Appendix

Study One Experimental Conditions

Control condition

Next, we will ask you several questions about your opinions on various topics. Please read each question carefully.

Scientific report

New Federal Climate Assessment Report

Released November, 2018

The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released in November 2018. The scientific consensus report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. Rising temperatures and extreme heat will cause severe droughts and wildfires throughout the country. This will degrade air quality, decrease crop yields for farmers, and reduce the amount of fresh water available in many places. The report also predicts that climate change will cause the level of the ocean to rise, flooding many coastal areas in the US. Many people who live in flood-prone locations will have to leave their homes. Storm surges that happen because of more intense hurricanes will cause salt-water intrusion, contaminating drinking water and destroying property and ecosystems in the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Scientific report attributed to President Trump

Trump Releases Federal Climate Assessment

Report November, 2018

The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released by President Trump's White House Office of Science and Technology in November 2018. The scientific consensus report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. Rising temperatures and extreme heat will cause severe droughts and wildfires throughout the country. This will degrade air quality, decrease crop yields for farmers, and reduce the amount of fresh water available in many places. The report also predicts that climate change will cause the level of the ocean to rise, flooding many coastal areas in the US. Many people who live in flood-prone locations will have to leave their homes. Storm surges that happen because of more intense hurricanes will cause salt-water intrusion, contaminating drinking water and destroying property and ecosystems in the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Conspiracy frame

Global Warming: Fake Science Again Serves Far-Left Political Agenda

November, 2018

The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released in November 2018. The scientific "consensus" report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. Skeptics of the report dismissed the findings as "fake science" being promoted by the left-wing media as a way to scare people into supporting a radical "political agenda." The conclusions of the report are said to "border on the absurd" and that the models on which they base their conclusions are supported by socialist bureaucrats whose goals are to justify sweeping changes in lifestyle and the global economy.

Conspiracy frame attributed to President Trump
Trump Argues Fake Science Again Serves Far-Left Political Agenda
November, 2018
The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released in November 2018. The scientific "consensus" report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. President Trump called the report's findings "fake science" being promoted by the left-wing media as a way to scare people into supporting a radical "political agenda." The President argued the report's findings "border on the absurd" and that the models on which they base their conclusions are supported by socialist bureaucrats whose goals are to justify sweeping changes in lifestyle and the global economy.

Combination of scientific report and conspiracy frame
　　Debated Federal Climate Assessment Report Released
November, 2018
The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released in November 2018. The scientific consensus report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. Rising temperatures and extreme heat will cause severe droughts and wildfires throughout the country. This will degrade air quality, decrease crop yields for farmers, and reduce the amount of fresh water available in many places. The report also predicts that climate change will cause the level of the ocean to rise, flooding many coastal areas in the US. Many people who live in flood-prone locations will have to leave their homes. Storm surges that happen because of more intense hurricanes will cause salt-water intrusion, contaminating drinking water and destroying property and ecosystems in the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. Skeptics of the report dismissed the findings as "fake science" being promoted by the left-wing media as a way to scare people into supporting a radical "political agenda." The conclusions of the report are said to "border on the absurd" and that the models on which they base their conclusions are supported by socialist bureaucrats whose goals are to justify sweeping changes in lifestyle and the global economy.

Combination of scientific report and conspiracy frame attributed to President Trump
Debated Federal Climate Assessment Report Released
November, 2018
The Fourth National Climate Assessment Report, which is mandated by Congress, was released in November 2018. The scientific consensus report predicts that climate change will cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages by the end of this century. Rising temperatures and extreme heat will cause severe droughts and wildfires throughout the country. This will degrade air quality, decrease crop yields for farmers, and reduce the amount of fresh water available in many places. The report also predicts that climate change will cause the level of the ocean to rise, flooding many coastal areas in the US. Many people who live in flood-prone locations will have to leave their homes. Storm surges that happen because of more intense hurricanes will cause salt-water intrusion, contaminating drinking water and destroying property and ecosystems in the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. President Trump called the report's findings "fake science" being promoted by the left-wing media as a way to scare people into supporting a radical "political agenda." The President argued the report's findings "border on the absurd" and that the models on which they base their conclusions are supported by socialist bureaucrats whose goals are to justify sweeping changes in lifestyle and the global economy.

Demographics

Table A1 - Sample Demographics (Study 1)

Variable	Frequency (%)
Age	
18 - 24	175 (5.9%)
25 - 34	409 (13.8%)
35 - 44	424 (14.3%)
45 - 54	436 (14.7%)
55 - 64	692 (23.3%)
65 - 74	685 (23.0%)
75 - 84	148 (5.0%)
85 or older	4 (0.1%)
Female	
Male	1,463 (49.2%)
Female	1,510 (50.8%)
Race	
White	2,067 (69.5%)
African American	312 (10.5%)
Asian American	142 (4.8%)
Hispanic	310 (10.4%)
Other	142 (4.8%)
Education	
Less than high school	91 (3.1%)
High school graduate	664 (22.3%)
Some college	790 (26.6%)
2 year degree	355 (11.9%)
4 year degree	721 (24.3%)
Professional degree	304 (10.2%)
Doctorate	48 (1.6%)
Income	
Less than $10,000	217 (7.3%)
$10,000 - $19,999	377 (12.7%)
$20,000 - $29,999	363 (12.2%)
$30,000 - $39,999	368 (12.4%)
$40,000 - $49,999	293 (9.9%)
$50,000 - $59,999	303 (10.2%)
$60,000 - $69,999	203 (6.8%)
$70,000 - $79,999	200 (6.7%)
$80,000 - $89,999	118 (4.0%)
$90,000 - $99,999	133 (4.5%)
$100,000 - $149,999	257 (8.6%)
More than $150,000	141 (4.7%)
Party ID	
Republican	986 (33.2%)
Independent	987 (33.2%)
Democrat	1,000 (33.6%)
Total	N=2,973

Main Effects Tables – Study 1

Table A2: Perceived Negative Effects of Climate Change

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	0.05	0.26	-0.05	-0.05
	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.23)
Conspiracy Trump Source	-0.03	0.14	-0.01	-0.19
	(0.11)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.24)
Scientific Report	0.20*	0.34**	0.20	0.12
	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.20)	(0.23)
Scientific Report Trump Source	0.20*	0.23	0.21	0.20
	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.24)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	0.31***	0.37**	0.18	0.40*
	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.20)	(0.23)
Conspiracy Trump Src. & Sci. Report	0.23**	0.46***	-0.10	0.37
	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.24)
Constant (Control Group)	4.55***	4.27***	4.65***	4.69***
	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.17)
Observations	2973	986	987	1000
AIC	11618.8	3440.7	3837.6	4215.6
BIC	11660.8	3475.0	3871.9	4249.9

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A3: Perceived Risks of Climate Change

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	0.01	-0.12	0.09	-0.03
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.17)	(0.11)
Conspiracy Trump Source	-0.07	-0.45**	0.18	0.09
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.16)	(0.11)
Scientific Report	-0.07	-0.21	0.09	0.03
	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.11)
Scientific Report Trump Source	-0.01	-0.02	-0.16	0.20*
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.17)	(0.11)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	0.08	-0.10	0.36**	0.02
	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.11)
Conspiracy Trump Src. & Sci. Report	-0.05	-0.09	-0.06	0.02
	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.17)	(0.11)
Constant (Control Group)	5.15***	4.36***	5.09***	5.97***
	(0.07)	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.08)
Observations	2973	986	987	1000
AIC	11117.1	3772.0	3575.0	2748.8
BIC	11159.1	3806.3	3609.3	2783.2

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* $p<0.10$, ** $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.01$

Table A4: Beliefs that Climate Change is a Hoax

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	0.04	0.29	-0.16	0.07
	(0.14)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.19)
Conspiracy Trump Source	-0.01	0.29	-0.20	-0.15
	(0.13)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.19)
Scientific Report	0.04	0.29	-0.23	-0.10
	(0.13)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.19)
Scientific Report Trump Source	0.16	0.08	0.21	0.13
	(0.13)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.19)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	-0.10	0.02	-0.34	-0.03
	(0.13)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.19)
Conspiracy Trump Src. & Sci. Report	-0.05	-0.00	-0.07	-0.10
	(0.14)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.19)
Constant (Control Group)	3.00***	3.85***	3.05***	2.12***
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.13)
Observations	2973	986	987	1000
AIC	12536.7	4166.3	4067.3	3783.3
BIC	12578.7	4200.6	4101.6	3817.7

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* $p<0.10$, ** $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.01$

Appendix A5 – Test of Source Effects

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Trump Source

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.59	4.52	0.07	0.540
Risk Scale	5.16	5.08	0.08	0.475
Hoax	3.03	2.99	0.04	0.754
Observations	838			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Trump Source - Republicans

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.53	4.41	0.12	0.460
Risk Scale	4.24	3.91	0.33	0.106
Hoax	4.14	4.14	0.00	0.991
Observations	268			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Trump Source - Independents

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.60	4.65	-0.04	0.822
Risk Scale	5.18	5.27	-0.09	0.589
Hoax	2.88	2.84	0.04	0.855
Observations	287			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Trump Source - Democrats

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.64	4.50	0.14	0.550
Risk Scale	5.94	6.06	-0.12	0.310
Hoax	2.20	1.98	0.22	0.243
Observations	283			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Trump Source

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.75	4.75	-0.01	0.955
Risk Scale	5.08	5.14	-0.06	0.592
Hoax	3.03	3.15	-0.12	0.388
Observations	844			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Trump Source - Republicans

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.61	4.50	0.11	0.484
Risk Scale	4.15	4.34	-0.19	0.300
Hoax	4.14	3.93	0.21	0.353
Observations	296			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Trump Source - Independents

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.85	4.86	-0.01	0.943
Risk Scale	5.18	4.93	0.25	0.180
Hoax	2.82	3.26	-0.44	0.077
Observations	266			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Trump Source - Democrats

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Trump Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.80	4.89	-0.09	0.707
Risk Scale	6.00	6.17	-0.16	0.141
Hoax	2.02	2.26	-0.24	0.221
Observations	282			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Trump Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt.

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.86	4.78	0.07	0.542
Risk Scale	5.23	5.10	0.13	0.238
Hoax	2.89	2.95	-0.05	0.685
Observations	837			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Republicans

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.64	4.73	-0.09	0.594
Risk Scale	4.26	4.27	-0.02	0.937
Hoax	3.87	3.85	0.02	0.917
Observations	285			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Independents

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	4.83	4.55	0.28	0.190
Risk Scale	5.45	5.03	0.42	0.013
Hoax	2.70	2.98	-0.27	0.214
Observations	261			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Democrats

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Scaled Effects Battery	5.08	5.06	0.02	0.919
Risk Scale	5.99	5.99	-0.00	0.990
Hoax	2.09	2.03	0.06	0.740
Observations	291			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Trump Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Survey Measures – Study 1

Effect Scale
Listed below are various effects that climate scientists predict will happen due to climate change. Rate the extent to which you believe climate change will have positive or negative effect in the US on …
Increasing droughts
Increasing wildfires
Coastal flooding
Intensity of hurricanes
Freshwater availability
Agricultural production
Increasing heat waves
The U.S. economy
- o Definitely negative (7)
- o Very likely negative (6)
- o Likely negative (5)
- o Neither positive nor negative (4)
- o Likely positive (3)
- o Very likely positive (2)
- o Definitely positive (1)

Risk Scale
Happening
Do you think that climate change is happening?
O   Definitely is NOT happening (1)
o   Very likely is NOT happening (2)
o   Probably is NOT happening (3)
o   Not sure (4)
o   Probably is happening (5)
o   Very likely is happening (6)
o   Definitely is happening (7)
Faster
To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statement:
"Climate change is occurring faster now because of human activity."
O   Strongly disagree (1)
o   Disagree (2)
o   Somewhat disagree (3)
o   Neither agree nor disagree (4)
o   Somewhat agree (5)
o   Agree (6)
o   Strongly agree (7)
Concern
How concerned are you about the effects that climate change will have on you, your family, and your community?
O   Extremely unconcerned (1)
o   Very unconcerned (2)
o   Somewhat unconcerned (3)
o   Neither unconcerned nor concerned (4)
o   Somewhat concerned (5)
o   Very concerned (6)
o   Extremely concerned (7)

Hoax
To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statement?

"The idea that climate change is primarily due to human activities is a hoax or a conspiracy"
o   Strongly disagree (1)
o   Disagree (2)
o   Somewhat disagree (3)
o   Neither agree nor disagree (4)
o   Somewhat agree (5)
o   Agree (6)
o   Strongly agree (7)

Study Two Experimental Conditions

Control condition
Next, we will ask you several questions about your opinions on various topics. Please read each question carefully.
Scientific report

Carbon Capture Technology May Be A Silver Bullet to Stop Climate Change
For immediate release
Several recent scientific consensus reports find that advances in technology can help slow climate change. When coal, oil or gas is burned in a power plant to create electricity, the by-product is carbon dioxide that is released into the atmosphere as a greenhouse gas. With "carbon capture" technologies, carbon dioxide is sucked from the air right at the power plant. The technology then turns this carbon dioxide into liquid that can be safely stored, or re-used to create a low-carbon fuel that can power airplanes and trucks. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change. A growing consensus of scientists recommends adopting these carbon removal technologies. For example, a major report produced by more than 800 experts working together, estimated that a power plant using carbon capture and storage could reduce emissions into the atmosphere by 80 to 90 percent, thereby helping to slow climate change.

Scientific report endorsed by Vice President Gore

Gore Argues Carbon Capture May Be A Silver Bullet to Stop Climate Change
For immediate release
Several recent scientific consensus reports find that advances in technology can help slow climate change. When coal, oil or gas is burned in a power plant to create electricity, the by-product is carbon dioxide that is released into the atmosphere as a greenhouse gas. With "carbon capture" technologies, carbon dioxide is sucked from the air right at the power plant. The technology then turns this carbon dioxide into liquid that can be safely stored, or re-used to create a low-carbon fuel that can power airplanes and trucks. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change. In response to the reports, former Vice President Al Gore acknowledged that a consensus of scientists recommends adopting these carbon removal technologies. For example, a major report produced by more than 800 experts working together, estimated that a power plant using carbon capture and storage could reduce emissions into the atmosphere by 80 to 90 percent.

Conspiracy frame

Carbon Capture is Turning Out to Be Just Another Scam
For immediate release
According to several scientific "consensus" reports, a technology called "carbon capture" claims to suck carbon dioxide from the air, turn it into a liquid using chemicals, and store it underground. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change.   In response to the reports, skeptics criticized carbon capture and storage as "nonsense" and "an extremely improbable solution." Instead, they

say it diverts attention from the real problem which is the unbridled release of carbon dioxide as a by-product of the burning of fossil fuels. The companies producing these fossil fuels such as ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Saudi Aramco are secretly promoting this engineering solution because they could both turn carbon dioxide capture into a profitable business while continuing to benefit from the sale of increasing amounts of carbon fuels such as oil and coal. In fact, these climate-altering strategies are unproven, poorly understood, and based on the false hope that addressing climate change simply involves a technological "fix."

Conspiracy frame attributed to Vice President Gore

Gore Argues Carbon Capture Turning Out to Be Just Another Scam
For immediate release
According to several scientific "consensus" reports, a technology called "carbon capture" claims to suck carbon dioxide from the air, turn it into a liquid using chemicals, and store it underground. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change.   In response to the reports, former Vice President Al Gore criticized carbon capture and storage as "nonsense" and "an extremely improbable solution." Instead, he noted that it diverts attention from the real problem which is the unbridled release of carbon dioxide as a by-product of the burning of fossil fuels. The companies producing these fossil fuels such as ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Saudi Aramco are secretly promoting this engineering solution because they could both turn carbon dioxide capture into a profitable business while continuing to benefit from the sale of increasing amounts of carbon fuels such as oil and coal. In fact, these climate-altering strategies are unproven, poorly understood, and based on the false hope that addressing climate change simply involves a technological "fix."

Combination of scientific report and conspiracy frame
Debated Technology May Be A Silver Bullet to Stop Climate Change
For immediate release
Several recent scientific consensus reports find that advances in technology can help slow climate change. When coal, oil or gas is burned in a power plant to create electricity, the by-product is carbon dioxide that is released into the atmosphere as a greenhouse gas. With "carbon capture" technologies, carbon dioxide is sucked from the air right at the power plant. The technology then turns this carbon dioxide into liquid that can be safely stored, or re-used to create a low-carbon fuel that can power airplanes and trucks. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change. A growing consensus of scientists recommends adopting these carbon removal technologies. For example, a major report produced by more than 800 experts working together, estimated that a power plant using carbon capture and storage could reduce emissions into the atmosphere by 80 to 90 percent, thereby helping to slow climate change.   In response to the reports, skeptics criticized carbon capture and storage as "nonsense" and "an extremely improbable solution." Instead, they say it diverts attention from the real problem which is the unbridled release of carbon dioxide as a by-product of the burning of fossil fuels. The companies producing these fossil fuels such as ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Saudi Aramco are secretly promoting this engineering solution because they could both turn carbon dioxide capture into a profitable business while continuing to benefit from the sale of increasing amounts of

carbon fuels such as oil and coal. In fact, these climate-altering strategies are unproven, poorly understood, and based on the false hope that addressing climate change simply involves a technological "fix."

Combination of scientific report and conspiracy frame attributed to Vice President Gore

Debated Technology May Be A Silver Bullet to Stop Climate Change
For immediate release
Several recent scientific consensus reports find that advances in technology can help slow climate change. When coal, oil or gas is burned in a power plant to create electricity, the by-product is carbon dioxide that is released into the atmosphere as a greenhouse gas. With "carbon capture" technologies, carbon dioxide is sucked from the air right at the power plant. The technology then turns this carbon dioxide into liquid that can be safely stored, or re-used to create a low-carbon fuel that can power airplanes and trucks. Capturing the carbon dioxide this way before it gets into the atmosphere would reduce greenhouse gases and slow climate change. A growing consensus of scientists recommends adopting these carbon removal technologies. For example, a major report produced by more than 800 experts working together, estimated that a power plant using carbon capture and storage could reduce emissions into the atmosphere by 80 to 90 percent, thereby helping to slow climate change. In response to the reports, former Vice President Al Gore criticized carbon capture and storage as "nonsense" and "an extremely improbable solution." Instead, he noted that it diverts attention from the real problem which is the unbridled release of carbon dioxide as a by-product of the burning of fossil fuels. The companies producing these fossil fuels such as ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Saudi Aramco are secretly promoting this engineering solution because they could both turn carbon dioxide capture into a profitable business while continuing to benefit from the sale of increasing amounts of carbon fuels such as oil and coal. In fact, these climate-altering strategies are unproven, poorly understood, and based on the false hope that addressing climate change simply involves a technological "fix."

Demographics (Study 2)

Table A5 – Sample Demographics

Variable	Frequency (%)
Age	
18 – 24	248 (9.0%)
25 – 34	494 (18.0%)
35 – 44	445 (16.2%)
45 – 54	436 (15.9%)
55 – 64	524 (19.1%)
65 – 74	479 (17.4%)
75 – 84	113 (4.1%)
85 or older	6 (0.2%)
Female	
Male	1,265 (46.1%)
Female	1,480 (53.9%)
Race	
White	1,959 (71.4%)
African American	251 (9.1%)
Asian American	235 (8.6%)
Hispanic	247 (9.0%)
Other	53 (1.9%)
Education	
Less than high school	84 (3.1%)
High school graduate	619 (22.6%)
Some college	679 (24.7%)
2 year degree	335 (12.2%)
4 year degree	675 (24.6%)
Professional degree	291 (10.6%)
Doctorate	62 (2.3%)
Income	
Less than $10,000	192 (7.0%)
$10,000 - $19,999	287 (10.5%)
$20,000 - $29,999	371 (13.5%)
$30,000 - $39,999	331 (12.1%)
$40,000 - $49,999	272 (9.9%)
$50,000 - $59,999	252 (9.2%)
$60,000 - $69,999	181 (6.6%)
$70,000 - $79,999	188 (6.8%)
$80,000 - $89,999	115 (4.2%)
$90,000 - $99,999	119 (4.3%)
$100,000 - $149,999	277 (10.1%)
More than $150,000	160 (5.8%)
Party ID	
Republican	910 (33.2%)
Independent	891 (32.5%)
Democrat	944 (34.4%)
Total	N=2,745

Main Effects Tables (Study 2)

Table A6: Support Carbon Capture

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	-0.94***	-0.60***	-0.91***	-1.12***
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.20)
Conspiracy Gore Source	-0.95***	-0.41*	-1.09***	-1.21***
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.20)
Scientific Report	0.66***	0.78***	0.72***	0.67***
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.20)
Scientific Report Gore Source	0.73***	0.82***	0.38**	1.05***
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.16)	(0.20)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	0.26**	0.73***	0.06	0.12
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.16)	(0.21)
Conspiracy Gore Src. & Sci. Report	0.01	0.45*	-0.01	-0.25
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.21)
Constant (Control Group)	4.53***	4.16***	4.61***	4.66***
	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.10)	(0.15)
Observations	2745	910	891	944
AIC	10298.8	3544.3	3169.2	3549.2
BIC	10340.2	3578.0	3202.8	3583.2

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A7: Invest in Carbon Capture

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	-0.89***	-0.41*	-0.84***	-1.45***
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.21)
Conspiracy Gore Source	-0.77***	-0.41*	-0.62***	-1.29***
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.21)
Scientific Report	0.45***	0.51**	0.56***	0.29
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.19)	(0.21)
Scientific Report Gore Source	0.36***	0.40*	0.27	0.33
	(0.11)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.20)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	0.04	0.52**	0.07	-0.48**
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.21)
Conspiracy Gore Src. & Sci. Report	-0.07	0.39*	-0.12	-0.52**
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.21)
Constant (Control Group)	4.60***	4.16***	4.50***	5.15***
	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.11)	(0.16)
Observations	2745	910	891	944
AIC	10486.9	3548.6	3312.7	3582.0
BIC	10528.3	3582.3	3346.3	3616.0

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table A8: Carbon Capture is a Deception

	All	Rep	Ind	Dem
Conspiracy	0.30***	0.08	0.28*	0.53***
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.16)	(0.20)
Conspiracy Gore Source	0.46***	0.26	0.48***	0.66***
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.17)	(0.20)
Scientific Report	-0.38***	-0.20	-0.26	-0.64***
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.17)	(0.20)
Scientific Report Gore Source	-0.31***	-0.17	-0.36**	-0.39**
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.16)	(0.19)
Conspiracy & Scientific Report	-0.03	-0.07	0.01	-0.01
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.16)	(0.20)
Conspiracy Gore Src. & Sci. Report	-0.02	-0.31	0.03	0.24
	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.16)	(0.20)
Constant (Control Group)	4.04***	4.09***	4.06***	3.95***
	(0.07)	(0.16)	(0.10)	(0.15)
Observations	2745	910	891	944
AIC	10011.8	3369.4	3138.0	3494.8
BIC	10053.2	3403.1	3171.6	3528.8

Note: Cell entries are OLS coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses below.
* $p<0.10$, ** $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.01$

Appendix A9 – Tests of Source Effects
Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Gore Source

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	3.59	3.57	0.02	0.876
Invest in Carbon Capture	3.71	3.83	-0.12	0.328
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.33	4.50	-0.16	0.136
Observations	769			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Gore Source - Republicans

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	3.56	3.75	-0.19	0.354
Invest in Carbon Capture	3.75	3.75	-0.00	0.993
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.17	4.35	-0.17	0.353
Observations	271			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Gore Source - Independents

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	3.70	3.52	0.18	0.351
Invest in Carbon Capture	3.66	3.88	-0.22	0.304
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.33	4.54	-0.20	0.299
Observations	221			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Source vs Conspiracy With Gore Source - Democrats

	Consp. No Src. Mean	Consp. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	p-value
Support Carbon Capture	3.54	3.45	0.09	0.642
Invest in Carbon Capture	3.70	3.86	-0.15	0.475
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.49	4.61	-0.13	0.500
Observations	277			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Gore Source

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	5.19	5.26	-0.07	0.560
Invest in Carbon Capture	5.05	4.96	0.09	0.439
Carbon Capture is Deception	3.65	3.72	-0.07	0.528
Observations	801			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Gore Source - Republicans

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	4.94	4.99	-0.04	0.847
Invest in Carbon Capture	4.67	4.56	0.11	0.594
Carbon Capture is Deception	3.89	3.92	-0.03	0.867
Observations	284			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Gore Source - Independents

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	5.33	4.99	0.34	0.106
Invest in Carbon Capture	5.06	4.77	0.29	0.173
Carbon Capture is Deception	3.80	3.69	0.10	0.602
Observations	224			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Sci. Rprt. No Source vs Sci. Rprt. With Gore Source - Democrats

	Sci. Rprt. No Src. Mean	Sci. Rprt. & Gore Src. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	5.33	5.72	-0.38	0.035
Invest in Carbon Capture	5.44	5.48	-0.05	0.794
Carbon Capture is Deception	3.31	3.56	-0.25	0.164
Observations	293			

Note: The first column contains the Scientific Report No Source condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Scientific Report & Gore Source condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt.

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	4.78	4.54	0.24	0.027
Invest in Carbon Capture	4.64	4.53	0.11	0.329
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.01	4.02	-0.01	0.936
Observations	773			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Republicans

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	4.89	4.61	0.28	0.167
Invest in Carbon Capture	4.68	4.56	0.12	0.562
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.02	3.79	0.24	0.199
Observations	268			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Independents

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	4.67	4.60	0.07	0.680
Invest in Carbon Capture	4.57	4.38	0.19	0.320
Carbon Capture is Deception	4.06	4.09	-0.03	0.872
Observations	237			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. vs Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. - Democrats

	Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. Mean	Diff.	*p*-value
Support Carbon Capture	4.78	4.41	0.37	0.061

Invest in Carbon Capture	4.67	4.63	0.04	0.817
Carbon Capture is Deception	3.95	4.19	-0.25	0.174
Observations	268			

Note: The first column contains the Conspiracy No Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition mean for each of the three dependent variables; The second column contains the mean for the Conspiracy with Gore Src. & Sci. Rprt. condition; The third column contains the difference in means between the conditions, with the p-value for each test presented in fourth column.

Measures (Study 2)

Support Carbon Capture
Do you oppose or support using "carbon capture" technologies as a way to fight climate change?
o   Strongly oppose (1)
o   Moderately oppose (2)
o   Slightly oppose (3)
o   Neither support nor oppose (4)
o   Slightly support (5)
o   Moderately support (6)
o   Strongly support (7)

Invest

Do you believe the United States' government should decrease or increase investments into "carbon capture" technologies as a way to slow the effects expected to occur due to climate change?
o   Decrease a great deal (1)
o   Decrease a moderate amount (2)
o   Decrease a little (3)
o   Neither increase nor decrease (4)
o   Increase a little (5)
o   Increase a moderate amount (6)
o   Increase a great deal (7)

Deception

To what extent do you disagree or agree with the following statement?
"The idea that carbon capture technologies can slow or reverse the effects of climate change is a deception promoted by carbon producing industries."
o   Strongly disagree (1)
o   Disagree (2)
o   Somewhat disagree (3)
o   Neither agree nor disagree (4)
o   Somewhat agree (5)
o   Agree (6)
o   Strongly agree (7)