

(/registries/osf/discover?

view_only=ccea2d32bed346ec8e8e63

35c97c3486)

OSF

REGISTRI

ES ▾

Add(/registries/osf/new?

Ne view_only=ccea2d32bed346ec8

w e8e6335c97c3486)



Projectivity, at-issueness and prior with factive and non-factive predicates

Public registration ▾



Metadata

Study Information



Hypotheses

[REDACTED] found that the more content is taken to be a priori true, the more likely it is to project. In that work, we collected prior probability ratings and projection ratings from different groups of participants. We found that the prior probability of content predicts projection of the content of the complement of 20 predicates, including both factive and non-factive ones. In this experiment, we collect prior probability ratings and projection ratings from the same participants (i.e., in a within-participant design).

Hypothesis

We hypothesize that a participant's rating of the prior probability of content predicts the participant's projection rating: the higher the prior probability, the more projective.

Design Plan

Study type

Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention experiment and includes randomized controlled trials.

Blinding

For studies that involve human subjects, they will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.

Is there any additional blinding in this study?

No response

Study design

Predicate and prior are within-participant factors. For each participant, a set of 20 content/fact combinations are created. In the prior block, the prior probability of the content given the fact is rated; in the projection block, the content/fact combinations are combined randomly for each participant with [REDACTED]

in the projection block, the content-fact combinations are combined randomly for each participant with the 20 predicates and the projectivity of the content is rated. It is a block design: projection and prior are

measured in separate blocks, with block order randomized by participant. Half of the stimuli are low-prior items, half are high-prior items (as established in a separate norming study), sampled randomly by participant.

No files selected

Randomization

Each participant rates the projectivity of the content of the complement of each of the 20 clause-embedding predicates given a fact about the content, as well as the prior probability of each content given the fact. The predicates are randomly combined with one of the 20 complement clauses for each participant, and each content is randomly combined with a high or low prior probability fact. The order of the projectivity and prior blocks is randomized by participant, as is the order of the 20 stimuli in each block.

Sampling Plan

Existing Data

Registration prior to creation of data

Explanation of existing data

No response

Data collection procedures

300 participants (US IP addresses, at least 99% of prior HITS approved) are recruited on Amazon's Mechanical Turk platform. Each participant is unique (as ensured by the use of UniqueTurker). They are paid \$1.80 and told the experiment takes about 9 minutes. They are told that they will assess the likelihood of events in one part and read questions that people ask to evaluate what these people meant in a second part. On a pre-screening page, Turkers are presented with a statement that one named person says to another. Turkers are excluded from participating if they fail to type the name of the second person into a box 3 times.

No files selected

Sample size

We will recruit 300 participants to provide judgments on projectivity and prior of the contents of the complements of the 20 clause-embedding predicates given a prior (high or low) fact about the content.

Sample size rationale

Based on sample size for the projection experiment of the XPRAG ██████████ talk (300 participants).

Stopping rule

No response


Variables

Manipulated variables

The clause-embedding predicates are manipulated (20 levels) as well as the prior probability of the content of the complement (2 levels: high, low). We also manipulate the complement clauses (but this manipulation is not of theoretical interest).

No files selected

Measured variables

Projectivity and prior of the contents are measured via the certainty and likelihood diagnostic used in the experiments reported on in the XPRAG  talk.

No files selected

Indices

Analyses are described here: [!\[\]\(5361750c22c4e047a52f4eac1ec2d4cc_img.jpg\)](https://github.com/)

No files selected

Analysis Plan

Statistical models

See analysis files in the GitHub repo: [!\[\]\(b792654f2cef9719eabeb6c5be00811e_img.jpg\)](https://github.com/)

No files selected

Transformations

See analysis files in the GitHub repo: [!\[\]\(b64b40baaee5acddc1eab8538ba84754_img.jpg\)](https://github.com/)

Inference criteria

See analysis files in the GitHub repo: [!\[\]\(28f72b996fc97883dfd9d4e8b1b16b4e_img.jpg\)](https://github.com/)

Data exclusion

See analysis files in the GitHub repo: [!\[\]\(aff7c69c44a5e015f18c35867ef3f5c3_img.jpg\)](https://github.com/)

Missing data

No response

Exploratory analysis

No response

Other

Other

No response