**Table A1. Sample Demographics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Question / Distribution** |
| Female | Are you male (43.86) or female (56.14%) |
| Ethnicity | Which of the following do you consider to be your primary racial or ethnic group?  White (1) = 84.25%; African American (2) = 3.76%; Asian American (3) = 7.80%; Hispanic (4) = 1.09%; Native American (5) = .87%; Other (6) = 2.24% |
| Age | What is your age?  under 18 (1) = .06%; 18-24 (2) = 4.46%; 25-34 (3) = 13.31%; 35-50 (4) = 23.99%; 51-65 (5) = 33.36%; over 65 (6) = 24.82% |
| Education | What is the highest level of education you have completed?  less than high school (1) = .59%; high school graduate (2) = 9.10%; some college = 28.67%; 4 year college degree (4) = 32.94%; advanced degree (5) = 28.70%. |
| Income | What is your estimate of your family’s annual household income (before taxes)?  < $30,000 (1) = 16.63%; $30,000 – $69,999 (2) = 35.76%; $70,000 – $99,999 (3) = 21.91%; $100,000 - $200,000 (4) = 21.47%; > 200,000 (5) = 4.24% |
| Party Identification\* | Generally speaking, which of the options on the scale below best describes your party identification?  strong Democrat (1) = 16.41%; weak Democrat (2) = 8.82%; lean Democrat (3) = 11.92%; Independent (4) = 31.58%; lean Republican (5) = 10.51%; weak Republican (6) = 7.00%; strong Republican (7) = 13.76% |
| Ideology | Which point on this scale best describes your political views?  very liberal (1) = 6.21%; mostly liberal (2) = 15.16%; somewhat liberal (3) = 12.91%; moderate (4) = 29.48%; somewhat conservative (5) = 14.05%; mostly conservative (6) = 15.80%; very conservative (7) = 6.39%; |
| Interest in Politics | In general, how interested are you in politics?  not at all interested (1) = 8.07%; not to interested (2) = 19.47%; somewhat interested (3) = 40.33%; very interested (4) = 25.12%; extremely interested (5) = 7.01% |
| Political Participation | How often do you participate in political activities (e.g. working on a campaign, attending a rally)?  never (1) = 60.30%; 2 = 22.67%; 3 = 6.68%; a few times a year (4) = 7.98; 5 = 1.39%; 6 = .49%; weekly (7) = .49% |
| Discuss Politics | About how many days a week, on average, do you talk about politics with your family and/or friends?  never (1) = 21.98%; 1 day/week (2) = 34.23%; 2 days/week (3) = 13.55%; 3 days/week (4) = 10.37%; 4 days/week (5) = 6.08%; 5 days/week (6) = 4.85%; 6 days/week (7) = 1.54%; every day (8) = 7.41% |
| Political Knowledge | Four questions, multiple choice other than the last question regarding the Secretary of State:  Know majority required to over-ride a Presidential veto  Know which party has majority in U.S. House  Know whose responsibility it is to declare law unconstitutional  Know current U.S. Sec. of State  0 correct = 9.44%; 1 correct = 11.01%; 2 correct = 16.38%; 3 correct = 25.55%; 4 correct = 37.62% |
| Energy Knowledge | Four questions, multiple choice:  Know whether most of the oil imported to the US comes from the Middle East  Know whether there is currently a ban on drilling for oil and gas off the Atlantic Coast and in the eastern Gulf of Mexico  Know what country is the world’s largest exporter of crude oil  Know which of the following is not a renewable energy source  0 correct = 14.93%; 1 correct = 24.09%; 2 correct = 34.25%; 3 correct = 21.94%; 4 correct = 4.79% |
| Science Knowledge | Two questions, multiple choice:  Is it true or false that lasers work by focusing sound waves?  Which travels faster: light or sound?  0 correct = 15.81%; 1 correct = 36.53%; 2 correct = 47.66% |
| Interest in Energy Politics | How interested are you in the politics of energy?  not at all interested (1) = 8.92%; not too interested (2) = 20.72%; somewhat interested (3) = 44.07%; very interested (4) = 21.01%; extremely interested (5) = 5.28% |
| Following Fracking News | How closely have you been following recent news about fracking?  not closely (1) = 28.29%; 2 = 17.07%; 3 = 13.92%; moderately closely (4) = 23.58%; 5 = 8.76%; 6 = 5.61%; very closely (7) = 2.77% |
| Following CNT News | How closely have you been following recent news about CNTs?  not closely (1) = 73.30%; 2 = 11.59%; 3 = 6.98%; moderately closely (4) = 6.47%; 5 = 1.09%; 6 = .51%; very closely (7) = .06% |

**\*** As with many other Internet samples, the percentage of respondents who identify as a pure Independent is larger than that found in non-Internet samples (see Chang & Krosnick, 2010, Malhotra & Krosnick, 2007).

**Experimental Conditions, Dependent Measures, Debriefing**

In this appendix, we provide the wording for our experimental stimuli and dependent measures. We included transition words (e.g., “Indeed”) when needed for given conditions; the complete wording for all conditions is available upon request from the authors.

**Table A2. Fracking Experiment Conditions & Wordings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Wording** |
| **Scientific Information** | We are now going to ask your opinion about a process to obtain energy called fracking. Fracking, although involving a type of drilling, is a novel method that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling and allows for the recovery of substantial energy reserves. A recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that fracking can be safely conducted on a large scale (and 99% of methane leakages are captured).  A senior vice president at the Environmental Defense Fund referred to recent developments as “good news.” |
| **Politicized**  **Scientific Information** | We are now going to ask your opinion about a process to obtain energy called fracking. Fracking, although involving a type of drilling, is a novel method that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling and allows for the recovery of substantial energy reserves. Yet, importantly, politics nearly always color scientific work with advocates selectively using evidence. This leads many to say it is unclear whether to believe scientific evidence related to debates over fracking. Some argue the process leads to the release of methane that harms the environment, while others disagree pointing to evidence that the methane can be captured. Indeed, a recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that fracking can be safely conducted on a large scale (and 99% of methane leakages are captured).  A senior vice president at the Environmental Defense Fund referred to recent developments as “good news.” |
| **Warning Text**  +  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 2)** | Later in this survey, we are going to ask about your opinion concerning a process to obtain energy called fracking. Although it involves a type of drilling, fracking is an entirely novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of fracking should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes fracking is better for the environment than alternative energy production methods. |
| **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 2)**  +  **Correction Text** | Earlier in this survey, we told you about a process to obtain energy called fracking. Although, as mentioned earlier, it involves a type of drilling, fracking is an entirely novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of fracking should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes fracking is better for the environment than alternative energy production methods. |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  +  **Correction Text**  **(for text see row 4)** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing. |

**Table A3. CNT Experiment Conditions & Wordings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Wording** |
| **Scientific Information** | We are now going to ask your opinion about an approach to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity, and thus, offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches and allows for the production of a substantial amount of energy. A recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that CNTs can be safely produced on a large scale (and do not pollute the environment). A professor of chemistry at Stanford referred to recent developments as “good and needed.” |
| **Politicized**  **Scientific Information** | We are now going to ask your opinion about an approach to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity, and thus, offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches and allows for the production of a substantial amount of energy. Yet, importantly, politics nearly always color scientific work, with advocates selectively using evidence. This leads many to say it is unclear whether to believe scientific evidence related to debates over CNTs. Some argue the process leads to pollution that harms the environment, while others disagree pointing to evidence that there are minimal or no negative environmental consequences. Indeed**,** a recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that CNTs can be safely produced on a large scale (and do not pollute the environment). A professor of chemistry at Stanford referred to recent developments as “good and needed.” |
| **Warning Text**  +  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 2)** | Later in this survey, we are going to ask about your opinion concerning a process to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity and thus offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of CNTs should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes CNTs are better for the environment than other energy production methods. |
| **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 2)**  +  **Correction Text** | Earlier in this survey, we told you about a process to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). As mentioned, CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity, and thus, offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of CNTs should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes CNTs are better for the environment than other energy production methods. |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  +  **Correction Text**  **(for text see row 4)** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing. |

**Fracking Dependent Variables**

Do you oppose or support the use of fracking (which while involving a type drilling, fundamentally differs from conventional drilling in its novelty and allows for the recovery of substantial energy reserves) as an approach to obtain energy in the United States?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*strongly moderately slightly neither oppose slightly moderately strongly*

*oppose oppose oppose nor support support support support*

Do you believe the United States’ government should decrease or increase investments into research that advances fracking as an approach for obtaining energy?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*decrease decrease decrease neither increase increase increase increase*

*a great deal a moderate a little nor decrease a little a moderate a great deal amount amount deal*

Do you agree with the following statement: “This process of fracking will lead to long-term energy sustainability - that is, it will help us develop energy to meet current needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs”?

*strongly moderately slightly neither disagree slightly moderately strongly*

*disagree disagree disagree nor agree agree agree agree*

Indicate how dangerous or safe you think it us to use fracking as an approach to obtain energy.

*extremely very somewhat neither somewhat very extremely*

*dangerous dangerous dangerous dangerous safe safe safe*

*nor safe*

As you think about fracking as an approach to obtain energy, how much anxiety do you feel?

*none at all a little a moderate a good a great deal*

*amount amount*

To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives about fracking?

*not at all not very much a little a moderate a good a great always*

*amount amount deal*

To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives about scientific technologies related to energy, in general?

*not at all not very much a little a moderate a good a great always*

*amount amount deal*

Would you be interested in being re-contacted with information about a method of obtaining energy known as fracking? [Options] Yes, No

*After answering the questions above, respondents in the conditions with an accuracy motivational inducement received the following prompt:* In a sentence or two, please explain why you feel the way you do about fracking/CNTs:

**CNT Dependent Variables**

Do you oppose or support the use of carbon nanotubes (CNTs) (which is a novel method to generate energy that is distinct from traditional approaches and allows for the production of a substantial amount of energy), as an approach to obtain energy in the United States?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*strongly moderately slightly neither oppose slightly moderately strongly*

*oppose oppose oppose nor support support support support*

Do you believe the United States’ government should decrease or increase investments into research that advances CNTs as an approach for obtaining energy?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*decrease decrease decrease neither increase increase increase increase*

*a great deal a moderate a little nor decrease a little a moderate a great deal amount amount deal*

Do you agree with the following statement: “The use of CNTs will lead to long-term energy sustainability - that is, it will help us develop energy to meet current needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs”?

*strongly moderately slightly neither disagree slightly moderately strongly*

*disagree disagree disagree nor agree agree agree agree*

Indicate how dangerous or safe you think to use CNTs as an approach to obtain energy.

*extremely very somewhat neither somewhat very extremely*

*dangerous dangerous dangerous dangerous safe safe safe*

*nor safe*

As you think about the use of CNTs as an approach to obtain energy, how much anxiety do you feel?

*none at all a little a moderate a good a great deal*

*amount amount*

To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives CNTs?

*not at all not very much a little a moderate a good a great always*

*amount amount deal*

To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives about scientific technologies related to energy, in general?

*not at all not very much a little a moderate a good a great always*

*amount amount deal*

Would you be interested in being re-contacted with information about a method of obtaining energy by producing CNTs? [Options] Yes, No

*After answering the questions above, respondents in the conditions with an accuracy motivational inducement received the following prompt:* In a sentence or two, please explain why you feel the way you do about fracking/CNTs:

**Debriefing**

Thank you for your participation in this study. You were told that “a consensus of scientists” believes that the approach for obtaining energy is “safe” and should not be politicized.  This may be true for some scientists, but it may not be true for all scientists – that is, there is some debate regarding this approach for obtaining energy. We provided information based on one perspective, which may not reflect an actual consensus; the point was consistent with some views but also subject to interpretation. Thus, it is unclear if a consensus actually exists and this should be considered as you think about the technology in the future. In short, despite what you read, it remains unclear if there is a consensus on the impact of the technology. Thank you again for your assistance and we apologize if these aspects of the survey are troubling.

**Table A4. Mean Overall Support for technologies**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 3.77 (0.64; 189) | 3.80 (0.70; 211) |
| Scientific information | | 5.93 (0.94; 193) | 6.06 (0.79; 199) |
| Politicized scientific information | | 2.02 (1.00; 195) | 2.40 (1.49; 193) |
| Warning + Politicized scientific information | | 5.56 (0.80; 185) | 5.39 (0.69; 201) |
| Politicized scientific information + correction | | 3.72 (0.79; 213) | 4.00 (0.71; 206) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info + correction | | 4.71 (0.49; 189) | 4.60 (0.67; 193) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the three-item scaled dependent variable discussed in the main text (1–7 point scale) with higher scores indicating increased support for fracking / CNTs; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A5. Mean level of anxiety**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 3.37 (0.94; 183) | 3.02 (1.18; 205) |
| Scientific information | | 1.93 (1.04; 191) | 1.54 (0.75; 189) |
| Politicized scientific information | | 4.04 (1.44; 194) | 4.20 (1.31; 189) |
| Warning + Politicized scientific information | | 2.06 (0.86; 185) | 1.84 (0.68; 198) |
| Politicized scientific information + correction | | 3.31 (0.77; 213) | 3.26 (0.92; 203) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info + correction | | 2.65 (0.92; 188) | 2.49 (0.78; 192) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “As you think about [fracking/CNTs] as an approach to obtain energy, how much anxiety do you feel?” on a 5-point scale with higher scores indicating greater anxiety; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A6. Mean level of perceived threat**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 4.54 (1.46; 186) | 4.92 (1.10; 202) |
| Scientific information | | 2.56 (1.45; 188) | 2.51 (1.45; 193) |
| Politicized scientific information | | 5.33 (1.70; 191) | 5.63 (1.40; 187) |
| Warning + Politicized scientific information | | 3.43 (1.11; 184) | 3.83 (0.93; 196) |
| Politicized scientific information + correction | | 4.72 (1.41; 212) | 5.12 (0.84; 199) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info + correction | | 4.34 (1.03; 187) | 4.55 (0.80; 191) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “Indicate how dangerous or safe you think it us to use [fracking / CNTs] as an approach to obtain energy” on a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating greater perceived danger; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A7. Perceived politicization**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 5.31 (0.99; 186) | 5.16 (1.11; 205) |
| Scientific information | | 2.82 (1.56; 189) | 2.52 (1.38; 193) |
| Politicized scientific information | | 5.99 (1.15; 191) | 5.84 (1.10; 187) |
| Warning + Politicized scientific information | | 3.71 (1.17; 184) | 3.54 (1.08; 197) |
| Politicized scientific information + correction | | 4.90 (1.00; 212) | 4.90 (1.14; 203) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info + correction | | 4.46 (0.95; 187) | 4.67 (0.99; 195) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives about [fracking/CNTs]?” on a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating that political considerations play a greater role; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

We asked all respondents the extent to which they think political consideration affect the nature of the information the public receives about [fracking / CNTs]. We find, as shown in Table A7 above, that in the conditions hypothesized to counteract politicization – i.e., warning, accuracy motivation with correction – that perceptions of politicization are significantly lower, relative to the baseline of no information (and relative to the politicized scientific information condition). These decreases in perceptions of politicization in these conditions are significant in all cases for both for fracking and for CNTs. For example, the decline in perceptions of politicization in the pure control group in the fracking study (5.31) compared to the condition with the accuracy motivation paired with a correction (4.46) is statistically significant and in the hypothesized direction (*t398*= 4.66; *p* ≤ .01). Similarly, the decline in perceptions of politicization in comparing the pure control in the CNT study (5.16) with the accuracy motivation and correction (4.67) is statistically significant and in the expected direction (*t371*= 8.47; *p* ≤ .01). We also found that the correction by itself lowered perceptions of a technology’s politicization, which was counter to our expectation (See hypothesis 4, Table 2).

We also correlated these technology specific politicization measures with a general politicization of science measure. While we find that the domain specific scores significantly correlate with the general measure (for fracking, *r* = .29; *p* ≤ .01; for CNTs, *r* = .23; *p* ≤ .01), the modest size of the correlations suggests that politicization is a domain specific dynamic. **Table A8: Request for Additional Information [See note 16 in the main text for a discussion of the results]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Fracking** | **CNTs** |
| Pure control | 43%  (N=186) | 43%  (N=206) |
| Scientific Information | 7%  (N=189) | 9%  (N=194) |
| Politicized  Scientific Information | 56%  (N=190) | 73%  (N=192) |
| Warning + Politicized scientific information | 21%  (N=185) | 20%  (N=196) |
| Politicized scientific information + correction | 40%  (N=213) | 48%  (N=203) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info + correction | 38%  (N=189) | 39%  (N=196) |

This table reports the percentage of respondents in each condition who requested to be re-contacted via email with additional information about the technology in each study.

**Results for Additional Experimental Conditions (See note 13):**

In both experiments, we included two additional conditions that we do not present in the main text because we lacked strong theoretical predictions for each and included them largely for completeness (e.g., to explore the impact of an accuracy motivation across scenarios). The two conditions included one with an accuracy motivational inducement paired with the politicized scientific information alone – i.e., in the absence of any counteractive communication attempt – and another with an accuracy motivation coupled with a warning about future politicization (see the exact wording of the experimental stimuli below in Table A9 and Table A10).

While we lacked a strong theoretical rationale, we did expect that increased accuracy motivation carried with it distinct implications for these conditions. In the case of the accuracy motivation with politicized information only, we thought that motivation would stimulate individuals to weigh the positive consensual scientific information more heavily in forming an opinion than they would absent such an inducement; yet, we still anticipated that politicized scientific information would significantly increase anxiety and threat, and decrease overall support for each technology, relative to the pure control group.

In the case of an accuracy motivation with a warning, we thought that the motivation would hinder the effectiveness of a warning about politicization relative to a warning without an accuracy inducement. We suspected this because *individuals will not anchor their initial opinion based on the warning entirely (i.e., they will not entirely dismiss subsequent claims of politicization), leading attitudes to shift less in the direction of positive consensual scientific information compared to individuals who receive a warning but do not receive an accuracy inducement.* Nonetheless, we expect that relative to no information, respondents in this condition will be significantly less anxious and threatened by each technology and more supportive of its use. Below, we report the exact wording for these additional experimental conditions for both the fracking experiment and the CNT experiment. The results confirm our expectations, although, as mentioned, we view these as more exploratory than definitive in terms of theoretical development.

**Table A9. Additional Fracking Experiment Conditions & Wordings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Wording** |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  **+**  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing.  [Later in the survey]  We are now going to ask your opinion about a process to obtain energy called fracking. Fracking, although involving a type of drilling, is a novel method that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling and allows for the recovery of substantial energy reserves. Yet, importantly, politics nearly always color scientific work with advocates selectively using evidence. This leads many to say it is unclear whether to believe scientific evidence related to debates over fracking. Some argue the process leads to the release of methane that harms the environment, while others disagree pointing to evidence that the methane can be captured. Indeed, a recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that fracking can be safely conducted on a large scale (and 99% of methane leakages are captured).  A senior vice president at the Environmental Defense Fund referred to recent developments as “good news.” |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  **+**  **Warning**  +  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 1)** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing.  Later in this survey, we are going to ask about your opinion concerning a process to obtain energy called fracking. Although it involves a type of drilling, fracking is an entirely novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional drilling. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of fracking should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes fracking is better for the environment than alternative energy production methods.  [Later in the survey the “Politicized Scientific Information” was presented] |

**Table A10. Additional CNT Experiment Conditions & Wordings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Wording** |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  **+**  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing.  [Later in the survey]  We are now going to ask your opinion about an approach to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity, and thus, offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches and allows for the production of a substantial amount of energy. Yet, importantly, politics nearly always color scientific work, with advocates selectively using evidence. This leads many to say it is unclear whether to believe scientific evidence related to debates over CNTs. Some argue the process leads to pollution that harms the environment, while others disagree pointing to evidence that there are minimal or no negative environmental consequences. Indeed**,** a recent study published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* shows that CNTs can be safely produced on a large scale (and do not pollute the environment). A professor of chemistry at Stanford referred to recent developments as “good and needed.” |
| **Accuracy Motivation**  **+**  **Warning**  +  **Politicized**  **Scientific Information**  **(for text see row 1)** | At some point in this survey, we are going to ask your opinion about an approach related to energy production in the United States. When thinking about your opinion, try to view the approach in an evenhanded way. We will later ask that you justify the reasons for your judgment – that is, why the technology is more or less appealing.  Later in this survey, we are going to ask about your opinion concerning a process to obtain energy by producing carbon nanotubes (CNTs). CNTs are tiny graphite that efficiently convert sunlight into electricity and thus offer a novel method to obtain energy that is fundamentally different from conventional approaches. Some say that it is difficult to assess the benefits of this process because people only point to evidence that supports their position. However, the assessment of CNTs should not be politicized; a consensus of scientists believes CNTs are better for the environment than other energy production methods.  [Later in the survey the “Politicized Scientific Information” was presented] |

**Table A11. Mean Overall Support for technologies**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 3.77 (0.64; 189) | 3.80 (0.70; 211) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info | | 2.55 (0.92; 193) | 2.85 (1.17; 189) |
| Acc. motivation + warning + politicized sci. info | | 4.95 (0.66; 204) | 4.82 (0.51; 192) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the three-item scaled dependent variable discussed in the main text (1–7 point scale) with higher scores indicating increased support for fracking / CNTs; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A12. Mean level of anxiety**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 3.37 (0.94; 183) | 3.02 (1.18; 205) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info | | 3.96 (1.13; 191) | 4.26 (0.97; 190) |
| Acc. motivation + warning + politicized sci. info | | 2.60 (0.65; 203) | 2.35 (0.74; 191) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “As you think about [fracking/CNTs] as an approach to obtain energy, how much anxiety do you feel?” on a 5-point scale with higher scores indicating greater anxiety; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A13. Mean level of perceived threat**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 4.54 (1.46; 186) | 4.92 (1.10; 202) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info | | 5.35 (1.76; 190) | 5.66 (1.32; 187) |
| Acc. motivation + warning + politicized sci. info | | 4.30 (0.96; 203) | 4.48 (0.71; 184) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “Indicate how dangerous or safe you think it us to use [fracking / CNTs] as an approach to obtain energy” on a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating greater perceived danger; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A14. Perceived politicization**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fracking | | CNTs |
| Pure control | | 5.31 (0.99; 186) | 5.16 (1.11; 205) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info | | 5.83 (1.00; 191) | 5.60 (1.05; 188) |
| Acc. motivation + warning + politicized sci. info | | 4.33 (1.07; 203) | 4.20 (1.01; 190) |

The scores reported above are mean responses to the question, “To what extent do you think political considerations affect the nature of the information that the public receives about [fracking/CNTs]?” on a 7-point scale with higher scores indicating that political considerations play a greater role; the standard deviation and N for each condition is listed in parentheses.

**Table A15. Request for Additional Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Condition** | **Fracking** | **CNTs** |
| Pure control | 43%  (N=186) | 43%  (N=206) |
| Acc. motivation + politicized sci. info | 55%  (N=192) | 57%  (N=188) |
| Acc. motivation + warning + politicized sci. info | 35%  (N=206) | 35%  (N=193) |
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