**ASC LAB**

**LAB EXPERIMENT ARCHIVE FORM UPDATED 08/07/19**

Use dark blue text to fill out this form and put responses below each header starting on a new line.

**SECTION 1: STUDY PLANNING**

**Completed by**

Kate

**Date completed**

8/01/16

**Researcher(s)**

Liz Redford, Morgan Conway, Rick Klein

**IRB protocol number and title**

2012-u-1337 Attitude Formation on the Internet

**Planned total N before any exclusions are applied (i.e., what you will enter into the PI study submission form)**

1600

**Specific, a priori inclusion/exclusion criteria to be considered a participant (i.e., what will be the starting number listed in your participants section)**

Will collect data with no restrictions, but will only use data from White, U.S. citizens who are 18+ and who complete the entire study (session\_status = C).

**Any exclusion criteria to be applied to study participants based on performance factors related to participation**

Will follow lab-standard cutoffs for IAT errors (i.e. exclude people with more than 40% errors on any given block or more than 30% errors overall).

**Rationale for initial sample size and final sample size after exclusion criteria applied**

In total I would like to have 700 usable data points; this number is arbitrary, but will definitely have 99% power. I will collect data from 1600 people to begin with. I expect that my completion rate will be around 65%, which will leave me with 1,040. Of those, I expect about 70% to be White and 18+, which will give me 728. I expect about 3% of people to have too-high error rates on the IAT, resulting in a total expected sample size of about 700 people.

**Project Implicit Study Name**

kratliff.attformation1

**Sona Name or MTurk Hit**

N/A

**Link to PI or Qualtrics Study** (test link)

<https://appprod-03.implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/Launch?study=/user/kratliff/genderpolitics2/genderpolitics2.expt.xml&refresh=true>

**Main research question or prediction**

Hypothesis: Hostile sexism scores, but not benevolent sexism scores, will be positively related implicit and explicit support for Bernie Sanders relative to Hillary Clinton.

**List any *a priori* analyses** (all others will be considered exploratory)

IV: Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism as measured by the shortened ASI.

DV1 (Explicit Preference): Self-reported rating of Bernie Sanders – rating of Hillary Clinton

DV2 (Implicit Preference): IAT score indictating preference for B.S. relative to H.C.

Two separate simultaneous regressions:

1. Implicit preference = HostileSexism + Benevolent Sexism + Hostile Sexism\*Benevolent Sexism
2. Explicit Preference = Hostile Sexism + Benevolent Sexism

Will also run these regressions controlling for political orientation; predict that they will hold up.

**\*IMPORTANT\* Before you launch your study you must share the study with Kate and give her data access privileges through the PI Dashboard.**

**SECTION 2: STUDY INFO (TO BE COMPLETED AT STUDY CONCLUSION)**

**Completed by**

Kate

**Date completed**

8/10/16

**Physical location of study** (e.g., online, Psych 231E and 231F)

N/A; Online

**Physical location where consents are stored**

N/A; Online

**Link to PI or Qualtrics Study** (production link)

<https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/Launch?study=/user/kratliff/genderpolitics2/genderpolitics2.expt.xml&refresh=true>

**Dates Conducted**

8/1/16 to 8/10/16

**RAs who ran the study**

N/A; Online

**Total N collected**

1600

**Total N of final sample**

1250

**Reason for any differences between planned N, Total N collected, and Total N of final sample**

Collected more data (N = 1600) than the planned sample (1200) to account for exclusion criteria. Target sample reached on 8/8; study came down on 8/12, so the total N is higher than needed.

**SECTION 3: FINDINGS (TO BE COMPLETED AFTER DATA ANALYSIS)**

**Completed by**

Kate

**Date completed**

8/12/16

**Analyses performed**

Exactly as described in the section on *a priori* analyses above. Also explored multiple demographic factors and tried the regression analyses both with and without the interaction term included. Looked at the relationship between candidate support and Gender Role beliefs.

**Gist of results** (distinguish between exploratory and confirmatory)

Original hypotheses were clearly confirmed (stronger support for B.S. relative to H.C. among those higher in hostile sexism, but not lower in hostile sexism. Relationship holds when controlling for political orientation. Gender role beliefs did not relate to candidate support. Some interesting demographic predictors worth exploring more fully.

**Other notes**

This study is a follow-up to a previous, similar study (kratliff.genderpolitics) and I plan to replicate it in a follow-up.