

## **Fake News - Familiarity 2 (#2571)**

**Created:** 01/16/2017 06:46 AM (PT)

**Shared:** 02/06/2017 11:43 AM (PT)

---

This pre-registration is not yet public. This anonymized copy (without author names) was created by the author(s) to use during peer-review. A non-anonymized version (containing author names) will become publicly available either when an author makes it public, or three years from the "Shared" date at the top of this document (whichever comes first). Until that time the contents of this pre-registration are confidential.

---

### **1) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?**

Fake news that is familiar is seen as more accurate. This occurs even if fake news is tagged as "disputed by 3rd party fact checkers" earlier in the experiment.

### **2) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.**

Participants will be presented with fake and real news headlines. They will be asked to indicate 1) whether they've heard about the stories before (manipulation check) and 2) how accurate they think the headlines are (i.e., whether the headlines describe a real event).

### **3) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?**

Participants will be presented with 12 news stories (6 real, 6 fake) and asked to indicate whether they would be willing to share the stories online (via social media) or not. This is intended to make participants familiar with the news stories. After an intervening period (where participants complete demographic questions), participants will be presented with 24 news stories (the 12 that were previously presented, and 12 new news stories - 12 will be fake and 12 will be real, all counterbalanced). Participants should rate the "old" news stories as more accurate than the "real" news stories (regardless of whether they are fake or real).

Participants will be complete one of two conditions: 1) A control condition (as described above) and 2) An experimental condition where the 6 fake news stories in the initial phase have been tagged as "disputed by 3rd party fact checkers".

### **4) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.**

Fake news that was previously tagged as disputed by 3rd party fact checkers should be viewed as *\*more\** accurate than fake news that was not tagged as disputed (and is new). That is, the (potential) negative effect of tagging the fake news as disputed will not be sufficient to overcome the positive effect of familiarity.

It is unclear whether fake news tagged as disputed will be seen as more accurate than fake news that was not tagged as disputed but is also familiar (that is, comparing accuracy judgments for "old" fake news across the between subject conditions). This is predicted if tagging fake news as disputed makes it more familiar (which is an open question). This analysis is secondary.

### **5) Any secondary analyses?**

Manipulation check: "Old" news stories should be rated as more familiar than "new" news stories.

### **6) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.**

500 participants on Mechanical Turk.

### **7) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., data exclusions, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)**

It is possible that fake and real news interacts in the above analyses (e.g., the effect of familiarity may be larger for fake relative to real news).

Political ideology will be measured in the demographic questionnaire. Moreover, half of the news stories are pro-Democrat and half are pro-Republican. These will be analyzed separately and liberals and conservatives will be compared.

### **8) Have any data been collected for this study already?**

No, no data have been collected for this study yet