ONLINE APPENDIX A

Methodology of the Content Analysis of Fox News and ABC News Coverage of Global Warming

Broadcast and cable television news organizations offer four types of news programs: morning news, daytime news, evening news, and news magazines (also called political talk shows). We chose to focus on evening, primetime news programs, because these programs are especially popular (Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2010). We chose ABC's World News Tonight to represent mainstream broadcast news programs. On Fox News, we focused on Special Report from Fox News, which is broadcast at about the same time as ABC News's World News and is considered to be Fox's primary news program.

Sampling

The unit of analysis is a news program transcript. We generated a random sample of transcripts in two stages. In the first stage, we compiled the population of transcripts for each media outlet between 2001 and 2010. Then we randomly sampled 30 transcripts for each year for each media outlet. The resulting stories and transcripts were the sample with which we conducted content analysis.

Fox News Special Report. The Fox News population consisted of all the transcripts from the Special Report program that contained either "global warming" or "climate change" in the full text of the transcript. The Fox News population was collected from the online LexisNexis database, selecting Fox News as the "TV and Radio News Transcripts" search option and "Special Report" as the show name.

The search term used was:

("global warming") OR ("climate change") AND SHOW("special report")

This search was done for each year between 2001 and 2010 on the Fox News Network.

ABC World News. The ABC News population consisted of all the transcripts from the evening broadcasts of the World News programs that contained either "global warming" or "climate change" in the full text of the transcript. The ABC News population was collected from the LexisNexis database by selecting ABC News from the "TV and Radio News Transcripts" search option. The SHOW instruction limited the results to only the World News programs. The NOT instruction was used so that World News Now and World News This Morning were not included. Thus, only World News Tonight, World News Saturday, and World News Sunday were included.

The search term was:

("global warming") OR ("climate change") AND SHOW("World News") NOT SHOW("now") NOT SHOW("this morning").

Procedure. For both media outlets, a list of stories was downloaded from LexisNexis, and full transcripts were obtained. The full transcripts were checked to determine whether the body of the transcript contained the search terms "global warming" or "climate change" and to remove stories that included phrases such as "climate changes" or "climate to change" that did not belong in the population. The selected transcripts were also checked for duplicates. In some instances, a single segment of the program was broken into two partial transcripts, and these portions were combined to produce a single transcript of the segment.

Coding

For each sampled transcript, two coders, who were unaware of the research questions being investigated, independently answered 31 yes/no questions according to elaborate instructions. The questions asked the coders to evaluate the "external quotes" in the/transcript, which were statements made by a person or group of people other than the author(s) or editors of the story or anyone employed by the television network broadcasting the story. Every external quote must have been said by a person or organization that was identified in the news story by a name or profession.

Coders answered a series of questions about each transcript:

Did the transcript quote an individual or group of individuals or organizations who explicitly stated or directly implied they believe any of the following?

(1) That global warming (GW) probably or definitely is or has been happening.

(2) That GW probably or definitely is not or has not been happening.

(3) That human activity might be or probably has been or definitely has been a cause of GW.

(4) That human activity definitely is not or probably is not a cause of GW.

(5) That it is not yet known whether or not human activity is a cause of GW.

(6) That GW probably or definitely will have or is having one or more effects on the environment that will be bad for people.

(7) That GW is not having or will not have one or more effects on the environment that will be bad for people.

(8) That it is not yet known whether or not GW will have or is having one or more effects on the environment that will be bad for people.

(9) That GW might have or might be having or has had or will have an effect on the environment that is good for people.

(10) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is or has been happening. The statement does not explicitly say most or all scientists believe this.

(11) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is or has been happening.

(12) That it is not clear how many scientists, if any, who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is or has been happening.

(13) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is not or has not been happening. The statement does not explicitly say most or all scientists believe this.

(14) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is not or has not been happening.

(15) That it is not clear how many scientists, if any, who study the climate believe that GW probably or definitely is not or has not been happening.

(16) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that human activity is a cause or the cause of GW. The statement does not explicitly say most scientists believe this.

(17) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that human activity is a cause or the cause of GW.

(18) That it is not clear how many, if any, scientists who study the climate believe that human activity is a cause of GW. The statement does not explicitly say most scientists believe this.

(19) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that human activity is not a cause of GW. The statement does not explicitly say most or all scientists believe this.

(20) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that human activity is not a cause of GW.

(21) That it is not clear how many, if any, scientists who study the environment believe that human activity is not a cause of GW.

(22) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have Consequences that would be bad for people. The statement does not explicitly say most or all scientists believe this.

(23) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have consequences that would be bad for people.

(24) That it is not clear how many, if any scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have consequences that would be bad for people.

(25) That one or more scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have consequences that would be good for people. The statement does not explicitly say most or all scientists believe this.

(26) That most or all scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have consequences that would be good for people.

(27) That it is not clear how many, if any, scientists who study the climate believe that GW will have consequences that would be good for people.

(28) That things should definitely be done to deal with, reduce, or cope with GW.

(29) That things should probably be done to deal with, reduce, or cope with GW.

(30) That things should not be done to deal with, reduce, or cope with GW.

(31) That the main topic of this story was about either global warming or climate change.

Inter-coder reliability was high, with agreement level of about 90% for the majority of coding questions. For the content analysis of Fox News transcripts, agreement was 90%, 98%, 95%, 97%, and 99% for coding question (1)–(5), respectively; 92%, 99%, 99%, 100%, and 95% for coding question (6)–(10), respectively; 99%, 99%, 99%, 100%, and 100% for coding question (11)–(15), respectively; 97%, 100%, 98%, 99%, and 100% for coding question (16)–(20), respectively; 100% for each of coding question (21)–(27), and 94%, 99%, 98%, and 90% for coding question (28)–(31), respectively.

And for the content analysis of ABC News transcripts, agreement was 83%, 99%, 95%, 100%, and 100% for coding question (1)–(5), respectively; 87%, 99%, 99%, 100%, and 89% for coding question (6)–(10), respectively; 97%, 100%, 100%, 100%, and 100% for coding question (11)–(15), respectively; 98%, 100%, 100%, 100%, and 100% for coding question (16)–(20), respectively; 100%, 91%, 98%, 100%, and 100% for coding question (21)–(25), respectively, and 100%, 100%, 93%, 99%, 99%, and 89% for coding question (26)–(31), respectively.

When the two coders gave different answers to at least one coding question about a transcript, a third coder performed another round of coding of that transcript

independently. Each discrepancy in coding answers among three coders was resolved by majority rule.

Measures

Green/Not Green Statements. A transcript was considered to have made "green statements" on global warming if it quoted one or more external sources that said any of the following: that global warming has been happening, that human activities are at least partly responsible for global warming, that global warming would be bad, that ameliorative actions about global warming should be taken; that is, a "yes" answer to any of questions (1), (3), (6), and (28)–(29).

A transcript was considered to have made "not-green statements" on global warming if it quoted one or more external sources that said any of the following: that global warming has not been happening, that human activities are not responsible for global warming, that global warming would not be bad, and that no ameliorative actions about global warming should be taken; that is, a "yes" answer to any of questions (2), (4)–(5), (7)–(9), and (30).

Each transcript was assigned to one of four categories. A transcript was categorized as "green" if it made "green statements" and did not make "not-green statements." A transcript was categorized as "not-green" if it made "not-green statements" and did not make "green statements." A transcript was categorized as "competing" if it made "green statements" and made "not-green statements." A transcript was categorized as "silent" if it did not make "green statements" OR "not-green statements."

Climate Scientists' Statements on Global Warming. A transcript was considered to have included scientists making green statements on global warming if

it quoted one or more climate scientists saying any of the following: that global warming has been happening, that human activities are at least partly responsible for global warming, that global warming would be bad; that is, a "yes" coding to any of the questions (10)–(11), (16)–(17), and (22)–(23).

A transcript was considered to have included scientists making not-green statements if it quoted one or more climate scientists saying any of the following: that global warming has not been happening, that human activities are not responsible for global warming, that global warming would not be bad; that is, a "yes" coding to any of the questions (12)–(15), (18)–(21), and (24)–(27).

Each transcript was assigned to one of four categories. A transcript was categorized as including climate scientists making "green" statements if it quoted climate scientists making "green statements" and not making "not-green statements." A transcript was categorized as including climate scientists making "not-green" statements if it quoted climate scientists making "not-green statements" and not making "green statements." A transcript was categorized as including climate scientists making "competing" statements if it quoted climate scientists making "green statements" and quoted climate scientists making "not-green statements." A transcript was categorized as climate scientists being "silent" if it did not quote climate scientists making "green statements" or "not-green statements."

ONLINE APPENDIX B

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Study 1

The data for Study 1 came from a Random Digit Dial (RDD) telephone survey of a nationally representative sample of American adults age 18 and over conducted by Abt SRBI between November 1 and November 14, 2010. A total of 1,001 interviews

were conducted in English and Spanish. The target population for the study is non-institutionalized people aged 18 and older living in the United States. Samples of telephone numbers were drawn from both landline and cellular RDD frames to reach people with access to either a landline or cell phone. People with residential landlines were not screened out of the cell phone sample. Both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International, LLC, according to specifications provided to them by Abt SRBI. Numbers in the landline sample were drawn with equal probabilities from active blocks (area code + exchange + two-digit block number) that contained one or more residential directory listings. The cellular telephone number sample was drawn through a systematic sampling from 1,000-blocks dedicated to cellular service according to the Telcordia database.

A maximum of seven call attempts were made to sampled telephone numbers. Refusal conversion was attempted on soft refusal cases in the landline sample. Calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chance of making contact with potential respondents. Each sample was released for interviewing in replicates, which were each representative subsamples of the larger sample. For the landline sample, the respondent was randomly selected from all of the adults in the household. For the cell sample, interviews were conducted with the person who answered the phone. Interviewers verified that the person was an adult and in a safe place before administering the survey. Cell sample respondents were offered a post-paid reimbursement of $10 for their participation. The response rate (AAPOR Response Rate 3) was 17.3%.

The data were weighted to ensure that the sample composition reflects the U.S. population as documented by figures from the U.S. Census Bureau. Weights were constructed to adjust for differential probabilities of selection due to the number

of adults in the household, the number of voice-use landlines and cell phones, and the overlap of landline and cell phone RDD frames, as well as noncoverage and nonresponse through post-stratification. In post-stratification, an iterative raking procedure was performed to match the sample to the population benchmarks of age, sex, education, ethnicity, race, and region using targets from the 2010 Current Population Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Study 2

The data for Study 2 came from a nationally representative probability sample of 887 American adults via the Internet by RAND Corporation between November 2 and December 12, 2012. The questionnaire was administered in English only. Respondents were drawn from the members of the American Life Panel maintained (ALP, https://mmicdata.rand.org/alp) by the RAND Corporation. The American Life Panel consists of more than 5,000 American adults age 18 or older recruited through probability-based sampling via random digit dialing telephone calls and who have agreed to participate in occasional online surveys. If needed, respondents were given laptops and Web-TVs and access to the Internet at no cost to allow them to answer questionnaires via the Internet. When people joined the American Life Panel, RAND collected demographic information such as sex, age, race/ethnicity, education, and income. Then, members received e-mails regularly inviting them to complete surveys and offering a cash incentive.

The data were weighted to ensure that the sample reflected the U.S. adult population as documented by figures from the U.S. Census Bureau. Weights were constructed through post-stratification whereby an iterative raking procedure was performed to match the sample to the population benchmarks of gender x race, gender x education, gender x age, income x household size using targets from the Annual

Social and Economic Supplement administered in March 2012 by the U.S. Census Bureau.

ONLINE APPENDIX C

Question Wording and Coding for Dependent and Political Measures

Dependent variable measures

Global warming fundamental beliefs.

1. *Global warming has been happening* **2012:** What is your personal opinion? Do you think that the world's temperature probably has been going up slowly over the past 100 years, or do you think this probably has not been happening? **2012:** What is your personal opinion? Do you think that the world's temperature probably has been going up over the past 100 years, or do you think this probably has not been happening? **2010:** "You may have heard about the idea that the world's temperature may have been going up slowly over the past 100 years. What is your personal opinion on this – do you think this has probably been happening, or do you think it probably has not been happening?" (Coding: 1 = "has probably been happening," 0 = "has probably not been happening" or don't know.)

2. *Global warming has been caused by humans* **2012:** Do you think a rise in the world's temperature is being caused mostly by things people do, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people do and by natural causes? **2012:** Do you think that the increase in the world's temperature over the past 100 years was caused mostly by things people did, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people did and by natural causes? **2012:** Assuming it's happening, do you think a rise in the world's temperature would be caused mostly by things people do, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people do and by natural causes? **2012:** If the world's temperature did increase over the past 100 years, do you think this increase was caused mostly by things people did, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people did and by

natural causes? **2010:** Do you think a rise in the world's temperature is being caused mostly by things people do, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people do and by natural causes? **2010:** Assuming it's happening, do you think a rise in the world's temperature would be caused mostly by things people do, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people do and by natural causes? (Coding: 1 = "caused mostly by things people do" or "about equally by things people do and by natural causes," 0 = "caused mostly by natural causes" or don't know.)

3. Five degrees warmer in 75 years would be bad **2012:** If the world's average temperature is about five degrees Fahrenheit higher 75 years from now than it is now, overall, would you say that would be good, bad, or neither good nor bad? **2010:** Scientists use the term "global warming" to refer to the idea that the world's average temperature may be about five degrees Fahrenheit higher in 75 years than it is now. Overall, would you say that if the world's average temperature is five degrees Fahrenheit higher in 75 years than it is now, would that be good, bad, or neither good nor bad?

Respondents who answered with "Good" or "Bad" were also asked: "Would you say it would be very good or somewhat good?" and "Would you say it would be very bad or somewhat bad?" respectively. Respondents who answered with "Neither good nor bad" were asked: "Do you lean toward thinking it would be good, lean toward thinking it would be bad, or don't you lean either way?" (Coding: 1 = very bad, 0.83 = somewhat bad, 0.67 = lean toward bad, 0.5 = don't lean either way or don't know, 0.33 = lean toward good, 0.17 = somewhat good, 0 = very good or don't know.)

4. Global warming will be a nationally serious problem **2012:** If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE UNITED STATES – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2012**: Assuming it's happening, if nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it

would be for THE UNITED STATES – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2010**: If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE UNITED STATES – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2010**: Assuming it's happening, if nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it would be for THE UNITED STATES – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? (Coding: 1 = very serious, 0.67 = somewhat serious, 0.33 = not so serious, 0 = not serious at all or don't know.)

5. *Global warming will be a globally serious problem* **2012:** If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE WORLD – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2012:** Assuming it's happening, if nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it would be for THE WORLD – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2010:** If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE WORLD – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? **2010:** Assuming it's happening, if nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it would be for THE WORLD – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all? (Coding: 1 = very serious, 0.67 = somewhat serious, 0.33 = not so serious, 0 = not serious at all or don't know.)

<u>Attitude toward government action on global warming</u> This measure was an index of the following two measures, scaled to range from 0 to 1.

1. *How much the federal government should do* Respondents were asked: "How much do you think the federal government should do about global warming – a great deal, quite a bit, some, a little or nothing?"

(Coding: 1 = a great deal, 0.75 = quite a bit, 0.5 = some, 0.25 = a little, 0 = nothing or don't know.)

2. *The government should limit greenhouse gas emissions* **2012:** As you may have heard, greenhouse gases are thought to cause global warming. In your opinion do you think the government should or should not limit the amount of greenhouse gasses that U.S. businesses put out? **2010:** Some people believe that the United States government should limit the amount of air pollution that U.S. businesses can produce. Other people believe that the government should not limit air pollution from U.S. businesses. What about you? Do you think the government should or should not limit air pollution from U.S. businesses? (Coding: 1 = "should limit," 0 = "should not limit" or don't know.)

<u>Attitude toward specific policies on global warming</u> This measure was an index of the following 11 measures, scaled to range from 0 to 1.

1. *Government should reduce greenhouse gases by power plants* **2012:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Lowering the amount of greenhouse gases that power plants are allowed to release into the air? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Lowering the amount of greenhouse gases that power plants are allowed to release into the air? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require,", 0 = "should stay out entirely" or don't know.)

2. *Favor a national cap and trade program* Respondents were asked: "There's a proposed system called 'cap and trade.' The government would issue permits limiting the amount of greenhouse gases companies can put out. Companies that did not use all their permits could sell

them to other companies. Companies that need more permits can buy them, or these companies can pay money to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that other people or organizations put out. This will cause companies to figure out the cheapest way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This type of permit system has worked successfully in the past to reduce the air pollution that companies put out. For example, in 1990, the federal government passed a law like this, called the Clean Air Act, which caused companies to put out a lot less of the air pollution that causes acid rain. Would you favor or oppose a cap and trade system to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that companies put out? Would you strongly favor/oppose or somewhat favor/oppose?" (Coding: 1 = strongly favor, 0.75 = somewhat favor, 0.5 = don't know, 0.25 = somewhat oppose, 0 = strongly oppose or don't know.)

3. *Tax breaks to produce renewable energy* **2012:** For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to produce more electricity from water, wind, and solar power? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to produce more electricity from water, wind, and solar power? (Coding: 1 = "favor," 0 = "oppose" or don't know.)

4. *Tax breaks to reduce air pollution from coal* **2012:** For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving tax breaks to companies that burn coal to make electricity if they use new methods to reduce the air pollution being released

from their smokestacks? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving tax breaks to companies that burn coal to make electricity if they use new methods to put the air pollution they generate into underground storage areas instead of letting that air pollution go up the smokestacks at their factories? (Coding: 1 = "favor," 0 = "oppose" or don't know.)

5. *Increase fuel efficiency of cars* **2012:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Building cars that use less gasoline? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Building cars that use less gasoline? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require," 0 = "stay out of entirely" or don't know.)

6. *Build electric vehicles* **2012:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Building cars that run completely on electricity? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Building cars that run completely on electricity? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require," 0 = "stay out of entirely" or don't know.)

7. *Build appliances that use less electricity* **2012:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay

out of entirely. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Building air conditioners, refrigerators, and other appliances that use less electricity? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Building air conditioners, refrigerators, and other appliances that use less electricity? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require," 0 = "stay out of entirely" or don't know.)

8. *Build more energy-efficient buildings* **2012:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Building new homes and offices that use less energy for heating and cooling? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Building new homes and offices that use less energy for heating and cooling? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require," 0 = "stay out of entirely" or don't know.)

9. *Increase consumption taxes on electricity* **2012:** For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on electricity so people use less of it? **2010:** For the next items please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on electricity so people use less of it? (Coding: 1 = "favor," 0 = "oppose" or don't know.)

10. *Increase consumption taxes on gasoline* **2012:** For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on gasoline so people either drive less, or buy cars that use less gas? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely. Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on gasoline so people either drive less, or buy cars that use less gas? (Coding: 1 = "should require by law" or "encourage with tax breaks but not require," 0 = "stay out of entirely" or don't know.)

11. *Tax breaks to build nuclear power plants* **2012:** For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Each of these changes would increase the amount of money that you pay for things you buy. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to build nuclear power plants? **2010:** For the next items, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming. Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to build nuclear power plants? (Coding: 1 = "favor," 0 = "oppose" or don't know.)

Trust in Scientists. All respondents were asked: "How much do you trust the things that scientists say about the environment – completely, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?" (Coding: 1 = completely, 0.75 = a lot, 0.5 = a moderate amount, 0.25 = a little, 0 = not at all or don't know.)

Political party identification

Political Party Identification. Respondents were asked "Do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or none of these?" A Democrat dummy

variable was coded 1 for respondents who answered "Democrat" and 0 for all others. A Republican dummy variable was coded 1 for respondents who answered "Republican" and 0 for all others. Respondents who answered with "Independent" or "none of these" constituted the omitted, base category in the regressions. A Party Affiliation DK/RF dummy variable was coded 1 for respondents who did not answer the political party affiliation question and 0 for all others.

Demographics

Female. 2012: "Please enter whether you are male or female." 2010: Interviewers recorded whether the respondent was male or female. A Female dummy variable was coded 1 for females and 0 for males.

Age. 2012: "Please enter your age." 2010: "In what year were you born?" Age was measured in years and calculated as the difference between 2010 and the answer to the question in the 2010 data. Dummy variable Age 18–24 was set to 1 for respondents who were aged between 18 and 24 and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Age 25–34 was set to 1 for respondents who were aged between 25 and 34 and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Age 35–44 was set to 1 for respondents who were aged between 35 and 44 and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Age 45–54 was set to 1 for respondents who were aged between 45 and 54 and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Age 55–64 was set to 1 for respondents who were aged between 55 and 64 and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Age 65 or older was set to 1 for respondents who were aged 65 or older and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable Age missing was set to 1 for respondents who did not answer the age question and 0 otherwise.

Race and Ethnicity. Respondents were asked: "Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent?" A Hispanic dummy variable was coded 1 for those reporting Hispanic ethnicity and 0 for others. Respondents were asked to "check one or more

categories" from a list and were told to select what race(s) they considered themselves to be. A White dummy variable was coded for 1 if respondents who selected "White" and 0 otherwise. A Black dummy variable was coded for 1 for respondents who selected "Black or African-American" and 0 for others. Dummy variable Other race was coded for 1 for respondents who selected a category other than "White" and "Black or African-American" and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable Race and ethnicity missing was set to 1 for respondents who did not answer the ethnicity and/or the race question and 0 otherwise.

Education. Respondents were asked: "What is the highest grade of school that you completed?" and presented with the following response choices: Less than high school graduate, High school graduate, Technical/trade school, Some college, College graduate, Some graduate school, and Graduate degree. Dummy variable High school or less was set to 1 for respondents who selected "Less than high school," "High school graduate," or "Technical/trade school," and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable Some college was set to 1 for respondents who chose "Some college" and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable College graduate was set to 1 for respondents who chose "College graduate," "Some graduate school," or "Graduate degree," and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable education missing was set to 1 for respondents who refused to answer the education question and 0 otherwise.

Income. Respondents were asked "Was your total income of you and all members of your family who lived with you in 2012, before taxes, less than $50,000, or $50,000 or more?" Respondents who answered with "Less than $50,000" were asked to choose one of the following categories: Less than $10,000, $10,000 to $19,999, $20,000 to $29,999, $30,000 to $39,000, and $40,000 to $49,999. Respondents who answer with "$50,000 or more" were asked to choose one of the following categories:

$50,000 to $74,999, $75,000 to $99,999, $100,000 to $149,999, and $150,000 or more. A dummy variable was constructed for each of these income categories: less than $30,000, $30,000 to $49,000, $50,000 to $74,999, $75,000 to $100,000, and $100,000 or more. An indicator was constructed for respondents who refused to answer the income question.

Having Child(ren). Respondents were asked "Are you the parent or guardian of one or more children under the age of 18, or not?" and "Are you the parent or guardian of any children who are age 18 or older, or not?" Dummy variable Having child(ren) was set to 1 for respondents who answered yes to either or both of these two questions and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable Having child missing was set to 1 for respondents who did not answer either or both questions and 0 otherwise.

Marital Status. Respondents were asked "What is your marital status? Are you married/living as married/co-habitating, separated, divorced, widowed, or never married?" Dummy variable Married was set to 1 for respondents who chose "married/living as married/co-habitating" and 0 otherwise. Dummy variable Marital status missing was set to 1 for respondents who did not answer this question and 0 otherwise.

Region. Based on respondents' zip code of their homes (or based on phone numbers if respondents refused to answer the zip code question: "What is your five digit zip code?"), dummy variable Northeast was set to 1 for respondents living in the Northeast region and 0 otherwise; dummy variable Midwest was set to 1 for respondents living in the Midwest region and 0 otherwise; dummy variable South was set to 1 for respondents living in the South region and 0 otherwise; dummy variable West was set to 1 for respondents living in the West region and 0 otherwise.

ONLINE APPENDIX D: TABLES

Table 5.1 *Associations of media exposure with opinions (Study 1)*

	Dependent measure							
	Fundamental beliefs							
Predictor	Existence	Human cause	Bad	National seriousness	Global seriousness	Attitude toward government action	Attitudes toward specific policies	Trust in scientists
Panel A								
All TV news	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.01
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	995	995	995	995	995	995	995	995
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.32$ $p = 0.97$	$F = 1.23$ $p = 0.27$	0.11	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.08
Panel B								
Fox News alone	-0.05***	-0.06***	-0.02**	-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.05***	-0.03***	-0.05***

(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	964	964	964	964	964	964	964	964
Wald Statistic/R^2	F = 1.01 p = .43	F = 0.56 p = 0.83	0.11	0.21	0.18	0.21	0.18	0.09
Panel C								
Not-Fox alone	0.04**	0.08***	0.02**	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.03***	0.06***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962
Wald Statistic/R^2	F = 0.35 p = 0.96	F = 1.05 p = 0.40	0.11	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.18	0.09

Notes: Presented are the marginal probabilities of logistic regressions in the first two columns and the OLS coefficients in the rest of the columns (standard errors in parentheses) of 10 days of viewing TV news, 10 days of viewing Fox News alone and 10 days of not-Fox TV news in the past 30 days on global warming opinion measures in top, middle and bottom panel, respectively, adjusting for sampling weights. Each cell is a separate regression. All regressions controlled for Democrat, Republican, female, Hispanic, white, black, age 18–24, age 25–34, age 35–44, age 45–54, age 55–64, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, eight income category dummies, having child(ren), married, Northeast, Midwest, and South. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for other race, less than high school, West region, age 65 or older, income less than $10,000, Independent, and moderate ideology. Dummies for missing values of control variables were included. The goodness of fit statistics at the last row in each panel were the *F*-corrected

Wald statistic for the first two columns and R^2 for the rest of the columns. Data source is the 2010 national survey in Study 1. *** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5.2 *Cross tabulation of frequencies of Fox News viewing and not-Fox news viewing (Study 1)*

Fox News exposure	No exposure to not-Fox TV news while not viewing Fox News	Some exposure to not-Fox TV news while not viewing Fox News	Total
No exposure to Fox News	9.55%	29.55%	39.10%
Some exposure to Fox News	26.73%	34.17%	60.90%
Total	36.28%	63.72%	100.00% (N=962)

Notes: Presented are the cross tabulation of viewership to Fox News and viewership to not-Fox News while not viewing Fox News among all respondents who answered the days of viewing television news and days viewing Fox News questions, adjusting for sampling weights.

Table 5.3 *Predicting frequencies of Fox News viewing and not-Fox television news viewing (Study 1)*

	Days viewing Fox News	Days viewing Fox News	Days viewing not-Fox TV news only	Days viewing not-Fox TV news only
Predictor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Days viewing not-Fox only		-0.51***		

		(0.03)		
Days viewing Fox News				-0.48***
				(0.03)
Democrat	-0.20*	-0.02	0.34***	0.24***
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Republican	0.36***	0.24**	-0.24**	-0.07
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Female	0.01	-0.03	-0.09	-0.09
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)
Hispanic	0.31*	0.15	-0.33**	-0.17
	(0.18)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.13)
Black	0.35**	0.37***	0.03	0.20
	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.13)
Other race	-0.09	0.06	0.28	0.24
	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.15)

Age 18–24	-0.46***	-0.70***	-0.46***	-0.68***
	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.13)
Age 25–34	-0.63***	-0.80***	-0.34**	-0.64***
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Age 35–44	-0.51***	-0.62***	-0.20	-0.45***
	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.12)
Age 45–54	-0.39***	-0.36***	0.06	-0.13
	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.10)
Age 55–64	-0.33**	-0.36***	-0.06	-0.22*
	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.11)
High school graduate	-0.17	-0.05	0.25*	0.17
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Some college	-0.25	-0.07	0.35**	0.23
	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.15)
College graduate	-0.40**	-0.27	0.26*	0.07

	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Income $10,000 to $19,999	0.23	0.16	-0.12	-0.02
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Income $20,000 to $29,999	0.22	0.31*	0.18	0.29*
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.16)
Income $30,000 to $39,999	0.61**	0.58***	-0.06	0.24
	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.18)
Income $40,000 to $49,999	0.27	0.36*	0.18	0.31*
	(0.22)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.18)
Income $50,000 to $74,999	0.20	0.29*	0.19	0.28
	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Income $75,000 to $99,999	0.27	0.34*	0.14	0.27
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Income $100,000 to $149,999	0.67***	0.68***	0.03	0.35*
	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.18)

Income $150,000 or more	0.36	0.41**	0.11	0.28
	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.23)	(0.20)
Have child(ren)	0.07	0.13	0.13	0.16*
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Married	-0.05	-0.10	-0.09	-0.12
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Northeast	0.21	0.13	-0.16	-0.06
	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.11)
Midwest	0.24*	0.12	-0.23*	-0.12
	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.11)
South	0.17	0.04	-0.26**	-0.18*
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Constant	1.00***	1.49***	0.98***	1.46***
	(0.26)	(0.25)	(0.20)	(0.20)

N	964	962	962	962
R^2	0.119	0.333	0.119	0.333

Notes: Presented are the coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) of OLS regressions adjusting for sampling weights. Each column is a separate regression. Dependent variable measures are days of viewing Fox News in the past 30 days in the first two columns and days of viewing not-Fox television news only in the past 30 days in the last two columns. Measure "Days viewing not-Fox TV news" was the days viewing not-Fox TV news while not viewing Fox News in the past 30 days. Respondents who did not report TV viewing were excluded from the regressions. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for other race, less than high school, West region, age 65 or older, income less than $10,000, Independent. Dummies for missing values of predictors were included in the regressions.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5.4 *Tests of motivated reasoning (Study 1)*

	Dependent measure							
	Fundamental beliefs							
Predictor	Existence	Human cause	Bad	National seriousness	Global seriousness	Attitude toward government action	Attitude toward specific policies	Trust in scientists
Panel A								
Democrat	0.13***	0.13***	0.04*	0.09***	0.10***	0.05*	0.07***	0.07**

	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Republican	-0.16***	-0.09*	-0.09***	-0.18***	-0.14***	-0.18***	-0.06***	-0.10***
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)
N	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001	964	1,001
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.22$ $p = 0.99$	$F = 1.40$ $p = 0.19$	0.11	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.08
							1,001	
<u>Panel B</u>								
Fox News alone	-0.06***	-0.06***	-0.02*	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.04***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Republican	-0.25***	-0.11*	-0.10***	-0.19***	-0.17***	-0.15***	-0.07***	-0.04
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)
Republican x	0.04	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.02	-0.02	-0.00	-0.04*
Fox News viewing	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
N	964	964	964	964	964	964	964	964

Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.60$ $p = 0.80$	$F = 0.67$ $p = 0.78$	0.11	0.20	0.17	0.21	0.17	0.09
Panel C								
Not-Fox alone	0.04**	0.08***	0.03***	0.07***	0.06***	0.07***	0.04***	0.07***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
Democrat	0.13**	0.08*	0.08**	0.18***	0.16***	0.11***	0.09***	0.13***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.04)
Democrat x	0.02	0.04	-0.02	-0.04**	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04*
Not-Fox viewing	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
N	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.21$, $p = 0.99$	$F = 1.51$, $p = 0.14$	0.10	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.09

Notes: Presented are the marginal probabilities of logistic regressions in the first two columns and the OLS coefficients in the rest of the columns (standard errors in parentheses) of political party identification on global warming opinions in Panel A, and of 10 days of viewing Fox News alone and 10 days of not-Fox TV news in the past 30 days and interactions of viewing frequency and political party identification on global warming opinions in Panel B and C, respectively adjusting for sampling weights. Each cell is a separate regression. All regressions controlled for Democrat, Republican, female, Hispanic, white, black, age 18–24, age 25–34, age 35–44, age 45–54, age 55–64, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, eight income category

dummies, having child(ren), married, Northeast, Midwest, and South. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for other race, less than high school, West region, age 65 or older, income less than $10,000, Independent, and moderate ideology. Dummies for missing values of control variables were included. The goodness of fit statistics at the last row in each panel were the *F*-corrected Wald statistic for the first two columns and R^2 for the rest of the columns. Data source is the 2010 national survey in Study 1.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5.5 *Associations of media exposure with opinions (Study 2)*

	Dependent measure							
	Fundamental beliefs							
Predictor	Existence	Human cause	Bad	National seriousness	Global seriousness	Attitude toward government action	Attitude toward specific policies	Trust in scientists
Panel A								
All TV News	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.01
(10 days of viewing)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	857	857	857	857	854	857	854	857
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.79$	$F = 0.70$	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.10

	$p = 0.62$	$p = 0.71$						
Panel B								
Fox News	-0.03***	-0.06***	-0.04***	-0.03***	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.03***	-0.03***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	857	857	857	857	854	857	854	857
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.85$ $p = 0.57$	$F = 0.74$ $p = 0.67$	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.16	0.11
Panel C								
Not-Fox	0.02	0.03*	0.02*	0.03***	0.03***	0.02**	0.02***	0.02***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	857	857	857	857	857	857	857	857
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 1.63$ $p = 0.10$	$F = 0.75$ $p = 0.67$	0.12	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.11

Notes: Presented are the marginal probabilities of logistic regressions in the first two columns and the OLS coefficients in the rest of the columns (standard errors in parentheses) of 10 days of viewing TV news, 10 days of viewing Fox News and 10 days of not-Fox TV news in the past 30 days on global

warming opinion measures in top, middle and bottom panel, respectively, adjusting for sampling weights. Each cell is a separate regression. All regressions controlled for Democrat, Republican, female, Hispanic, black, other race, age 18–24, age 25–34, age 35–44, age 45–54, age 55–64, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, Northeast, Midwest, and South. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for white, less than high school, West region, age 65 or older, and Independent. Dummies for missing values of control variables were included in the regressions. The goodness of fit statistics at the last row in each panel were the *F*-corrected Wald statistic for the first two columns and R^2 for the rest of the columns. Data source is the 2012 national survey in Study 2.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5.6 *Cross tabulation of frequencies of Fox News viewing and not-Fox News viewing (Study 2)*

Fox News exposure	No exposure to not-Fox TV news	Some exposure to not-Fox TV news	Total
No exposure to Fox News	8.37%	27.75%	36.12%
Some exposure to Fox News	5.35%	58.53%	63.88%
Total	13.72%	86.28%	100.00% (N=857)

Notes: Presented are the cross tabulation of viewership to Fox News and viewership to not-Fox News among all respondents who answered the days of viewing Fox News and days viewing not-Fox TV news questions (N=857) adjusting for sampling weights.

Table 5.7 *Predicting frequencies of Fox News viewing and not-Fox television news viewing (Study 2)*

	Days viewing Fox News	Days viewing Fox News	Days viewing not-Fox news	Days viewing not-Fox news

Predictor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Days viewing not-Fox news		0.04		
		(0.04)		
Days viewing Fox News				0.05
				(0.04)
Democrat	0.16	0.09	1.57	1.56
	(0.85)	(0.86)	(1.00)	(1.00)
Republican	4.87***	4.86***	0.12	-0.10
	(1.13)	(1.14)	(1.16)	(1.17)
Female	0.71	0.67	0.79	0.76
	(0.77)	(0.77)	(0.84)	(0.84)
Hispanic	2.51**	2.50**	0.14	0.02
	(1.00)	(0.99)	(1.09)	(1.08)
Black	3.94***	3.84***	2.30*	2.12

	(1.34)	(1.35)	(1.38)	(1.38)
Other race	1.53	1.56	-0.66	-0.73
	(1.58)	(1.55)	(2.00)	(1.97)
Age 18 to 24	-7.91***	-7.55***	-8.49***	-8.13***
	(1.68)	(1.70)	(2.22)	(2.22)
Age 25 to 34	-4.67***	-4.24***	-10.12***	-9.91***
	(1.40)	(1.43)	(1.30)	(1.31)
Age 35 to 44	-4.94***	-4.78***	-3.64**	-3.41**
	(1.39)	(1.40)	(1.46)	(1.46)
Age 45 to 54	-2.17	-2.03	-3.43**	-3.33**
	(1.47)	(1.48)	(1.41)	(1.42)
Age 55 to 64	-2.08	-2.09	0.23	0.33
	(1.48)	(1.48)	(1.39)	(1.39)
Some college	-2.43**	-2.47**	0.73	0.84
	(1.01)	(1.01)	(1.08)	(1.07)

College graduate	-4.46***	-4.44***	-0.45	-0.25
	(0.90)	(0.90)	(0.94)	(0.95)
Northeast	0.99	0.86	3.12***	3.08***
	(1.18)	(1.19)	(1.18)	(1.18)
Midwest	-1.31	-1.35	1.04	1.10
	(1.21)	(1.21)	(1.34)	(1.34)
South	-0.53	-0.61	1.78*	1.81*
	(0.99)	(0.99)	(1.02)	(1.02)
Constant	11.78***	11.07***	16.59***	16.05***
	(1.48)	(1.59)	(1.43)	(1.49)
N	857	857	857	857
R^2	0.119	0.121	0.141	0.143

Notes: Presented are the coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) of OLS regressions adjusting for sampling weights. Each column is a separate regression. Dependent variable measures are days of viewing Fox News and days of viewing not-Fox TV news in the past 30 days in the first and last two columns,

respectively. Respondents who did not report TV viewing were excluded from the regressions. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for white, high school graduate or less than, West region, age 65 or older, and Independent. Dummies for missing values of predictors were included.
*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5.8 *Tests of motivated reasoning (Study 2)*

	Dependent measure							
	Fundamental beliefs							
Predictor	Existence	Cause	Bad	National seriousness	Global seriousness	Attitude toward government action	Attitude toward specific policies	Trust in scientists
Panel A								
Democrat	0.07**	0.13***	0.03	0.10***	0.09***	0.13***	0.11***	0.08***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Republican	-0.14***	-0.10**	-0.07**	-0.15***	-0.15***	-0.16***	-0.07**	-0.03
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.02)
N	887	881	878	875	872	872	858	883
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.61$	$F = 0.50$	0.12	0.16	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.10

	$p = 0.79$	$p = 0.87$						
Panel B								
Fox News	-0.02	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.01	-0.03***	-0.03***	-0.02**	-0.02***
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Republican	-0.12*	-0.09	-0.09**	-0.09**	-0.11***	-0.11**	-0.08**	-0.03
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Republican x	-0.03	-0.03	0.03	-0.08***	-0.06**	-0.09***	-0.03	-0.02
Fox News viewing	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
N	857	857	857	857	854	857	854	857
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 1.11$ $p = 0.35$	$F = 1.09$ $p = 0.36$	0.14	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.13	0.09
Panel C								
Not-Fox	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02*	0.03**	0.02	0.03**	0.02*
(10 days of viewing)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)

Democrat	0.13***	0.06	0.07**	0.14***	0.14***	0.17***	0.15***	0.07**
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Democrat x	-0.01	0.08**	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.02
Not-Fox viewing	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
N	857	857	857	857	854	857	854	857
Wald Statistic/R^2	$F = 0.54$ $p = 0.84$	$F = 0.50$ $p = 0.86$	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.11

Notes: Presented are the marginal probabilities of logistic regressions in the first two columns and the OLS coefficients in the rest of the columns (standard errors in parentheses) of 10 days of viewing Fox News alone and 10 days of not-Fox TV news in the past 30 days and interactions of viewing frequency and political party identification on global warming opinions in Panel A and B, respectively adjusting for sampling weights. Each cell is a separate regression. All regressions controlled for Democrat, Republican, female, Hispanic, black, other race, age 18–24, age 25–34, age 35–44, age 45–54, age 55–64, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, Northeast, Midwest, and South. Base categories omitted from the regressions are indicators for other race, less than high school, West region, age 65 or older, and Independent. Dummies for missing values of control variables were included. The goodness of fit statistics at the last row in each panel were the *F*-corrected Wald statistic for the first two columns and R^2 for the rest of the columns. Data source is the 2012 national survey in Study 2.

*** $p < 0.01$ ** $p < 0.05$ * $p < 0.10$.