

Supplementary Information for “Conscientiousness does not moderate the association between political ideology and susceptibility to fake news sharing”

Exclude attention (a covariate) from the full model

As a robustness check, we excluded the attention covariate in the full model reported in the main text (Figure 3). We modeled sharing intentions as a function of conservatism, headlined veracity (coded 0 [false], 1 [true]), conservatism-veracity interaction, and their three-way interactions with covariates (share ~ conservatism * veracity * (conscientiousness + openness + extraversion + agreeableness + neuroticism + age + gender + education + AOT)). As shown in Figure S1, the overall pattern of results is similar to that reported in the main text (Figure 3). In Studies 4 and 5 where we found significant two-way conservatism-conscientiousness interactions (Figure S1, second row, first column), we did not find significant three-way conservatism-conscientiousness-veracity interactions (Figure S1, fourth row, first column). The Bayesian meta-analysis found that conservatism was associated with false news sharing ($b = 0.19$ [0.07, 0.32]), but there was a null three-way conservatism-conscientiousness-veracity interaction effect ($b = 0.04$ [-0.06, 0.15]).




Figure S1. Estimates from three-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines, controlling for interactions with Big-5 factors, age, gender, education, and actively open-minded thinking (AOT). Note that unlike Figure 3 in the main text, attention was excluded from the models. Headline veracity was coded 0 (false) and (true). Error bars are 95% CIs. Study 3 was excluded because it only had false headlines. Study 5^A: conservatism was the mean of social and economic conservatism (both

measured using 5-point scales). Study 5*: conservatism was L&K's 7-point conservatism measure.

Exclude Study 1 (Lucid sample) from meta-analyses

Because data quality from Lucid was lower, we re-fitted the Bayesian meta-analytic models excluding Study 1 (which recruited participants from Lucid). For the first model (Fig. 1; share ~ conservatism * conscientiousness) that modeled overall sharing intentions (true and false headlines) in both Lawson and Kakkar's (2021) studies and our studies, conservatism correlated with news sharing ($b = 0.43$ [0.37, 0.49]), and there was a conservatism-conscientiousness interaction ($b = -0.30$ [-0.36, -0.24]). As stated in the main text (Fig. 1), this two-way interaction effect is driven by the studies from the original paper and not our studies ($b = -0.05$ [-0.12, 0.03]).

We then modeled sharing intentions as a function of conservatism, conscientiousness, headline veracity (coded 0 [false], 1 [true]), and their interactions (Fig. 2; share ~ conservatism * conscientiousness * veracity). Excluding Study 1 did not change the Bayesian meta-analytic conclusions (null three-way conservatism-conscientiousness-veracity interaction effects, $b = 0.03$, [-0.01, 0.06]).

Finally, we fitted the full model to control for relevant covariates (Fig. 3; share ~ conservatism * veracity [coded 0/1] * (conscientiousness + openness + extraversion + agreeableness + neuroticism + age + gender + education + attention + AOT)). Again, excluding Study 1 did not change the Bayesian meta-analytic conclusions (null three-way conservatism-conscientiousness-veracity interaction effects, $b = 0.04$, [-0.09, 0.17]).

Feelings thermometer or warmth toward Democrats/Republicans as conservatism/ideology measure




Figure S2. Estimates from two-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines. Error bars are 95% CIs. Conservatism was an aggregate feelings thermometer (toward Democrat [Republican] voters) ("How would you rate Democrat [Republican] voters?"; 101-point scale: Very Cold to Very Warm).




Figure S3. Estimates from three-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines. Headline veracity was coded 0 (false) and (true). Error bars are 95% CIs. Study 3 was excluded because it presented only false headlines. Conservatism was an aggregate feelings thermometer (toward Democrat [Republican] voters) ("How would you rate Democrat [Republican] voters?"; 101-point scale: Very Cold to Very Warm).




Figure S4. Estimates from three-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines, controlling for interactions with Big-5 factors, age, gender, education, attention, and actively open-minded thinking (AOT). Headline veracity was coded 0 (false) and (true). Error bars are 95% CIs. Study 3 was excluded because it only had false headlines. Conservatism was an aggregate feelings thermometer (toward Democrat [Republican] voters) (“How would you rate Democrat [Republican] voters?”; 101-point scale: Very Cold to Very Warm).

Partisanship as conservatism/ideology measure




Figure S5. Estimates from two-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines. Error bars are 95% CIs. Conservatism was a partisanship measure (“Which of the following best describes your political preference?”; 6-point scale: Strongly Democratic to Strongly Republican).




Figure S6. Estimates from three-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines. Headline veracity was coded 0 (false) and (true). Error bars are 95% CIs. Study 3 was excluded because it presented only false headlines. Conservatism was a partisanship measure ("Which of the following best describes your political preference?"; 6-point scale: Strongly Democratic to Strongly Republican).




Figure S7. Estimates from three-way interaction logistic regression models predicting the sharing of true and false headlines, controlling for interactions with Big-5 factors, age, gender, education, attention, and actively open-minded thinking (AOT). Headline veracity was coded 0 (false) and (true). Error bars are 95% CIs. Study 3 was excluded because it only had false headlines. Conservatism was a partisanship measure ("Which of the following best describes your political preference?"; 6-point scale: Strongly Democratic to Strongly Republican).

Table S1. Two-way interaction models for alternative measures of conservatism, combining data from five studies

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
IM	0.035 (0.106)	0.030*** (0.004)	0.019*** (0.005)	0.093 (0.363)	1.222** (0.372)	0.314** (0.113)	0.281* (0.116)	0.127 (0.369)	0.015** (0.005)	0.338** (0.122)
C	-0.286** (0.089)	-0.047 (0.058)	-0.037 (0.077)	-0.367*** (0.052)	-0.265*** (0.060)	-0.155 (0.081)	-0.141 (0.089)	-0.346*** (0.045)	-0.176* (0.069)	-0.133 (0.089)
IM x C	0.004 (0.026)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	0.036 (0.088)	-0.207* (0.091)	-0.048 (0.027)	-0.050 (0.028)	0.015 (0.090)	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.055 (0.030)
Intercept	0.200 (0.360)	-1.031*** (0.231)	-0.723* (0.318)	0.636** (0.210)	0.150 (0.244)	-0.496 (0.327)	-0.459 (0.357)	0.707*** (0.185)	-0.375 (0.280)	-0.582 (0.359)
SE	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid	by: pid
BF01	225	0.002	0.606	187	14	50	49	188	57	40

Note. IM: Ideology/partisanship measure. C: Conscientiousness. IM x C: Two-way interaction. SE: Standard error type (clustered by pid [participant ID]). BF01: Bayes factor favoring the null hypothesis (IM x C estimate equals 0) over the alternative/complement hypothesis (IM x C estimate does not equal 0). Each column is one model with a different ideology/partisanship measure: (1) demrep_c (continuous partisanship measure), (2) warm_repub (warmth toward Republicans), (3) warm_democrat (warmth towards Democrats), (4) potus2020trump (Trump vote 2020), (5) potus2016trump (Trump vote 2016), (6) social_conserv (social conservatism), (7) economic_conserv (economic conservatism), (8) party (binary partisanship measure), (9) warmth_both (mean of warm_repub and warm_democrat [reversed coded]), (10) social_econ_conserv (mean of social and economic conservatism). Except for model 3 (warm_democrat), higher IM values indicate greater conservatism or Republican: Note that the IM x C interaction estimates for model 2 (warm_repub) and model 3 (warm_democrat) are both negative, even though the two variables are negatively correlated with each other, $r = -0.35$, $t(2392) = -18.16$, $p < .001$.

Table S2. Two-way conservatism-conscientiousness interaction Bayes factor (BF01) favoring the null for different measures of conservatism

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Study 1	79.05	21.75	8.89	80.79	85.29	96.89	69.67	44.53	105.98	82.27	
Study 2	74.59	15.49	47.36	95.89	87.36	67.64	57.11	90.87	82.2	60.22	
Study 3	54.59	50.42	9.04	68.23	62.11	44.14	74.4	60.62	67.52	58.23	
Study 4	101.3	91.82	88.13	91.95	50.22	77.16	105.19	84.8	106.88	101.66	
Study 5	107.23	4.27	53.24	95.54	1.72	98.94	94.62	88.2	64.04	95.3	81.56

Note. Bayes factor (BF01) for the interaction coefficient from two-way interaction models are shown (standard errors are clustered by participant). Most Bayes factor favored the null hypothesis (interaction estimate equals 0) over the alternative/complement hypothesis (interaction estimate does not equal 0). Each column is one model with a different ideology/partisanship measure: (1) demrep_c (continuous partisanship measure), (2) warm_repub (warmth toward Republicans), (3) warm_democrat (warmth towards Democrats), (4) potus2020trump (Trump vote 2020), (5) potus2016trump (Trump vote 2016), (6) social_conserv (social conservatism), (7) economic_conserv (economic conservatism), (8) party (binary partisanship measure), (9) warmth_both (mean of warm_repub and warm_democrat [reversed coded], (10) social_econ_conserv (mean of social and economic conservatism), (11) ideology (Lawson & Kakkar's conservatism measure).