
Pre-election data EDA


Exploratory data analysis plotting


Expectations

Check that we got a rough balance in event probability responses for the two candidates (given the uncertainty in polling and prediction markets, we should expect respondents to reflect this).




Cloze






Maze


Look at average Maze RT by gender of pronoun, and for each condition of two sentences presented. Shows an effect of gender (male pronoun is read faster than female, neutral is perhaps even faster than male). These Maze RTs are not residualized. But could be for slightly smaller std error probably.



We can also look at the effect of event probability (who the participant thinks will be president) on pronoun RT bias



And participant age




And by participant gender



pronoun_gender


And broken down by participant reported political affiliation

SPR RT on pronouns by participant's reported political affil.



And broken down by participant reported preference


SPR RT on pronouns by participant's reported candidate preference overall




SPR


Likewise look at average SPR RT by gender of pronoun, and for each condition of two sentences presented. These RTs are residualized. Results look similar to Maze RTs, but are less pronounced/lower power.

Still, I think high enough power that we don't need to run further trials.






We could also try to look at the effect of event belief, but this is too low power with SPR:



Yet given that we can see it plausibly in the Maze data, we don't necessarily need this. SPR averages broken down by participant gender





SPR averages broken down by participant gender

SPR RT on pronouns by participant's reported political affil.

