**EGAP Registry Form Schema**

**Note from EGAP: while the standard workflow is down, this form replaces the registration form on egap.org. For this alternate workflow, the time/date that your email is *sent* will become the timestamp for your registration. It may still take up to three business days to review, upload, and post your submission, but the timestamp will be locked in as described.**

B1 Title of Study – *short text*

Sources of Misperception: Media Choice and the Economic Impact of Legal Immigration

B2 Authors – *if you haven’t registered a study with EGAP before, please provide name, title, institution, and email address for each author*

Patrick W. Kraft, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, kraftp@uwm.edu

Nicholas R. Davis, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, nrdavis@uwm.edu

Taraleigh Davis, Graduate Student, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, taraleig@uwm.edu

Amanda J. Heideman, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, heidem24@uwm.edu

Jason T. Neumeyer, Graduate Student, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, neumeye6@uwm.edu

Shin Young Park, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, parksy@uwm.edu

B3 Acknowledgements – *short text*

B4 Is one of the study authors a university faculty member? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Yes

B5 Is this Registration Prospective or Retrospective? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Registration prior to assignment of treatment

B6 Is this an experimental study? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Yes

B7 Date of start of study – *date (MM/DD/YYYY format; please only list* ***ONE DATE****)*

11/25/2019

B8 Gate date – *date (MM/DD/YYYY format); gating is discouraged, but if necessary, EGAP policy limits the gate range to 18 months maximum (****18 months from the DATE OF SUBMISSION, not from the study start date)****. If you foresee any issues with this, please contact* [*paps@egap.org*](mailto:paps@egap.org)*. If you do not want to gate your study, please leave this field blank.*

B9 Was this design presented at an EGAP meeting? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

No

B10 Is there a pre-analysis plan associated with this registration? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Yes

*For the next three fields (C1-C3), the response box is a long answer plain text box. Please try to limit your response to ~300 words at most, and use your pre-analysis plan to elaborate further if necessary.* ***Also, the plain text field limits formatting, so please do not include bullet point lists with multiple indentations, footnotes, tables, images, or other complicated formatting.***

C1 Background and explanation of rationale – *long answer*

Various important issues at the center of today's politics---such as immigration or climate change---are imbued with citizens' misperceptions. A growing body of research therefore explores whether such misperceptions can be mitigated by providing corrective information. While such corrections have been shown to reduce factual misperceptions, they appear to have little to no effect on underlying attitudes. Our study contributes to this active research area by examining how variations in the source and delivery mode of corrective information moderate their effectiveness. In our experimental design, respondents are exposed to a news article about immigration reported by either Fox News or MSNBC. The main treatment consists of either allowing free choice of the respective media source or assigning it randomly. Our outcomes of interest focus on the perceived economic impact of legal immigration, attitudes towards immigrants, and engagement with the news article. In order to isolate the effect of delivery mode and messenger, the news content is held constant across news sources.

C2 What are the hypotheses to be tested/quantities of interest to be estimated? – *long answer*

Our study explores how the way people access corrective information influences the likelihood of its success in reducing misperceptions. In general, we expect that those who were able to choose a news agency are more likely to pick a source similar to their usual media diet. Additionally, we expect those who read a news story from a trusted news source (and who are able to pick the news agency) are more inclined to evaluate the article positively and change their attitudes in the direction of the news article.

See pre-analysis plan for more detailed information.

C3 How will these hypotheses be tested? – *long answer*

To test our hypotheses, we will rely on simple differences-in-means and OLS estimators.

See pre-analysis plan for more detailed information.

C4 Country – *short answer*

USA

C5 Sample Size (# of Units) – *short answer*

600

C6 Was a power analysis conducted prior to data collection? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Yes

C7 Has this research received Institutional Review Board (IRB) or ethics committee approval? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

Yes

C8 IRB Number – *short answer*

UWM IRB #20.044

C9 Date of IRB Approval – *short answer*

09/03/2019

C10 Will the intervention be implemented by the researcher or a third party? If a third party, please provide the name. – *multiple choice (SELECT AS MANY AS APPLICABLE)*

Researchers

C11 Did any of the research team receive remuneration from the implementing agency for taking part in this research? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

No

C12 If relevant, is there an advance agreement with the implementation group that all results can be published? – *multiple choice (SELECT ONE)*

N/A

C13 JEL classification(s) – *short answer; please provide alphanumeric code(s)*

Methodology – *select all that apply*

Experimental Design

Statistics

Survey Methodology

Policy – *select all that apply*

Elections

Governance

Certification – *indicate agreement*

By submitting this form and accompanying documents with EGAP, I confirm that I have rights to put this information in the public domain and I understand that this information will remain on the EGAP registry in perpetuity, regardless of whether the research is subsequently implemented or not.

Confirmation – *indicate agreement*

You should receive a confirmation of your registration within three business days. Your registration is considered complete only when confirmation is received. If you do not receive confirmation within three business days please contact [paps@egap.org](mailto:paps@egap.org). Hitting SAVE at the bottom of this page will submit the registration. Please only do so when you are ready to submit. ONCE YOU HAVE HIT SAVE AT THE BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE PLEASE DO NOT HIT THE BACK BUTTON. Doing so creates multiple registrations, and we will delete all but the most recent. If you accidentally created multiple registrations, please contact [paps@egap.org](mailto:paps@egap.org)

**Note from EGAP: while the standard workflow is down, this form replaces the registration form on egap.org. For this alternate workflow, the time/date that your email is *sent* will become the timestamp for your registration. It may still take up to three business days to review, upload, and post your submission, but the timestamp will be locked in as described.**

Additional Documentation – *please attach your pre-analysis plan, survey instrument, or any other files associated with the registration (files must be under 5MB)*