ASPREDICTED

Wharton University of Pennsylvania CREDIBILITY LAB
(http://credlab.wharton.upenn.edu)

You are logged in as: **mpj32@cornell.edu**

HOME (index.php) See List (see_list.php)

Change my AsPredicted email (update_email1.php) Log out (logout.php)

As Predicted:"*Expressive Responding in Political News Evaluation*" (#21023)

Created: 03/18/2019 02:12 PM (PT)

Author(s)
Maurice Jakesch (Cornell University) - mpj32@cornell.edu

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
H1: The major factor determining people's evaluation of political news is whether the claim the news makes aligns with their own political views. ["Major" operationalized as the respective factor being a highly significant predictor of whether participants believe a claim is true, $p < 0.01$, and its coefficient is larger than the other factors considered in the model, most notably the source of the claim.]

H2a/b: Providing a bonus payment for correct answers will significantly reduce the importance of this factor. That is, when people are incentivized to give correct answers, whether a claim aligns with their own politics will be significantly less predictive of their news evaluations. We hypothesize this will be the case for left-leaning subjects (a) and right-leaning subjects (b).

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Participants will rate 16 news headlines with associated sources, indicating whether they believe the claim a headline makes is 'True' or 'False' (multiple choice, binary). The ratings they assign to different claims are the main dependent variable.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
After providing informed consent and before receiving instructions, participants will be assigned randomly to either a control or treatment group. Participants in the control group rate 16 headlines and receive a base pay for it. Participants in the treatment group additionally receive a bonus payment. In the instructions we tell them that "[their] answers will be evaluated by a politically balanced panel of experts consisting of three Republicans and three Democrats. If you rate 12 out of 16 articles correctly, you will receive a $1.5 bonus payment on top of the base compensation." Similarly, they are reminded on every rating page that "if [they] answer 12 or more questions correctly, [they] will receive a $1.5 bonus payment."

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
To estimate how the particular characteristics of an observation affect the answers of participants, we calculate a panel-probit regression with random effects per headline. We will group all left-leaning sources (CNN, NYT, Huffington Post) and all right-leaning sources (Fox, Breitbart, Drudge Report) into on category. We do not consider

the non-political headlines in the analysis, and group pro-Democrat and Pro-Republican headlines into one category each. Instead of considering absolute political characteristics of the claim and source (left vs. right), we consider relative politics compared the the participants own political views (as indicated in the demographic section). For example, for a participant who classified themselves as left- or left-center, a pro-Republica headline from the NYT would show up as an opposed headline from and aligned source in the model. The full model is in R will be:

glm(answer ~ publisher_alignment*subject_politics*group+headline_alignment*subject_politics*group, data = dfl, family = "binomial")

We will consider both the significance of the the different factors as well as the relative size of the coefficients to answer our questions.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will exclude participants who rate the 16 claims as either all true or all false. We furthermore exclude participants who fail one of the two attentiveness checks (rephrasing and checking whether the instructions were understood).

7) 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.
We will recruit 400 participants via Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT). To counterbalance the under-representation of conservatives on MTurk, we will post an otherwise identical conservative-only task (n=100) in addition to our main task (n=300).

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register?
(e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
Nothing else to pre-register.

If you click the red button you will make this pre-registration public, creating a permanent .pdf document that will be viewable by anyone who knows its URL. The .pdf is also copied to the web-archive (https://web.archive.org/), a permanent archive outside our control. Making a pre-registration public is a permanent non-reversible decision. We recommend you discuss with co-authors first, and that you make the pre-registration public after the paper containing the relevant study has been accepted for publication. Before publication you probably want to create an anonymous .pdf to share with reviewers.

Make Public (make_public.php?a_id=21023)