CREP Turri et al. Report Form

**Descriptive Statistics of the Sample**

Split the data by para\_condition and scale\_condition. Then calculate the percent of Female participants (gender), the race/ethnicity of participants (race\_ethnic), and the average age of participants with the standard deviation. Fill in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Gettier Case | Knowledge Case | Ignorance Case |
| Binary Original Scale | Sample Size | N value |  |  |
| Female | % |  |  |
| White/European | % |  |  |
| Latin/Hispanic | % |  |  |
| Black/African | % |  |  |
| Asian | % |  |  |
| Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | % |  |  |
| Other | % |  |  |
| Age | M (SD) |  |  |
| Visual Analog Scale | Sample Size | N value |  |  |
| Female | % |  |  |
| White/European | % |  |  |
| Latin/Hispanic | % |  |  |
| Black/African | % |  |  |
| Asian | % |  |  |
| Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | % |  |  |
| Other | % |  |  |
| Age | M (SD) |  |  |

**Percent Correct of Attention Question**

In the Gettier and Knowledge case, you should find that the answer to squirrel\_prairie is Ground Squirrel and the answer to the Ignorance case is Prairie Dog, regardless of which scale they are using.

Calculate the percent correct for each condition:

Gettier Case:

Knowledge Case:

Ignorance Case:

**Hypothesis Tests:**

**Direct replication:**

Here’s the table from the original study:



Recreate the table on our study by calculating the percent of each answer using para\_condition and knows\_believes:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No threat  Knowledge Case | Threat  Gettier Case | No Detection  Ignorance Case |
| Knows | % |  |  |
| Reasonable |  |  |  |

Is that difference statistically significant? Calculated a chi-square test on just knows\_believes:

If *p* < .05, then use a chi-square test on each pairwise combination:

* No threat versus threat
* No threat versus no detection
* Threat versus no detection

Here’s their results:

**Overall:** As predicted, assignments to conditions affected the rates of knowledge attribution, χ2(df = 2, N = 135) = 39.63, p <.001, Cramer’s V = .542 (all tests are two-tailed unless otherwise noted).

**Follow up:** Pairwise comparisons detected no difference in knowledge attributions between the No Threat and Threat conditions, Fisher’s p = .164, n.s., and a large difference between Threat and No Detection, Fisher’s p < .001, Cramer’s V = .509.

Are our results the same?

Is that difference statistically significant (part 2)? Calculated a chi-square test on just reason\_unreason:

If *p* < .05, then use a chi-square test on each pairwise combination:

* No threat versus threat
* No threat versus no detection
* Threat versus no detection

Here’s their results:

**Overall:** Condition did not affect whether people said that it was reasonable for the protagonist to think he was looking at an object of the relevant sort, χ2(df= 2, N = 135) = 4.49, p = .106, n.s., so the differences in knowledge attribution can not be due to perceived differences in what it was reasonable for the protagonist to believe.

Are our results the same?

**Extension:**

As an extension, we added the visual analog scale to see if the categorical results would extend to a continuous measure.

For knows\_believes, calculate a one-way ANOVA to determine if there are overall differences in ratings:

If *p* < .05, then use a t-test on each pairwise combination (you can use a Bonferroni correction option in your program if you want):

* No threat versus threat
* No threat versus no detection
* Threat versus no detection

Do these results match the results we found above?

For reason\_unreason, calculate a one-way ANOVA to determine if there are overall differences in ratings:

If *p* < .05, then use a t-test on each pairwise combination (you can use a Bonferroni correction option in your program if you want):

* No threat versus threat
* No threat versus no detection
* Threat versus no detection

Do these results match the results we found above?