१ 🗆 ५

Wiki

**S** Links

**Analytics** 

Comments

Components

Describe the (numbered) hypotheses in terms of directional relationships between your (manipulated or measured) variables. 1. We expect a significant main effect of probe type with slower mean response latencies for correct rejections of implied probes (i.e., ideological probe words implied by but not included in the behavioral statement) than of control probes (i.e., that were not implied in the behavioral statement but rather in another behavioral statement of

SII Study 2 Probe Recognition 2F

the task). 2. We expect a significant interaction between probe type and reason type, indicating a reduction of inference effects when sufficient reasons for the behavior are provided as compared to control reasons that cannot explain the behavior. For interaction effects, describe the expected shape of the interactions.

For the correct rejections of implied probes, we expect faster mean response latencies when the behavioral description is accompanied by sufficient reasons for the behavior

compared to when it is accompanied by control reasons which do not sufficiently explain the behavior.

For the correct rejections of control probes, we expect no effect of the reason type on the mean response latencies. If you are manipulating a variable, make predictions for successful check variables or explain why no manipulation check is included.

We include a manipulation check for reason type. The sufficient reasons are supposed to sufficiently explain the behaviors, whereas the control reasons are supposed to insufficiently explain the behavior (or not explain the behavior at all). We thus ask participants at the end of the study to rate the sufficiency of each reason for the respective behavior and expect the sufficient reasons to score higher in their sufficiency

ratings than the control reasons. Recommended elements **Recommended elements** 

A figure or table may be helpful to describe complex interactions; this facilitates correct specification of the ordering of all group means.

No files selected For original research, add rationales or theoretical frameworks for why a certain

If multiple predictions can be made for the same IV-DV combination, describe what outcome would be predicted by which theory. No response B. Methods - Essential elements

**Description of essential elements** Design List, based on your hypotheses from section A:

Independent variables with all their levels a. whether they are within- or between-participant b. the relationship between them (e.g., orthogonal, nested).

Probe type: implied vs. implied-other (within-participant factor) Reason type: sufficient reason vs. control reason (within-participant factor) The two variables probe type and reason type are orthogonal.

hypothesis is tested.

No response

List dependent variables, or variables in a correlational design Mean response latency of correct rejections Error rates (exploratory)

Third variables acting as covariates or moderators. Order of presentation: behavior first vs. reason first (within-participant factor, exploratory)

**Planned Sample** If applicable, describe pre-selection rules. The sample will include respondents on Prolific, a. whose nationality is German,

b. whose first language is German, c. who currently reside in Germany, d. who are 18 years or older,

e. who have not participated in any of this study's pre-tests or studies from our group using the same experimental paradigm. Indicate where, from whom and how the data will be collected. Participants will be recruited via the online-platform Prolific.co according to the pre-

Justify planned sample size We target a small effect of f = .15 using a repeated-measures ANOVA. To attain a testpower of 1 –  $\beta$  = .80 at a significance level of  $\alpha$  = .05, we are prepared to collect valid

morepower-050.png

morepower-046.png morepower-050.png

obrien-fleming-type-3.html • obrien-fleming-type-3.html

d) data-based outlier criteria;

Procedure

or double blind), as in a published Methods section.

data of N = 352 participants. We will, however, employ a sequential testing procedure, which may result in a smaller sample, as explained below. If applicable, you can upload a file related to your power analysis here (e.g., a protocol of power analyses from G\*Power, a script, a screenshot, etc.). morepower-046.png

selection rules. Demographic data will be collected via Qualtrics whereas the Probe Recognition Paradigm is programmed in PsychoJS and will be hosted on Pavlovia.org.

Describe data collection termination rule. Due to the novelty of our research design and materials, our a-priori effect size estimate is subject to uncertainty. To avoid unnecessary spending in case of a larger than expected effect size, we employ a sequential testing procedure (Lakens, 2014). We will perform two interim analyses – one after collecting one third and one after collecting

the GroupSeq package for R (Pahl, 2018) using a O'Brien-Fleming type spending

**Exclusion Criteria** Describe anticipated specific data exclusion criteria. For example: a) missing, erroneous, or overly consistent responses; b) failing check-tests or suspicion probes; c) demographic exclusions;

We exclude data of participants, a. who do not complete the probe recognition task, b. who withdraw their consent for data analysis after full debriefing, c. whose recognition performance is < 60% in the probe recognition task, d. whose average response times are slower than two standard deviations of the sample mean, and/or e. who self-report not having followed the instructions conscientiously (5 or lower on a scale from 1 to 10) or rate their own data to be unfit for analyses. **Procedure** Describe all manipulations, measures, materials and procedures including the

e) method-based outlier criteria (e.g. too short or long response times).

only insufficiently) explain the behavior. For each participant, half of the target items are randomly selected to contain the sufficient reason. The remaining target items contain the control reason. The order of presentation of the behaviors and reasons is randomized for each participant, with half of the items beginning with the behavior and the other half beginning with the reason. The items are presented in the center of the computer screen. The behavior and reason statements are separated by an empty line. The duration of presentation is based on

presented until a response is recorded (with a post-response pause of 100ms).

interval of 500ms, the next item is presented.

make less mistakes even if they take more time to respond. If their error rate is at 5% or lower, they are told to carry on as before. The following test block is split into two parts of equal length, giving the participants the opportunity to pause. After completion of the test block, participants again receive feedback on their error rate. After completion of the probe recognition task, participants first rate each label with regard to (a) how much they identify with it (5-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "very strongly"), (b) whether it is necessary to explain the behavior it was implied by (5point scale ranging from "no" to "yes"), and (c) with regards to the baserate of the label on a five-point scale ranging from "very low" to "very high". The order of these three ratings is counterbalanced across participants. Ultimately, participants rate whether the presented reason information can sufficiently explain the respective behavior on a fivepoint scale ranging from "no" to "yes" (see ratings.xlsx).

Gabriel, 2020), and their gender and age. Finally, they are asked to rate on a 10-point scale how diligently they followed the instructions, whether they think their data is fit for analyses (yes or no), and whether they had any assumptions about the exact purpose of the experiment. Ultimately, they are debriefed about the purpose of the study and asked for their informed consent for data storage and analysis. Study participation is planned to take approximately 30-35 minutes. Materials Target items. Each target item consists of two statements, describing a behavior and a reason. Each

explain the behaviors. We further ensured that the semantic overlap between the ideological labels associated with the target items is minimal. To pretest the behaviors, we asked participants to read them and write down labels that come to their minds. For each behavior, we chose the most frequently mentioned label. On average 54% of the participants mentioned the chosen or a synonymous label. The consensus ranged from 30% to 89%. In a further pretest, participants rated how well the chosen labels explained the behaviors. The average score was 1.30 (ranging from 0.53) to 1.94; on a rating scale from -2 (very badly) to 2 (very well)) To pretest the reasons, we showed participants the behaviors together with the respective sufficient or control reasons. We asked them to indicate whether the reasons sufficiently explained the behaviors. On a rating scale from -2 (no) to 2 (yes), the sufficient reasons had an average score of 0.84 (ranging from 0.00 to 2.00); the control

reasons had an average score of -0.97 (ranging from -1.80 to 0.13). The average

For each target item we selected four probe words: (1) the implied label (implied

length was similar to their respective implied probe.

ideological label can be used to infer the correct response.

0.80 to 2.93).

Filler items.

probes.

etc.)

instructions.xlsx

supplement of any publication.

the statistical technique;

No covariates will be used.

**Second Prediction** 

See above.

hypotheses section. Include:

the statistical technique;

No covariates will be used.

No response

**Further Predictions** 

hypotheses section. Include:

rationale for each covariate used, if any;

We don't plan to use other techniques.

conclusion, including prior values or distributions.

ratings.xlsx stimuli.xlsx ratings.xlsx

negative responses to label probes. To prevent strategic responding, we include 24 additional filler items. Each filler item also consists of a behavior and a reason. They differ from the target items in that they contain ideological labels (the same labels implied in the target items). By using these contained labels as probe words, we assure that the number of affirmative and negative responses to label probes is balanced across all trials. The remaining probes for the filler items were again picked from either the filler item itself or from another filler item. Moreover, the number of affirmative and negative responses is balanced across different word types (48 nouns, 30 adjectives, 15

verbs, three names). Therefore, neither word type nor the property of being an

We wanted the probability of each probe word being part of the item to appear

12 items contain one of the probes, 18 items contain two of the probes, 12 items

test items can at the most contain the two control probes, these distributions are

In the filler trials three items contain one of the probes, six items contain two of the

probes, 12 items contain three of the probes and three items contain four of the

contain three of the probes and three items contain all four of the probes. Because the

unequally allocated across test and filler trials. In the test trials three items contain zero of the probes, nine items contain one of the probes, 12 items contain two of the probes.

Recommended elements **Recommended elements Procedure** Set fail-safe levels of exclusion at which the whole study needs to be stopped, altered, and restarted. You may pre-determine what proportion of excluded participants will cause the study to be stopped and restarted. No response If applicable, you can upload any files related to your methods and procedure

here (e.g., a paper describing a scale you are using, experimenter instructions,

instructions.xlsx C. Analysis plan - Essential elements **Confirmatory Analyses** Describe the analyses that will test the first main prediction from the hypotheses section. Include:

The mean response latency of correct rejections serves as the dependent variable.

For each combination of experimental conditions (implied vs. implied-other; sufficient reason vs. control reason) and participant, we will compute mean response latencies of the correct rejections. We will use an individual cut-off of M+2\*SD for slow responses and the log-transformation in our main analyses. Because there are no conventions

regarding outlier correction and transformations in the probe recognition paradigm, we

analysis using different cut-off criteria for slow responses (no cut-off, 2500 ms, 2000 ms,

follow a recommendation by Krieglmeyer & Deutsch (2010) and employ a multiverse

and 1500 ms) and transformations (no transformation, a log-transformation, and an

inverse transformation) and report each combination's effect on the results in the

the relevant variables and how they are calculated;

We will conduct a two-way ANOVA with Probe type (implied vs. implied-other) and reason type (sufficient vs. control) as within-participants factors. Hypothesis 1 refers to the main effect of probe type. each variable's role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate); Probe type: IV Reason type: IV Mean response latency: DV rationale for each covariate used, if any;

if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian

statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential

conclusion, including prior values or distributions.

the relevant variables and how they are calculated;

reason type (sufficient vs. control) as within-participants factors.

We don't plan to use other techniques.

each variable's role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate); Probe type: IV Reason type: IV Mean response latency: DV

Hypothesis 2 refers to the interaction effect for probe type and reason type

**Third Prediction** Describe the analyses that will test the third main prediction from the hypotheses section. Include: the relevant variables and how they are calculated;

statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential conclusion, including prior values or distributions. No response **Fourth Prediction** 

the relevant variables and how they are calculated;

conclusion, including prior values or distributions.

rationale for each covariate used, if any;

hypotheses section. Include:

the statistical technique;

each variable's role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate); No response rationale for each covariate used, if any;

the relevant variables and how they are calculated; No response the statistical technique;

if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential conclusion, including prior values or distributions. No response

rationale for each covariate used, if any;

Recommended elements

**Recommended Elements** 

imputation, interpolation).

are met.

scripts, etc.).

No, data collection has not begun

**Specify contingencies and assumptions, such as:** Method of correction for multiple tests. No response

No response Reliability criteria for item inclusion in scale. No response Anticipated data transformations.

The method of missing data handling (e.g., pairwise or listwise deletion,

Assumptions of analyses, and plans for alternative/corrected analyses if each assumption is violated. If upon visual inspection the mean correct response latencies are severely non-normal in any cell of the design, we will apply transformations to try and achieve a normal distribution. If Mauchly's test of sphericity indicates that the assumption of sphericity is not met, we will apply a correction to the degrees of freedom.

We will apply cutoffs and transformations to the raw reaction times (see above).

However, no further transformations will be applied directly to the dependent variable (mean response latency of correct rejections), provided that the assumptions of analysis

No files selected Final questions Has data collection begun for this project?

Optionally, upload any files here that are related to your analyses (e.g., syntaxes,

No The (estimated) start and end dates for this project are 10. June 2022

If data collection has begun, have you looked at the data?

Description Research on person perception has revealed that people tend to attribute others' behavior to stable person

Carsten Sander and Juliane Degner

**Contributors** 

characteristics, even if it can just as well be explained by reasons such as situational factors or mental states. This tendency is known as the correspondence bias (Gilbert & Malone, 1995) and may play an important role in the domain of political polarization. Specifically, people may attribute each other's politically relevant behaviors to stable ideological dispositions (such as leftist, conservative, racist, or feminist), while neglecting potential other causes and thereby impeding mutual understanding. To investigate the role of the correspondence bias in political polarization, we examine whether spontaneous ideological inferences are reduced when behaviors are accompanied by information on relatively sufficient reasons for the behavior. We thus extend previous research on spontaneous trait inferences (STI, Winter & Uleman, 1984) and the correspondence bias to spontaneous inferences of ideological dispositions. Show less • **Registration type** Pre-Registration in Social Psychology

**Date registered** June 9, 2022

(van 't Veer & Giner-Sorolla, 2016): Pre-

Registration

Psychology Social and Behavioral Sciences Social Psychology Life Sciences

political polarization social perceptions spontaneous inferences

Date created June 9, 2022 **Associated project** osf.io/u5m9w Category Project **Publication DOI** No publication DOI Subjects **Affiliated institutions** This registration has no affiliated institutions License CC-By Attribution 4.0 International **Tags** Citation osf.io/zrshv ▼

two thirds of the total sample. To avoid increasing the type 1 error probability, we lower the alpha boundaries for each analysis. We calculated the new alpha boundaries with function. We will stop data collection if the observed effects are significant at  $\alpha$  = .0002 at the first or at  $\alpha$  = .012 at the second interim analysis. If they are not, we collect the full sample and perform the final analysis with  $\alpha$  = .046. To detect an effect of f = .15 given this alpha boundary, a sample size of N = 360 is needed. Based on the last study of this project we expect an exclusion rate of 4%. We thus aim at collecting data of N = 375participants. Accordingly, interim analyses will be performed at n = 125 and n = 250. order of presentation and the method of randomization and blinding (e.g., single We employ a Probe Recognition Paradigm (e.g., Todd et al., 2011). Participants are told that they are participating in a study on text comprehension and instructed to read and memorize a series of short texts (see instructions.xlsx). They are presented 24 target items and 24 filler items (see stimuli.xlsx) in a randomized order. Each target item consists of two statements, describing a behavior and a reason. Each reason comes in two different versions: A sufficient reason that can sufficiently explain the respective behavior and a control reason that consists of almost the same words yet does not (or item length, with an assumed reading rate of 200 words per minute, resulting in a range from 6.6 to 18.6 seconds. Each item is followed by a blank screen for 250 ms, a fixation cross for 500 ms, and a randomized sequence of four probe words, each of which is Participants are instructed to indicate whether the probe word appeared in the text or not by pressing [J] or [F], respectively (see instructions.xlsx). They are told that they should respond as quickly as possible and that it is very important that they make few mistakes. When participants make a mistake, an error message appears (red letter "X" presented for 1000 ms). After presentation of all four probe words and an inter-trial Participants first perform a practice block containing five items with individualized feedback on their error rate: If their error rate is higher than 5%, they are told to try and Next, participants are asked to state their political orientation using the one-item Left-Right Self-Placement scale (Breyer, 2015), their interest in politics using a one-item scale (Zentralarchiv für empirische Sozialforschung (ZA) & Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA) e.V., 2014), their satisfaction with Germany's political system using the German Satisfaction with the Political System Short Scale (SPS; Dentler, Bluemke, & reason comes in two different versions: A sufficient reason that can sufficiently explain the respective behavior and a control reason that consists of almost the same words yet does not (or only insufficiently) explain the behavior. We pretested the target items to make sure that a) the behaviors are associated with ideological labels, b) the sufficient reasons sufficiently explain the behaviors, and c) the control reasons do not sufficiently difference between sufficient reason and control reason scores was 1.82 (ranging from condition), (2) a non-synonymous control label implied by another target item (impliedother condition), (3 and 4) two filler words that either occur in the target item or in another target item. Thus, across the entire experiment, each label appears twice as a probe in the target trials. We chose the implied-other probes such that their word The target items do not contain ideological labels. They do therefore exclusively warrant completely random (independent of whether the prior probe word had been part of the item). Therefore we chose the probes such that three items contain zero of the probes,

Describe the analyses that will test the second main prediction from the We will conduct a two-way ANOVA with Probe type (implied vs. implied-other) and if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential each variable's role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate); if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian Describe the analyses that will test the fourth main prediction from the if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential Describe the analyses that will test any further (main) predictions from the each variable's role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate);

AU::U

Any additional comments before I pre-register this project No response Copyright © 2011-2022 Center for Open Science | Terms of Use | Privacy Policy | Status | API TOP Guidelines | Reproducibility Project: Psychology | Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology