Table S3. Linear regression estimates for respondent's judgment of program success.

Variable	Estimate	Inconsistent Scenarios			Consistent Scenarios	
		Difference decreases, ratio increases	Difference constant, ratio increases	Difference decreases, ratio constant	Difference decreases, ratio decreases	Difference increases, ratio increases
Post vs. Pre	β*	-0.125	-0.275	0.200	0.075	0.100
	95% CI	(-0.81,0.56)	(-0.63,0.08)	(-0.27,0.67)	(-0.30,0.45)	(-0.58,0.78)
Ratio vs. Difference	β	-0.650	-0.475	0.175	0.150	-0.225
	95% CI	(-1.07,-0.23)	(-1.13,0.18)	(-0.50,0.85)	(-0.36,0.66)	(-0.94,0.49)
Post X Ratio	β	-0.875	0.175	-1.525	0.275	-0.075
	95% CI	(-1.72,-0.03)	(-0.37,0.72)	(-2.39,-0.66)	(-0.27,0.82)	(-0.96,0.81)
Large vs. small change†	β	-1.512	0.087	0.763	1.512	-0.113
	95% CI	(-2.03,-1.00)	(-0.25,0.43)	(0.18,1.34)	(1.14,1.88)	(-0.56,0.34)
Constant	β	5.106	2.206	3.469	3.969	1.906
	95% CI	(4.35,5.86)	(1.66,2.75)	(2.93,4.01)	(3.47,4.47)	(1.41,2.40)
Observations		160	160	160	160	160

*Effect on subject's assessment of whether the hypothetical intervention was successful (1=not at all … 7=very successful). CI, confidence interval (clustered by subject). † p-values for treatment heterogeneity by Large vs. small change (i.e., Post X Ratio X Large) were 0.195, 0.768, 0.427, 0.373, and 0.379 across the 5 scenarios.