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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?
   a. The study aims to develop a new rape myth acceptance scale. Rape myth acceptance is defined as the endorsement of “false beliefs, statements, or stereotypes about rape, rape victims, and rape perpetrators” (Burt, 1980). The most popular rape myth acceptance scales are the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale revised (MacMahon & Farmer, 2011), Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999), and the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980). However, these scales all contain arguably factual statements about rape and seem to measure knowledge of rape rather than rape myth acceptance. Our goal is the create a new scale that is devoid of statements which may hold true under empirical examination and validate this scale—named the Rape Excusatory Attitudes and Language scale (REAL scale.)
   b. It’s hypothesized that acceptance of rape myths will be negatively correlated with empathy toward rape victims and positively correlated with empathy toward rape perpetrators. In other words, individuals are expected to accept fewer rape myths if they are more empathetic to victims of rape, and others are expected to accept more rape myths if they are more empathetic to perpetrators of rape.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
   a. Rape myths will be measured through an existing rape myth acceptance scale (IRMA) and our REAL scale.
   b. Empathy toward rape victims and rape perpetrators will be measured through the Rape-Victim Empathy Scale (Smith & Frieze, 2003).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
   a. Correlational study without conditions. All participants will be exposed to the same scales: the IRMA, REAL scale, Rape-Victim Empathy Scale (Smith & Frieze, 2003), and social desirability short form-C scale (Reynolds, 1982).

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
   a. With sample 1: factor analysis with principle component factoring and varimax rotation to extract latent factors.
   b. Sample 2: confirmatory factor analysis
   c. Convergent validity of the REAL scale with the IRMA (positive correlation expected).
   d. Discriminant validity of the REAL scale with the empathy toward rape victims scale (negative correlation expected).
   e. Reduction of items via examination of the inter-item correlation matrix.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
   a. Individuals whose scores are above two standard deviations of the mean on the social desirability scale will be removed from analysis.
   b. Individuals who score higher than three standard deviations above the mean on any of the scales will be “brought back to the fence” (i.e., their extreme value will be replaced with value of the third standard deviation above the mean).

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.
   a. Sample 1: 300 participants will be collected in the first round of analyses to create a factor structure.
   b. Sample 2: An additional 300 participants will be collected for the second round of analyses to run a confirmatory factor analysis.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
   n/a