Online Appendix

Non-compliance analysis

In "encouragement designs" such as this one – where respondents are encouraged to take part in the treatment but the researcher does not have full control over whether they were, in fact, treated – noncompliance can be an important issue. Comparing the average outcome among participants in the treatment group who actually received the treatment to the average outcome among those in the control group is deeply misleading, given that the participants actually treated are a nonrandom subset of the original treatment group (see Gerber & Green 2012, Ch. 5). Accordingly, this study examines the effects of assignment to the treatment groups – the "intent-to-treat" (ITT) effects, which are random – rather than the effects of actually receiving the treatment (see Albertson & Lawrence 2009 for a formal demonstration of the bias introduced by assessing the effects of viewing as opposed to the effects of being assigned to view a show).

Compliance rates among those assigned to the treatments were high, suggesting that the choice of estimand was unlikely to affect the substantive results significantly. Defining compliance as watching coverage of the Iowa caucuses on the assigned show for at least one night, 97.0% of those assigned to watch *ABC* reported watching the show; 85.1% of those assigned to watch *Hannity* reported watching the show; and 87.0% of those assigned to watch *TDS* reported watching the show.

These compliance rates did not differ significantly across conditions, as shown in Table A-1 below. There were no statistically significant differences across the groups in the mean number of nights of coverage participants said they watched.

Table A-1: Number of nights of coverage respondents in each experimental condition reported watching

	0	1	2	3	Total
Assigned to watch ABC World News	2	4	21	39	66
	3.0	6.1	31.8	59.1	100%
Assigned to watch Hannity	14	5	22	47	88
	15.9	5.7	25.0	53.4	100%
Assigned to watch <i>The Daily Show</i>	8	4	9	41	62
	12.9	6.5	14.5	66.1	100%

Attrition analysis

Of the 506 respondents who completed the pre-caucus survey, 306 completed the post-caucus survey. If attrition were systematically related to potential values of the dependent variable, then the remaining participants assigned to the treatment and control groups would no longer be random samples of the original pool of participants. Accordingly, supplementary analyses tested for relationships between attrition and participants' background attributes or experimental assignment, as recommended by Gerber & Green (2012) and Albertson & Lawrence (2009).

Those assigned to ABC and *TDS* were less likely to complete the post-caucus survey. Of the 127 participants in the control group, 37 (29.1%) did not complete the post-caucus survey. Of the 126 participants assigned to watch ABC, 60 (47.6%) did not complete the post-caucus survey. Of the 126 participants assigned to watch *Hannity*, 38 (30.2 %) did not complete the post-caucus survey. Of the 127 participants assigned to watch *TDS*, 65 (51.2%) did not complete the post-caucus survey.

As recommended by Gerber & Green (2012), we regressed attrition on participants' background attributes and experimental assignment. Since one major concern in studies of media effects is that those more favorably predisposed to the program they are assigned to watch will be more likely to complete the study, we included interaction terms between the respondent's party identification and the assignment condition. The dependent variable is coded as 1 for participants who did not complete the post-caucus survey, 0 for participants who did complete the post-caucus survey. We use a logistic regression model; the results are shown in Table A-2 below:

Table A-2: Logistic regression of attrition on participants' background attributes and experimental assignment

	Attrition
Assigned to watch ABC World News	.49
	(.52)
× Democrat	.49
	(.70)
× Republican	1.27
•	(.82)
Assigned to watch <i>Hannity</i>	49
	(.55)
× Democrat	15
	(.76)
× Republican	1.56 †
-	(.85)
Assigned to watch <i>The Daily Show</i>	.85
	(.52)
× Democrat	41
	(0.69)
× Republican	.96
	(.84)
Pretest perception of Romney's viability	.19

	(.17)
Pretest perception of Romney's electability	16
	(.14)
Democrat	.00
	(.52)
Republican	26
1	(.65)
Trust in media	.18 †
	(.10)
Perception of media as biased	02
•	(.12)
Political knowledge	68***
_	(.16)
Education	22**
	(.08)
Broadcast news use	01
	(.04)
Cable news use	.00
	(.04)
Age	03**
	(.01)
Female	01
	(.22)
Black	.20
	(.47)
Hispanic	.12
	(.91)
Constant	3.53
	(.88)
Log-likelihood	-260.45
N	453

Notes: † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels are based on one-tailed tests.

Coding notes:

- Independent is the excluded category for Party ID.
- Trust in media and perceptions of media as biased are measured on -2 to +2 scale.
- Political knowledge is measured as the number of correct answers to three factual questions about the candidates running for president.
- News consumption is measured as the number of days in the past week the respondent watched broadcast [cable] news.
- White/Other is the excluded category for race.

None of the assignment conditions, the party identification measures, or their interactions was significantly related to attrition, with one exception. The interaction between assignment to watch *Hannity* and Republican identification (relative to an Independent) is weakly significant (1.56 (.85), p=.07). However, the positive coefficient indicates that Republicans assigned to

watch *Hannity* were actually more, not less, likely to drop out of the study. This suggests that favorability toward media assignment did not affect attrition in a substantively problematic way. At the same time, several other background variables were related to attrition rates, in predictable ways. Respondents' levels of education (-.22 (.08), p=.01), political knowledge (-.68 (.16), p=.00), and age (-.03 (.01), p=.00) were all significantly related to attrition, indicating that older, better-educated, and more knowledgeable respondents were less likely to drop out of the survey.

In the tables that follow, we include controls for these and other covariates, to better assess the experimental effects. However, the fact that attrition appears almost entirely unrelated to treatment condition or party affiliation suggests it is reasonable to assume that missing data are independent of potential outcomes.

Table A-3: Replicating models in Table 2 with additional controls

	Likelihood of Romney	Likelihood of Romney
	winning nomination	winning general election
Pretest perception	.24***	.59***
	(.05)	(.04)
Assigned to watch ABC World News	.14	.15
	(.10)	(.11)
Assigned to watch <i>Hannity</i>	.16†	.21*
	(.09)	(.11)
Assigned to watch <i>The Daily Show</i>	.24*	09
	(.10)	(.12)
Trust in media	02	05
	(.03)	(.04)
Perception of media as biased	.05	09†
	(.04)	(.04)
Interest in politics	01	10
	(.08)	(.09)
Broadcast news use	02	.01
	(.01)	(.01)
Cable news use	.01	01
	(.01)	(.02)
Newspaper use	.01	.01
	(.01)	(.01)
Internet news use	.01	03†
	(.01)	(.01)
Constant	1.85	.84
	(.20)	(.21)
\mathbb{R}^2	.13	.47
N	304	301

Notes: † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels are based on one-tailed tests.

Coding notes:

• Newspaper use and Internet news use were measured as before (as the number of days in the past week the respondent consumed that type of news).

Table A-4: Replicating models in Table 2 without lagged dependent variable

	Likelihood of Romney	Likelihood of Romney
	winning nomination	winning general election
Assigned to watch ABC World News	.18	.45***
	(.11)	(.13)
Assigned to watch <i>Hannity</i>	.17†	.29*
,	(.10)	(.13)
Assigned to watch <i>The Daily Show</i>	.35**	.12
,	(.11)	(.14)
Democrat	09	42***
	(.09)	(.11)
Republican	.10	.39**
•	(.10)	(.13)
Trust in media	06	11*
	(.04)	(.04)
Perception of media as biased	.14**	.02
•	(.04)	(.06)
Education	.07*	.00
	(.03)	(.04)
Interest in politics	02	08
	(.09)	(.11)
Age	.01	.02***
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	.14†	.11
	(.08)	(.10)
Black	30	72**
	(.19)	(.23)
Hispanic	49	22
	(.32)	(.40)
Broadcast news use	02	01
	(.01)	(.02)
Cable news use	.02	.01
	(.02)	(.02)
Newspaper use	01	03
	(.02)	(.02)
Internet news use	.01	01
	(.01)	(.02)
Constant	1.82	.82
	(.30)	(.37)
\mathbb{R}^2	.09	.31
N	273	272

Notes: $\dagger p < .10$; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels are based on one-tailed tests.