

Supplemental Material: Misuses of Inspiration

Additional Participant Information

In addition to demographics on race and gender, we also requested participants' level of education ($n_{4 \text{ year degree}} = 231, 46.7\%$; $n_{\text{some college}} = 99, 20\%$; all others 165, $< 33.3\%$) and political affiliation ($n_{\text{Democrat}} = 246; 49.7\%$; $n_{\text{Independent}} = 143; 28.9\%$; $n_{\text{Republican}} = 95, 19.2\%$; all others 11, $< 2.2\%$) and political orientation ($n_{\text{Conservative}} = 77, 15.6\%$; $n_{\text{Moderate}} = 122, 24.6\%$; $n_{\text{Liberal}} = 154, 31.1\%$; $n_{\text{Very liberal}} = 104, 21\%$; all others 38, 7.68%).

Because we adapted the narrative from a real news report, in the second round of data collection, we also asked if participants had read the story before (e.g., before participating in the study). Five participants said yes, 11 were not sure, and the remainder had not read the story before. (Note that participants who were in the first round of data collection were automatically ineligible to participate in the second round of data collection; there are no duplicate participants.)

Additional Attention Check

Participants were asked the yes/no question, "Were you paying attention during this study? Please be honest. This will not affect your credit for the study, only whether we use your data." Among participants who were excluded from analysis for failing the story recall check, no participants selected "yes" for this item.