Analysis plan

Goals of this study:

1. Determine whether the ten acts we have found to be important to abstract notions of redemption are important under contexts in which participants are presented specific acts.
   1. Explore whether act severity influences the importance of each of the themes.
2. Explore whether importance ratings differ when participants believe it is possible for someone to be redeemed after committing different types of acts versus when they believe it is not possible.

In this study, participants will read and respond to nine different hypothetical scenarios in which someone acts unethically, with the acts varying in severity (low, medium, high). Missing data should not be an issue as participants are paid to complete the entire survey. I will not be removing outliers, however, I will be removing participants who failed the attention check in my survey. Participants will be first asked whether they believe it is possible for the transgressor to be redeemed after behaving according to the scenario. I will obtain frequencies of this variable for each story for exploratory purposes. Although I am interested in both groups (whether redemption is possible or not), I will first look at those participants who believe redemption is possible for each of the acts. Participants will then respond to a question asking how important are ten themes for the transgressor to be redeemed. The IV will be the act severity and the DV will be the importance of each of the themes. First, I will need to calculate reliability scores (cronbach’s alpha) for each of the themes across the stories of low, medium, and high severity to make sure we can collapse the three stories from each severity level into one score. If reliable, I will calculate the means for each theme across the three stories within each severity level. First I will determine whether the themes are actually viewed as significantly important to redemption by running a one-sample t-test from the ‘important’ anchor on the scale (4). Then, for themes that are viewed as significantly important, I will compare these means across severity levels to determine whether certain themes are deemed more important than others depending on the severity of the acts (ANOVA). I will do this same process for participants who believed the acts were not redeemable, to explore how this belief influences our results.

Pseudocode:

# Remove participants who failed attention check

* Obtain a subset of my data for those who passed the attention check

# Exploring frequencies of whether redemption is possible for each story

* Frequency of yes/no responses for each of the nine stories

# Calculate reliabilities across stories within each level of severity

* Three groups: low, medium, high
* If reliability of each group is α > 0.70, then I will consider the stories to be reliable

# If reliable, create composite scores across each theme

* For each level of severity, I will create averages of the themes across the three stories

# Analysis

* One-sample t-test for each theme to determine whether it is viewed as significantly important to redemption (if the mean is significantly less than 4: *important*, then it will be viewed as not important to redemption)
* For the themes that are important, I will run a one-way ANOVA using severity as the IV and importance as the DV to see whether severity significantly influences which themes are important.