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?
Q1: Do respondents update their attitudes and certainty of attitudes less when presented arguments incongruent with their strongly held political beliefs than when they are presented arguments incongruent with political beliefs they feel mostly ambivalent about?
H0: Strength of prior attitude does not affect the magnitude of change in respondents’ attitude strength and certainty.
H1: On average, respondents will differ in how much they update post-treatment attitude strength and certainty between strong prior attitudes and weak prior attitudes.

Q2: Do respondents who have been primed for directional motives update their attitudes less than respondents who have been primed for accuracy motives when both groups are presented with arguments incongruent with their weakly held political beliefs?
H0: Priming for directional motives does not affect the magnitude of respondents’ belief strength and certainty.
H1: Respondents primed for directional motives will differ in average post-treatment belief strength and certainty from respondents primed for accuracy motives.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Post-treatment attitudes: 7-point Likert scale rating agreement to a one-sentence political belief
Post-treatment certainty: 0-100 sliding scale rating certainty about a one-sentence political belief
Post-treatment certainty (multi-item): index from seven 9-point Likert scales rating certainty about a one-sentence political belief
Post-treatment combined attitude measure: measure combined from (1) and (2) to produce a -100 to 100 201-point scale
Seconds spent on thought listing tasks: Qualtrics timer question measuring how long respondents spent on the thought listing page before moving onto the next page
Number of thoughts: code from respondents’ open-ended responses to the thought listing task
Share of denigrating arguments: (number of thoughts in thought listing responses that critique the statements presented) / (number of thoughts in total)
Argument strength rating: 7-point Likert scale rating strength of a set of 4 pro and 4 con arguments
Argument accuracy rating: 4-point Likert scale rating accuracy of a set of 4 pro and 4 con arguments
Difference-in-variances for attitudes and confidence: use Levene’s Test to compare variances between directional and accuracy conditions for the post-treatment attitude measure and post-treatment certainty measure

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
12 conditions total = 2 priming conditions (directional vs. accuracy motives) x
  3 levels of information (4 pro arguments vs. 2 pro and 2 con vs. 4 con) x
  2 levels of belief strength (strong belief and weak belief (within-subjects))

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
To assess the first hypothesis, we plan to estimate the following models for the single-item attitude strength (outcome 1) and multi-item certainty scale (outcome 3): we will regress both outcomes on pre-treatment measures of each outcome, an information condition indicator, an attitude strength condition indicator, and their interaction.

To assess the second hypothesis, we plan to estimate the following model for the attitude strength and multi-item certainty outcomes: we will regress both outcomes on pre-treatment measures of each outcome, a motivation condition indicator, an information condition indicator, an attitude strength condition indicator, and lower and higher-order interactions for all experimental factors.

To validate that the information and motivation conditions were effective, we will regress outcomes 5-7 on pre-treatment attitudes, pre-treatment certainty (single item), a motivation condition indicator, an information condition indicator, an attitude strength condition indicator, and lower and higher-order interactions for all experimental factors.

Outcomes 8-9 will be analyzed by examining the mean ratings for pro arguments, the mean ratings for con arguments, and the mean difference between pro and con ratings. We will regress this outcome on pre-treatment attitudes, pre-treatment certainty (single item), a motivation condition indicator, an information condition indicator, an attitude strength condition indicator, and lower and higher-order interactions for all experimental factors.
All models will be estimated using OLS with CR2 robust standard errors (clustered by respondent).

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We plan to analyze the subset of respondents who provided a valid prompt and obtained tailored responses. Qualtrics will flag if the respondent is shown generic responses (if GPT-3 could not produce output in response to their prompt), returning generic_flag = 1. We will analyze cases where generic_flag does not equal 1.

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.
Target enrollment sample: 1,200 respondents.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We plan to use structural topic models to assess how the use of topics varies as a function of the motivation and attitude strength conditions. We also plan to assess conditional effects using text analysis models that interact the information, motivation, and attitude strength conditions. We will perform an exploratory analysis on observations flagged with generic_flag = 1, looking for differences in post-treatment beliefs between respondents shown tailored and generic responses to their prompts. We may conduct an argument-level analysis that regresses each argument individually on the experimental conditions above. We may also use outcomes (2) and (4) to examine the robustness of our findings to alternative measures of certainty. We also plan to estimate difference-in-variances for attitudes and confidence (using Levene’s Test), comparing directional to accuracy conditions (i.e., two variance estimates) for weak and strong conditions separately. We also plan to assess subgroup differences based on prior attitudes, certainty, and political sophistication. We will discretize these variables into tertiles and compare the lower to upper tertile.