algum candidato?

- Nunca
- Raramente
- Frequentemente
- Sempre

3. Em uma escala onde 0 significa "nenhuma confiança" e 10 significa "muita confiança", quanta confiança você tem em sites que fazem checagem de notícias falsas como Agência Lupa, Boatos.com, e-farsas e Aos Fatos?

## End of Survey Message (Treatment Assignment): (Wave 1 only)

Em parceria com jornal Folha de Sõ Paulo, alguns participantes do nosso estudo estõ sendo sorteados para terem acesso GRATUITO ao conteúdo online e ao aplicativo da Folha por 6 meses. A Folha de São Paulo é o jornal de maior circulação do Brasil e cobre as eleições nacionais e municipais brasileiras há décadas.

Clique no link abaixo e preencha algumas informações para receber um voucher de acesso gratuito a Folha.

## Follow-Up Email



# ATENÇÃO!!!

A Folha de São Paulo está disponibilizando uma nova ferramenta para você checar se uma notícia é verdadeira ou falsa. Você pode usar sempre que quiser e ajudar o país a combater Fake News durante as eleições.

FOLHA INFORMAÇÕES ELEIÇÕES 2020

# Folha lança newsletter com checagem de fake news nas eleições; envie sua dúvida para verificação

Leitor receberá a Confirma, às terças e sextas, com conteúdo verificado e reportagens sobre tecnologia e segurança nas eleições



#### Clique aqui e saiba mais!

https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/poder/2020/10/folha-lancanewsletter-com-checagem-de-fake-news-nas-eleicoesenvie-sua-duvida-para-verificacao.shtml

LEIA AGORA

#### Como identificar uma fake news?

Há vários tipos da fake news: texto verdadeiro, mas título e subtítulos falsos; texto e título verdadeiros, mas foto falsa; tudo falso; entre outros. Nem sempre é fácil avaliar. Mas seguindo algumas dicas você pode avaliar a veracidade de uma noticia antes de ir compartilhando nas redes sociais e em aplicativos de celular.

#### 8 passos para identificar fake news

#### Avalie a fonte, o site, o autor do conteúdo.

Muitos sites publicadores de fake News têm nomes parecidos com endereços de sites de noticias. Portanto, avalie o endereço e verifique se o site é confiável, missão. Também veja se outros conteúdos do site também são duvidosos.

#### Avalie a estrutura do texto

Site que divulgam fake News costumam apresentar erros de português, de formatação, letras em caixa alta e uso exagerado de pontuação.

#### Preste atenção na data da publicação

Veja se a notícia ainda é relevante e está atualizada.

Leia mais que só o título e o subtítulo

- Leia a notícia até o fim. Muitas vezes, o título e o subtítulo não condizem com o texto.
- Pesquise em outros sites de conteúdo
- Duvide se você receber uma notícia bombástica que não esteja em outros sites de notícia
- Veja se não se trata de site de piadas
- Alguns sites de humor usam da ironia para fazer piada.
- Só compartilhe após checar se a informação é correta
- Não compartilhe conteúdo por impulso. Você é responsável pelo o que você compartilha.
- Use o Saúde Sem Fake News



() (<u>8</u>) (<u>8</u>)

## Rumor Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)

Gostaríamos de saber o quanto as pessoas acompanharam as notícias sobre a cidade de São Paulo e a eleição durante a campanha. A seguir, você verá algumas manchestes de notícias. Por favor, indique se se você considera a manchete como sendo verdadeira ou falsa?



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa

## Rumor Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)

Gostaríamos de saber o quanto as pessoas acompanharam as notícias sobre a cidade de São Paulo e a eleição durante a campanha. A seguir, você verá algumas manchestes de notícias. Por favor, indique se se você considera a manchete como sendo verdadeira ou falsa?



QUANDO UM HOMEM SOZINHO CONSEGUE INCOMODAR UM IMPÉRIO DO MAL, ISSO É SINAL DE QUE ESTÁ AGINDO CERTO. AVANTE PRESIDENTE! - 6 h - 🕲

A Rede Globo pertence ao Bahrein, Libia e Kwait. A Rede Globo deve a esses países muito dinheiro través de empréstimos que foram feitos pelo Arabic Iank.

família Marinho. -Esses países são inimigos declarados do Qatar onde Bolsonaro esteve também além dos Emirados Árabes e da Arábia Saudita,países esses que Bolsonaro acabou de fechar negócios mibrardánes

-Entenderam. -Eolisonaro fez negócios com países que são inimigos dos credores da Rede Globo. -Quanto mais a gente souber da verdade e dos motivos, mais condições teremos de defender Bolsonaro desas corja. -TE conhecereis a verdade e a verdade vos literatorió.

603 503

91 cor 980 compartill

Curtir □ Comentar & Compartilhar

Os principais acionistas do Arab Banking Corporation são as entidades governamentais: Kuwait Investment Authority com participação de 28 61%

Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa

## Polícia Federal descobre que Bolsonaro tem R\$ 200 milhões em conta na Suíça 🚥

Nathan Lopes Do UOL, em São Paulo 07/01/2019 | 12h22



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa

## 4 Descriptive Statistics (Study 1)

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics in First Wave of São Paulo Online Panel Study 1

Variable	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	n
Age	.39	.21	0	1	1,000
Class	.50	.27	0	1	1,000
Sex (woman)	.59	.49	0	1	1,000
Folha subscriber	.06	.24	0	1	1,000
Rumor 1 belief	.21	.41	0	1	1,000
Rumor 2 belief	.19	.39	0	1	1,000
Rumor 3 belief	.22	.42	0	1	$1,\!000$
Rumor 4 belief	.28	.45	0	1	1,000
Rumor acceptance scale	.23	.26	0	1	1,000
Treatment	.58	.49	0	1	1,000
Compliance (email)	.27	.45	0	1	1,000
Compliance (newspaper)	.07	.25	0	1	1,000
Compliance (newspaper or email)	.30	.46	0	1	$1,\!000$

Notes: All variables recoded to range between 0 and 1. Summary Statistics for additional variables available in the replication materials.

Table A2: Descriptive Statistics in Second Wave of São Paul	o Online Panel Study
---	----------------------

Variable	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	n
Age	.41	.21	0.03	1	731
Class	.53	.26	0	1	731
Sex (woman)	.57	.50	0	1	731
<i>Folha</i> subscriber	.07	.25	0	1	731
Rumor 1 belief	.24	.43	0	1	731
Rumor 2 belief	.27	.44	0	1	731
Rumor 3 belief	.17	.37	0	1	731
Rumor 4 belief	.17	.37	0	1	731
Rumor acceptance scale	.21	.24	0	1	731
Treatment	.55	.50	0	1	731
Compliance (email)	.27	.44	0	1	731
Compliance (newspaper)	.07	.26	0	1	731
Compliance (newspaper or email)	.30	.46	0	1	731

Notes: All variables recoded to range between 0 and 1. Summary Statistics for additional variables available in the replication materials.

# 5 Balance Checks (Study 1)

Table A3: Balance Checks of Pre-Treatment Covariates Between Treatment Groups In Waves 1 and 2

Were 1 Greeniste		Wave 1			Wave 2	
wave 1 Covariate	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta
Rumor acceptance	04***	.02	08	06***	.02	11
São Paulo Vote (2)	.01	.03	.01	.03	.03	.04
São Paulo Vote (3)	01	.02	02	01	.02	02
São Paulo Vote (4)	01	.02	02	02	.03	.02
Past Pres. Vote (2)	01	.03	01	.03	.03	.03
Past Pres. Vote (3)	05*	.03	05	08**	.04	08
Past Pres. Vote (4)	.03*	.02	.05	.02	.02	.04
Future Pres. Vote (2)	.05	.03	.05	.09**	.04	.09
Future Pres. Vote $(3)$	01	.03	01	02	.03	02
Future Pres. Vote (4)	03*	.02	06	03	.02	06
Future Pres Vote (5)	- 01	02	- 02	- 00	02	- 01
Mayor's Approval	- 01	02	- 02	- 01	02	02
Governor's Approval	.01	.02	.02	.01	.02	.01
President's Approval	04*	.02	06	05*	.03	.07
Self knowledge	01	02	01	- 02	02	- 03
Others knowledge	- 02	.02	- 03	- 01	02	- 02
Political knowledge	02	.02	05	- 04*	.02	02
Political interest	00	.02	.01	04	.02	07
Petieta	.05	.00	.05	.00	.00	.07
Antipotista	.00	.02	- 01	- 01	.02	- 01
Partisan	00	.02	01	01	.02	01
Antipartisan	.00	.05	.05	.00	.04	.00
Nopportion	.05	.05	.04	.02	.04	.03
Follo subscription	05	.02	05	05	.03	.03
Modio Trust	.01	.01	.02	.01	.02	.01
I off right ideology	02	.02	03	.00	.02	.01
A ro	02	.02	04	02	.02	.03
Age Sou (Women)	01	01	04	00	.02	01
Class	01	.03	01	.00	.04	.00
Clobe cons	.02	.02	.04	.01	.02	.01
Booord cons.	.05	.02	.00	.00	.03	.07
Falles come	01	.02	02	02	.02	04
Tonos Linno como	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
Denglada como	.01	.01	.02	.02	.01	.05
D. Faralelo cons.	00	.01	00	.01	.01	.03
UOL cons.	.01	.02	.01	.01	.03	.01
Jovem Pam cons.	.01	.02	.02	.01	.02	.01
Brasil 247 cons.	.00	.01	.00	.01	.02	.01
Issue 1	02	.02	03	.00	.03	.04
Issue 2	.00	.02	.00	.01	.02	.03
Issue 3	01	.02	01	.01	.03	.02
Issue 4	.00	.01	.01	.02	.02	.03
Issue 5	07***	.02	09	08***	.03	11
Issue 6	.06***	.02	.08	07**	.03	09
Issue 7	07***	.02	09	07***	.03	07
Issue 8	01	.02	01	.00	.02	.01
Russomano ideology	00	.02	00	.02	.02	.03
Tatto ideology	01	.02	02	00	.02	00
Covas ideology	.03	.02	.05	.03	.02	.05
França ideology	.01	.02	.03	.02	.02	.04
Boulos ideology	02	.02	03	00	.02	00
F(50, 909)		1.63			1.70	
p-value		.00			.00	
Chi-Square (50)		63.41			61.95	
p-value		.10			.12	
Hotelling's T		69.23			69.70	
p-value		.07			.09	
n		1.000			731	

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Beta is standardized regression coefficient.

## 6 Randomization Analysis

We investigated whether the imbalances detected in our Study 1 could be caused by an implementation issue in the randomization algorithm used by the survey platform. The survey company made the randomization algorithm used in their platform available to us. We and a third-party researcher, who is familiar with the programming language used by the survey company, reviewed the code and we found no obvious issues with the algorithm.

We then simulated data for a two-arm survey experiment with simple randomization using the company's algorithm by creating 1,000 samples of 1,000 respondents out of a 9,996 automatically generated responses to a survey experiment using the survey company's survey platform interface. To create these 1,000 samples, we randomly sampled with replacement from these 9,996 automatically-generated responses. We then compared the distribution of units assigned to treatment in these 1,000 samples of 1,000 respondents to 1,000 samples of 1,000 respondents using R package randomizr (function simple ra, with probability 0.5). As can be seen in Figure A1, the number of units assigned to treatment using the algorithm in the survey company's platform and *randomizr* are similar. We note that the survey company's algorithm produces an average of 503 units assigned to treatment across the 1,000 samples while randomizr produces 501 units assigned to treatment on average, also across 1,000 samples. Furthermore, we did not obtain a single sample, using either the survey company's algorithm or randomizr, out of 1,000 trials, that had an allocation of 575 units to treatment. Furthermore, the probability that 575 or more units are assigned to treatment in 1,000 independent trials, assuming a probability of 0.5 for each trial, following a binomial distribution is essentially zero (0.0000008601165). We interpret these results as somewhat inconclusive, since we fail to detect systematic issues with the randomization algorithm, but we find that the random allocation we obtained in our study 1 is also unlikely.

Table	A4:	Summary	statistics
-------	-----	---------	------------

Rand.	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	Std. Dev.
Survey Comp.	452	493	503.50	503.58	514	549	15.37
randomizr	447	489	500	500.22	512	554	16.39

grup and a second seco

Figure A1: Comparing Distributions

## 7 Adjusted Models (Study 1)

For complete list of covariates included in the analysis, see table in section 5 of this appendix.

Table A5: Table 1 Models 1-4 With Controls: ITT and CACE for Additive Scale or Rumor Acceptance

Independent				
Covariate	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	10***			
	(.02)			
Newspaper		77***		
		(.16)		
Email		× ,	21***	
			(.03)	
Newspaper/Email			~ /	19***
				(.03)
Constant	.28***	.36***	.32***	.30***
	(.08)	(.11)	(.08)	(.07)
Treatment		.12***	.48***	.56***
		(.02)	(.03)	(.32)
n	712	712	712	712

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Models control for all wave 1 covariates and has a few missing observations from variables not reported on Table A1. The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect on compliance from the first stage regression model.

Independent	OIS(1)	2 SI S $(2)$	2 CI C (2)	9 CT C $(4)$
Covariate	OLS(1)	25L5(2)	2515 (3)	25L5 (4)
Treatment	26***			
	(.03)			
Newspaper	~ /	-1.91***		
		(.36)		
Email			50***	
			(.07)	
Newspaper/Email				46***
11/				(.06)
Constant	.31*	.50*	.28*	.34**
	(.16)	(.27)	(.17)	(.17)
Treatment	i	.13***	.49***	.56***
		(.02)	(.03)	(.03)
n	712	712	712	712

Table A6: Table 1 Models 5-8 with controls: ITT and CACE for Repeated Rumor

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Models control for all wave 1 covariates and has a few missing observations from variables not reported on Table A1. The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect on compliance from the first stage regression model.

## 8 Correlates of Attrition (Study 1)

Wave 1 Covariate	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta
Treatment Assignment	.09**	.03	.08
Rumor acceptance	.04**	.02	.06
São Paulo Vote $(2)$	02	.03	.02
São Paulo Vote (3)	00	.02	00
São Paulo Vote (4)	.02	.03	.02
Past Pres. Vote $(2)$	.02	.03	.01
Past Pres. Vote $(3)$	03	.03	03
Past Pres. Vote $(4)$	.05**	.02	.08
Future Pres. Vote (2)	.02	.03	.02
Future Pres. Vote (3)	04	.03	04
Future Pres. Vote (4)	.00	.02	.00
Future Pres. Vote $(5)$	.02	.02	.04
Mayor's Approval	.03	.02	.04
Governor's Approval	.00	.02	.01
President's Approval	.02	.03	.02
Self knowledge	06***	.02	09
Others knowledge	01	.02	02
Political knowledge	08***	.02	12
Political interest	02	.03	02
Petista	.04*	.02	.06
Antipetista	.02	.02	.03
Partisan	03	.04	03
Antipartisan	01	.03	01
Nonpartisan	00	.03	00
Folha subscription	03**	.01	06
Media Trust	01	.02	01
Left-right ideology	.02	.02	.04
Age	06***	.02	13
Sex (Woman)	.07**	.03	.06
Class	09***	.02	15
Globo cons.	.01	.03	.01
Record cons.	.05**	.02	.07
Folha cons.	01	.02	02
Terça Livre cons.	.02	.01	.05
B. Paralelo cons.	.02	.02	.05
UOL cons.	01	.02	01
Jovem Pam cons.	.01	.02	.01
Brasil 247 cons.	.02	.02	.05
Issue 1	.05**	.02	.06
Issue 2	.03	.02	.04
Issue 3	.04*	.03	.05
Issue 4	.01	.02	.02
Issue 5	.07***	.03	.08
Issue 6	02	.03	02
Issue 7	.04	.03	.04
Issue 8	.02	.02	.03
Russomano ideology	03	.02	05
Tatto ideology	.06***	.02	.09
Covas ideology	02	.02	03
França ideology	.02	.02	.04
Boulos ideology	.05**	.02	.07

Table A7: Wave 1 Correlates of Panel Attrition in Study 1

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.0'. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10.

Notes (2): Mean differences are OLS estimates of regressing the covariate on the attrition indicator. Notes (3): Beta is standardized regression coefficient.

Note: The joint-significance test (on interactions) after regressing panel attrition on the treatment interacted with all wave 1 covariates yields an F-statistic (50, 858) of 1.30 (see codes), which is not statistically significant. This provides evidence that, while the

treatment is associated panel attrition, it does not systematically interact with subjects' traits to predict attrition.

## 9 Bounding Estimates (Study 1)

Study 1 presented problems of differential attrition between treatment and control groups in the panel survey. To address such concerns, Table A13 shows the estimates of bounds for the ITT effects using three different approaches. First, we estimate extreme bounds by replacing the missing values in post-treatment rumor acceptance with the best and worst possible outcomes depending on treatment assignment (Manski, 1990; Gerber and Green, 2012). That is, the lower bound estimates the ITT effects after replacing the value of the dependent variable for subjects with missing data in the treatment group with the highest value of rumor acceptance and with the lowest value of rumor acceptance for subjects in the control group. The upper bound is estimated after replacing the value of the dependent variable for subjects assigned to the treatment group with missing data with the lowest value of rumor acceptance and with the highest value of rumor acceptance for those assigned to the control group. We also use trimming bounds to place bounds around the ITT estimates (Lee, 2009; Tauchmann, 2014). The lower bound is estimated after removing the "excess" observations with the lowest outcomes for the treatment effect, while the upper bound is estimated after removing those observations with the highest outcomes for the treatment effect. A third approach estimates plausible lower bounds for the effect by replacing the missing observations in the post-treatment dependent variables with their pre-treatment values (Margalit and Shayo, 2020). We report robust standard errors available in Stata along with the coefficient estimates.

Fatimata	]	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Estimate	Extreme	Trimmed	Plausible	Extreme	Trimmed
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ITT for Additive Scale	.20***	06***	09***	33***	15***
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)
ITT for Repeated Rumor	.29***	16***	18***	47***	29***
	(.03)	(.05)	(.02)	(.03)	(.03)

Table A8: Lower and Upper Bounds for Treatment Effects (ITT) of Intervention on Rumor Acceptance (Study 1)

\*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

The ITT estimates using extreme bounds (columns 1 and 4) suggest that the results could change substantially under the extreme bounds' assumptions about the patterns of attrition. The lower bounds are positive and significant, while the upper bounds are negative and significant for both dependent variables.<sup>31</sup> Under more restrictive assumptions, the estimates using trimming (columns 2 and 5) and plausible (column 3) bounds show that the treatment effect is consistently negative. The lower bounds are never larger

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>Since the expected treatment effects are negative, the terms "lower" and "upper" are used to characterize the estimates' absolute values relative to the naive ITT estimates.

than -.06 (p<.05) for the additive scale and -.16 (p<.05) for the repeated rumor, indicating that the intervention is still effective even under less favorable patterns of panel attrition. The upper bounds are -.33 (p<.05) for the additive scale and -.37 (p<.05) for the repeated rumor. Overall, the results suggest that differential attrition could only be a threat to the observed treatment effects under quite conservative assumptions used by the extreme bounds analysis.

# 10 Heterogeneous Effects (Study 1)

Independent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	18***	09***	16***	07***
	(.05)	(.02)	(.04)	(.03)
Political knowledge	24***			
	(.05)			
Presidential approval		.09**		
		(.04)		
Media trust			06	
			(.06)	
Political interest				03
				(.03)
Treatment*knowledge	.08			
	(.06)			
$Treatment^*$ approval		05		
		(.05)		
$Treatment^{*}trust$			08	
			(.07)	
$Treatment^*interest$			× ,	09*
				(.04)
Constant	.44***	.24***	.31***	.29***
	(.04)	(.02)	(.03)	(.02)
n	731	712	731	731

Table A9: OLS Models (ITT) with Heterogeneous Effects on Additive Scale of Rumor Acceptance

Notes: \*\*\*p < 0.01. \*\*p < 0.05. \*p < 0.10. Standard errors in parentheses.

Independent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	30***	16***	31***	21***
	(.09)	(.04)	(.09)	(.05)
Political knowledge	01		× ,	
	(.09)			
Presidential approval	× ,	.05		
		(.08)		
Media trust			18*	
			(.10)	
Political interest				.03
				(.06)
Treatment*knowledge	.09			
	(.11)			
Treatment*approval		27***		
		(.10)	10	
Treatment*trust			.12	
m , ,*· , ,			(.14)	۳ 1
Treatment interest				51
Constant	10***	1 = * * *	07***	(.09)
Constant	$.18^{-10}$	$.10^{+10}$	.2(10)	$.13^{+++}$
	(.07)	(.03)	(.00)	(.04)
n	(31	(12	(31	731

Table A10: OLS Models (ITT) with Heterogeneous Effects on Repetead Rumor

Notes: \*\*\*p < 0.01. \*\*p < 0.05. \*p < 0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

# 11 Alternative Dependent Variables (Study 1)

Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)	
Treatment	19***				
	(.02)				
Newspaper		-1.41***			
		(.26)			
Email			39***		
			(.05)		
Newspaper/Email				34***	
				(.05)	
Constant	.31***	.31***	.31***	.31***	
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
Treatment		.13***	.48***	.55***	
		(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
n	731	731	731	731	

Table A11: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Pro-Bolsonaro Rumors (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estim

Table A12: Main Models (1	ITT and CACE)	for Anti-Bolsonaro Run	nors (no controls)
---------------------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------------

Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)	
Treatment	05*				
	(.03)				
Newspaper		34*			
		(.19)			
Email			09*		
			(.05)		
Newspaper/Email			× /	08*	
<b>i i</b> /				(.05)	
Constant	.24***	.24***	.24***	.24***	
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
Treatment		.13***	.48***	.55***	
		(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
n	731	731	731	731	

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estimates the standard errors in parentheses.

Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)	
Treatment	02				
	(.02)				
Newspaper		11			
		(.17)			
Email			03		
			(.05)		
Newspaper/Email				03	
				(.04)	
Constant	.72***	.72***	.72***	.72***	
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
Treatment		.13***	.48***	.55***	
		(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
n	731	731	731	731	

Table A13: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Political Knowledge (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estim

Table A14: Main Models	(ITT and CACE)	) for Media Trust (	(no controls)
------------------------	----------------	---------------------	---------------

Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)	
Treatment	01				
	(.02)				
Newspaper		04			
		(.15)			
Email			01		
			(.04)		
Newspaper/Email			× ,	01	
/				(.04)	
Constant	.55***	.55***	.55***	.55***	
	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	
Treatment		.13***	.48***	.56***	
		(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
n	731	731	731	731	

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estim

Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	2SLS(3)	2SLS(4)	
Treatment	.01				
	(.01)				
Newspaper		.05			
		(.12)			
Email			.01		
			(.03)		
Newspaper/Email				.01	
				(.03)	
Constant	.58***	.58***	.58***	.58***	
	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	
Treatment		.13***	.49***	.55***	
		(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	
n	731	731	731	731	

Table A15: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Fact-Checking Attitudes (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p < 0.01. \*\*p < 0.05. \*p < 0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estimates the standard errors in parentheses.

## 12 Instrumentation - Study 2 (in English)

Note: In this section we include the main variables (treatment stimuli and dependent variables) and relevant covariates that were not included in Study 1.

## Attention to Fake News:

1. In your opinion, are fake news a very serious problem, a serious problem, or not a problem?

- Very serious
- Somewhat serious
- Not a problem

2. How important are fact-checking agencies such as AgênciaLupa, Boatos.com, e-farsas e Aos Fatos?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not important

## Ability to Identify Fake News:

- 1. How do you assess your ability to identify fake news?
  - Very good
  - Good
  - Bad
  - Very bad

2. In your opinion, telling a false story from a true story is a very easy task, an easy task, a difficult task or a very difficult one?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Difficult
- Very difficult

## Feeling thermometer:

1. Now I would like to know more details regarding on your thoughts about a few political figures. Please, using a scale from 0 to 10 to say how much you like the listed figures, with 0 being you don't like that figure at all and 10 being you like them a lot.

• Jair Bolsonaro

- Lula
- Sérgio Moro

## Rumor Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)

We would like to know how much people follow news about Brazil. In what follows, you will see a few pieces of news. Please, indicate whether you believe them to be true or false.



This story is:

- True
- False



This story is:

• True
• False



This story is:

- True
- False



- True
- False

Polícia Federal descobre que Bolsonaro tem R\$ 200 milhões em conta na Suíça 🚥





This story is:

- True
- False



- True
- False



- True
- False

#### Rumor Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)

We would like to know how often people followed the news about the city of São Paulo and its elections during the campaign. Below, you will see some news headlines. Please indicate whether you consider the headline to be true or false.



- True
- False



- True
- False



This story is:

- True
- False



- True
- False



- True
- False



- True
- False



- True
- False

Real News Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)



- True
- False



Cientista-chefe da entidade afirma que é necessário maior transparência e educação sobre a importância da imunização Larisa Gaspar, especial para o Estadão O de sentendo es 2020 18031

- True
- False



Bolsonaro é escolhido 'pessoa corrupta do ano' por consórcio internacional de jornalistas investigativos (via @fausto\_macedo)



This story is:

- True
- False

Real News Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)



- True
- False



- True
- False

# Polícia Federal conclui inquérito e imputa crime a Bolsonaro

terra 💭

Por ter foro privilegiado, presidente não foi indiciado; caberá a Alexandre de Moraes decidir se abre ação contra o chefe do Executivo





Presidente Jair Bolsonaro REUTERS/Adriano Machado Foto: Reuters

- True
- False

### 13 Instrumentation - Study 2 (in Portuguese)

Note: In this section we include the main variables (treatment stimuli and dependent variables) and relevant covariates that were not included in Study 1.

#### Attention to Fake News:

1. Na sua percepção, as notícias falsas (ou fake news) são um problema muito grave, pouco grave ou não são um problema?

- Muito grave
- Pouco grave
- Não são um problema

2. Como você avalia a importância de agências de checagem de notícias falsas, como AgênciaLupa, Boatos.com, e-farsas e Aos Fatos?

- Muito importantes
- Pouco importantes
- Nada importantes

#### Ability to Identify Fake News:

1. Como você avalia a sua capacidade de identificar notícias falsas (ou fake news)?

- Muito boa
- Boa
- Ruim
- Muito ruim

2. Na sua opinião, diferenciar uma notícia falsa de uma notícia verdadeira é uma tarefa muito fácil, fácil, difícil ou muito difícil?

- Muito fácil
- Fácil
- Difícil
- Muito difícil

#### Feeling thermometer:

1. Agora gostaria de saber com mais detalhes o que você pensa sobre algumas personalidades políticas. Por favor, use uma nota de 0 a 10 para indicar o quanto você gosta da pessoas listadas, sendo que zero significa que você não gosta da pessoa de jeito nenhum e dez que você gosta muito.

- Jair Bolsonaro
- Lula
- Sérgio Moro

#### Rumor Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)

Gostaríamos de saber o quanto as pessoas acompanharam as notícias sobre a cidade de São Paulo e a eleição durante a campanha. A seguir, você verá algumas manchestes de notícias. Por favor, indique se se você considera a manchete como sendo verdadeira ou falsa?



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa

Polícia Federal descobre que Bolsonaro tem R\$ 200 milhões em conta na Suíça 🚥





Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa

#### Rumor Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)

Gostaríamos de saber o quanto as pessoas acompanharam as notícias sobre o Brasil. A seguir, você verá algumas notícias. Por favor, indique se você considera que elas são verdadeiras ou falsas.



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



#### Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- $\bullet~$ Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- $\bullet~$ Verdadeira
- $\bullet~$ Falsa

Real News Acceptance (Wave 1, pre-treatment)



- Verdadeira
- Falsa

saide OMS refuta declaração de Bolsonaro sobre vacina: 'Elas erradicaram sarampo e varíola'

Cientista-chefe da entidade afirma que é necessário maior transparência e educação sobre a importância da imunização Larisa Gaspar, especial para o Estadão O de sentendo es 2020 18031

- Verdadeira
- Falsa



Bolsonaro é escolhido 'pessoa corrupta do ano' por consórcio internacional de jornalistas investigativos (via @fausto\_macedo)



Essa notícia é:

- Verdadeira
- Falsa

Real News Acceptance (Wave 2, post-treatment)



- Verdadeira
- Falsa



- Verdadeira
- Falsa

## Polícia Federal conclui inquérito e imputa crime a Bolsonaro

terra D

≡

Por ter foro privilegiado, presidente não foi indiciado; caberá a Alexandre de Moraes decidir se abre ação contra o chefe do Executivo





Presidente Jair Bolsonaro REUTERS/Adriano Machado Foto: Reuters

- Verdadeira
- Falsa

### 14 Descriptive Statistics (Study 2)

Table A16:	Descriptive	Statistics in	n First	Wave of S	São Paulo	Online	Panel	Study	2
								•/	

Variable	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	n
Rumor 1 belief	.47	.50	0	1	1,037
Rumor 2 belief	.25	.44	0	1	1,037
Rumor 3 belief	.39	.49	0	1	1,037
Rumor 4 belief	.26	.44	0	1	$1,\!037$
Rumor 5 belief	.33	.47	0	1	$1,\!037$
Rumor 6 belief	.17	.38	0	1	$1,\!037$
Rumor 7 belief	.24	.43	0	1	$1,\!037$
Rumor acceptance scale	.30	.22	0	1	$1,\!037$
Real news 1 belief	.46	.50	0	1	1,037
Real news 2 belief	.60	.49	0	1	1,037
Real news 3 belief	.40	.49	0	1	1,037
Real news acceptance scale	.49	.31	0	1	1,037
Treatment	.50	.50	0	1	$1,\!037$
Compliance (email)	.30	.46	0	1	1,037

Notes: All variables recoded to range between 0 and 1. Summary Statistics for additional variables available in the replication materials.

Variable	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	n
Rumor 1 belief	.43	.50	0	1	678
Rumor 2 belief	.46	.50	0	1	676
Rumor 3 belief	.32	.47	0	1	676
Rumor 4 belief	.16	.37	0	1	679
Rumor 5 belief	.27	.44	0	1	676
Rumor 6 belief	.16	.37	0	1	678
Rumor 7 belief	.09	.29	0	1	677
Rumor acceptance scale	.27	.21	0	1	674
Real news 1 belief	.44	.50	0	1	675
Real news 2 belief	.76	.43	0	1	676
Real news 3 belief	.46	.50	0	1	676
Real news acceptance scale	.55	.32	0	1	674
Treatment	.50	.50	0	1	694
Compliance (email)	.40	.49	0	1	694

Table A17: Descriptive Statistics in Second Wave of São Paulo Online Panel Study 2

Notes: All variables recoded to range between 0 and 1. Summary Statistics for additional variables available in the replication materials.

## 15 Balance Checks (Study 2)

Table A18: Balance Checks of Pre-Treatment Covariates Between Treatment Groups In Waves 1 and 2

Where 1 Commister		Wave 1			Wave 2	
wave 1 Covariate	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta
Income	.02	.01	.04	.02	.01	.05
Education	.01	.05	.01	.04	.05	.02
Age	.02	.01	.05	.01	.02	.02
Sex (Woman)	01	.03	01	.06	.04	.06
Catholic	.05	.03	.05	.04	.04	.04
Evangelical	02	.03	03	02	.03	02
White	.03	.03	.03	.00	.04	.00
Political interest	.01	.02	.01	.01	.02	.02
Bolsonaro Past Vote	00	.03	00	05	.04	05
Haddad Past Vote	00	.03	00	.03	.03	.03
Bolsonaro Vote Intention	.01	.03	.01	04	.03	04
Lula Vote Intention	02	.03	02	.02	.04	.02
Bolsonaro Feeling	00	.02	01	04	.03	.05
Lula Feeling	01	.02	02	.03	.03	.04
Moro Feeling	02	.02	03	02	.02	03
Left-right ideology	02	.02	03	04*	.02	06
Media Trust	00	.02	00	.00	.02	.00
Rumor acceptance	01	.01	01	00	.02	00
Rumor acceptance (repeated)	.01	.02	.01	.02	.02	.04
Real news acceptance	.00	.02	.01	.03	.02	.04
Real news acceptance	01	02	01	01	04	01
(repeated)	01	.05	01	.01	.04	.01
Fake news attention	.00	.01	.00	02	.02	05
Fake news ability	01	.02	01	00	.02	01
F (23, 1,013/670)		.64			.85	
p-value	.90 .66					
Chi-Square (23)		14.23			18.20	
p-value		.92			.75	
Hotelling's T		14.86			18.66	
p-value		.91			.75	
n		1,037			694	

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.0<sup>6</sup>. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Beta is standardized regression coefficient.

### 16 Correlates of Attrition (Study 2)

Wave 1 Covariate	Mean Diff.	Robust SE	Beta
Treatment Assignment	00	.03	00
Income	12***	.01	.24
Education	18***	.04	12
Age	09***	.01	18
Sex (Woman)	.04	.03	.04
Catholic	06*	.03	06
Evangelical	.11***	.03	.01
White	05	.03	05
Political Interest	18***	.02	28
Bolsonaro Past Vote	01	.03	01
Haddad Past Vote	06**	.03	06
Bolsonaro Vote Intention	.01	.03	.01
Lula Vote Intention	03	.03	03
Bolsonaro Feeling	.02	.03	.02
Lula Feeling	03	.02	04
Moro Feeling	02	.02	03
Left-right ideology	02	.02	03
Media Trust	08***	.02	12
Rumor acceptance	.05***	.01	.10
Rumor acceptance (repeated)	.03*	.02	.06
Real news acceptance	03	.02	05
Real news acceptance (repeated)	01	.03	01
Fake news attention	03**	.01	07
Fake news ability	05***	.02	08

Table A19: Wave 1 Correlates of Panel Attrition in Study 2

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.0'. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10.

Notes (2): Mean differences are OLS estimates of regressing the covariate on the attrition indicator. Notes (3): Beta is standardized regression coefficient.

Note: The joint-significance test (on interactions) after regressing panel attrition on the treatment interacted with all wave 1 covariates yields an F-statistic (23, 989) of 1.14 (see codes), which is not statistically significant at conventional levels and provides further evidence that panel attrition is not a major concern for the analyses.

### 17 Adjusted Models (Study 2)

For complete list of covariates included in the analysis, see table in section 15 of this appendix.

Table A20: Table 2 Models 1-6 with controls: ITT and CACE for Additive Scales of Rumor/Real/Real-Rumor Acceptance

Independent	False, OLS	False, 2SLS	Real, OLS	Real, 2SLS	Diff., OLS	Diff., $2SLS$	
Covariate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)	
Treatment	03**		.02		.05**		
	(.01)		(.02)		(.02)		
Email		04**		.03		.06**	
		(.02)		(.03)		(.03)	
Constant	08	09	.25***	.26***	.33***	.36***	
	(.06)	(.06)	(.10)	(.09)	(.10)	(.10)	
Treatment		.79***	•	.79***		.79***	
		(.02)		(.02)		(.02)	
n	674	674	674	674	674	674	

Notes: \*\*\*p < 0.01. \*\*p < 0.05. \*p < 0.10.

Notes (2): Robust standard errors in parentheses. Models control for all wave 1 covariates. The bottom treat

Table A21: Table 2 Models 7-12 with controls: ITT and CACE for Gains in Rumor/Real/Real-Rumor Acceptance

Independent	False, OLS	False, 2SLS	Real, OLS	Real, 2SLS	Diff., OLS	Diff., 2SLS	
Covariate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)	
Treatment	04**		.05		.09**		
	(.02)		(.03)		(.04)		
Email		05**		.06		.11**	
		(.02)		(.04)		(.04)	
Constant	16**	18**	.13	.15	.29*	.34**	
	(.08)	(.07)	(.14)	(.14)	(.15)	(.15)	
Treatment		.80***	•	.80***		.80***	
		(.02)		(.02)		(.02)	
n	675	675	675	675	675	675	

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10.

Notes (2): Robust standard errors in parentheses. Models control for all wave 1 covariates. The bottom treat

### 18 Bounding Estimates (Study 2)

Although we Study 2 did not have problems if differential attrition and had weaker ITT estimates than Study 2 for rumor acceptance, below we present the bounding estimates for comparison.

Table A22: Lower and Upper Bounds for Treatment Effects (ITT) of Intervention on Rumor Acceptance (Study 2)

Estimata	]	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Estimate	Extreme	Trimmed	Plausible	Extreme	Trimmed
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ITT for Additive Scale	.33***	03	02*	37***	04
	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.03)
ITT for Repeated Rumor	.09***	02	02	09***	03
	(.02)	(.03)	(.01)	(.02)	(.03)

\*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

### 19 Measures of Attention and Ability (Study 2)

We included questions to attempt to measure attention and ability to identify fake news in both waves of Study 2 (see instrumentation section above). Each measure is an additive scale of two questions of self-reported ability/attention. Below we report ATEs and HTEs for those variables.

Independent Veriable	Additiv	ve Scale	Gains in I	Repeated
Independent Variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	OLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	03**		01	
	(.01)		(.02)	
Email		04**		01
		(.02)		(.02)
Constant	.95***	.95***	.02*	.02*
	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Treatment		.80***		.80***
		(.02)		(.02)
n	672	672	672	672

Table A23: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Self-Reported Attention to Fake News (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect on compliance from the first stage regression model.

Independent Variable	Additiv	ve Scale	Gains in I	Repeated
independent variable	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	OLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	04*		03	
	(.02)		(.02)	
Email		06*		04
		(.03)		(.03)
Constant	.91***	.91***	.04**	.04**
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)
Treatment		.80***		.80***
		(.02)		(.02)
n	671	671	671	671

Table A24: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Self-Reported Ability to Identify Fake News (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

on compliance from the first stage regression model.

While the ATEs for the additive scales are negative, indicating that the treatment decreases subjects' attention and ability to identify fake news, the results for the change between waves are null. This is explained by the fact ability and attention are correlated to panel attrition, with subjects scoring higher values in the two variables being more likely to drop from the second wave (see section 16 on Correlates of Attrition for Study 2 above).

The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect

Independent Veriable	Additi	ve Scale	Gains in I	Repeated
independent variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	05	18**	01	08
	(.05)	(.08)	(.07)	(.10)
Ability	02		01	
	(.04)		(.05)	
Attention		14**		02
		(.06)		(.07)
Treatment*Ability	.02		04	
	(.06)		(.08)	
Treatment*Attention		.17**		.04
		(.08)		(.11)
Constant	.31***	.41***	.00	.01
	(.04)	(.06)	(.05)	(.07)
n	674	674	675	675

Table A25: OLS Models (ITT) with Heterogeneous Effects on Additive Scale and Repeated Rumors

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

The results regarding moderation based on ability and attention are also inconsistent. The only significant effects are observed for attention moderating the treatment effect on the additive scale (the treatment ceases to reduce belief as attention to fake news increases). However, the pattern is not observed for repeated rumors and may as well be related to differential attrition for the variable, with subjects scoring higher values being more likely to drop from the second wave.

### 20 Heterogeneous Effects (Study 2)

Independent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	06	03	03	02
	(.04)	(.02)	(.03)	(.04)
Education	01			
	(.02)			
Bolsonaro Feeeling		.15***		
		(.03)		
Media trust			04	
			(.04)	
Political interest			. ,	03
				(.04)
Treatment <sup>*</sup> education	.02			
	(.02)			
Treatment*feeling		.01		
0		(.04)		
Treatment*trust		( )	.00	
			(.05)	
Treatment*interest				01
				(.06)
Constant	.30***	.23***	.31***	.31***
	(.03)	(.02)	(.02)	(.03)
n	674	674	674	674

Table A26: OLS Models (ITT) with Heterogeneous Effects on Additive Scale of Rumor Acceptance

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Standard errors in parentheses.

Independent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	09	04	.02	04
	(.06)	(.03)	(.04)	(.07)
Education	.01			
	(.02)			
Bolsonaro Feeling		.03		
		(.04)		
Media trust			.01	
			(.05)	
Political interest				.02
				(.06)
Treatment <sup>*</sup> education	.03			
	(.03)			
Treatment*feeling	× ,	03		
<u> </u>		(.06)		
Treatment*trust			13*	
			(.07)	
Treatment*interest				02
				(.08)
Constant	02	02	01	.02
	(.04)	(.02)	(.03)	(.04)
n	675	675	675	675

Table A27: OLS Models (ITT) with Heterogeneous Effects on Repeated Rumors

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

#### Alternative Dependent Variables (Study 2) 21

Independent Variable	Additive Scale		Gains in Repeated	
	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	OLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	04**		04	
	(.02)		(.04)	
Email		05**		05
		(.03)		(.05)
Constant	.31***	.31***	01	01
	(.02)	(.02)	(.03)	(.03)
Treatment		.80***		.80***
		(.02)		(.02)
n	675	675	678	678

Table A28: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Pro-Bolsonaro Rumors (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect

on compliance from the first stage regression model.

Table A29: Main Models (ITT and CACE) fo	or Anti-Bolsonaro Rumors (	(no controls)
--	----------------------------	---------------

Independent Variable	Additive Scale		Gains in Repeated	
	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	OLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	.01		02	
	(.02)		(.04)	
Email		.02		02
		(.03)		(.04)
Constant	.21***	.21***	04*	04*
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)
Treatment		.80***		.80***
		(.02)		(.02)
n	676	676	676	676

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect on compliance from the first stage regression model.

Independent Variable	Additive Scale		Gains in Bonostod	
	Additive Scale		Gams in Repeated	
	OLS(1)	2SLS(2)	OLS(3)	2SLS(4)
Treatment	00		01	
	(.02)		(.02)	
Email		01		01
		(.03)		(.03)
Constant	.57***	.57***	.04***	.04***
	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)
Treatment		.79***		.79***
		(.02)		(.02)
n	684	684	684	684

Table A30: Main Models (ITT and CACE) for Media Trust (no controls)

Notes: \*\*\*p<0.01. \*\*p<0.05. \*p<0.10. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

The bottom treatment estimate row reports the treatment effect

on compliance from the first stage regression model.

### 22 Subjects

Our first study was conducted by survey company Quaest Consultoria & Pesquisa in partnership with Folha de São Paulo. Our second study was also conducted by survey company Quaest Consultoria & Pesquisa.

Approximately 15 thousand invitations were sent to online panel participants located in São Paulo. The online panel participants are recruited from subjects who participated in face-to-face interviews with this survey company. Only participants who currently reside in São Paulo and were at least 18 years old were eligible to participate. Subjects received a compensation from the survey company for their participation.

Sample sizes were defined based on budget availability (in both studies) and our cooperation with *Folha de São Paulo* since the newspaper was providing vouchers (in the first study). In both studies, all subjects who participated in the first wave were invited to participate again in the second wave and we did not change recruitment criteria after the recruitment began.

### 23 CONSORT Flow Diagrams

Figure A2: Study 1


Figure A3: Study 2

