



## zavala\_anthony\_critcher2013

2024-10-12

https://github.com/ucsd-psych201a/critcher2013 2 Anthony Zavala

Critcher2013

Introduction

I chose to replicate this project because of how it relates to my research interest in misinformation in how people develop their beliefs in ideas from social media such as the far right. This theory is based on the idea of how people make quick judgments based on others' quick decisions. The idea of people reacting to misinformation quickly based on assumptions is similar to this research done in this article. I am excited to hear more about how important reaction time is going to affect people's judgments on others. Getting to do htis type of research can improve my understanding of what rearch I wold like to continue on. Understanding the possibilities of how people reaction time is important of this.

I would like to conduct this by doing one question similar to the one about Pamela who gives her children a man for adoption. The differing of the internet is a part I'm excited for it because of how people might answer more honestly. The bias of being in person might give different answers to this experiment. They have this situation and have participants react to it and start to compare in which Pamela makes the decision quickly or longer and based on her response. This project is about people making quick judgments based on others' quick decisions such as in the action of selling one's child and many other examples. This could be in a matter of seconds in a certain group of experiments to test the reactant time and difference whether it be positive or negative based on an individual's action.

## Methods

Power Analysis Planned Sample (Don't need now) Materials "Immediately following the description of Justin and Nate's actions, we asked participants the following sets of items (all on 1–7 scales):

Quickness. As a manipulation check, participants indicated how quickly (vs. slowly) the decision was made.

Moral character evaluation. The three moral evaluation items had participants assess the agents' underlying moral principles and standards (Justin: a 1/4 .94; Nate: a 1/4 .78) by asking whether the agent: "has entirely good (vs. entirely bad) moral principles," "has good (vs. bad) moral standards," and "deep down has the moral principles and knowledge to do the right thing."

Certainty. We included 4 items to assess each actor's perceived decision certainty. Participants indicated "how conflicted [each] felt when making his decision" (reverse-scored), "how many reservations [each] had" (reverse-scored), whether the target "was quite certain in his decision" (vs. had considerable reservations), and "how far [each] was from choosing the alternate course of action." The items had high internal reliability



**Hide Toolbars**