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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?
Are Republicans and Democrats motivated to take more or less advice from a co-partisan versus counter-partisan when judging the veracity of non-partisan news?

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Each subject first provides an initial rating of the veracity of one non-political news story on a 7-point scale. Then the rating of a Republican or a Democrat is provided (the “influence”). The dependent variable is the amount the subject updates from their initial answer toward the influence on the 7-point scale; in case of influence = initial answer, any update is in the opposite direction of the influence (i.e. a negative amount of update).

After the news veracity rating, subjects are asked to estimate which party was more accurate in the previous news task both before and after being provided with some noisy feedback. The key dependent variables are the prior and posterior probability that subjects assign to their own-party being more accurate, as well as the amount of belief update.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
For the news veracity rating task, each subject is randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. The between subject 2X2 design is [Same-party influence, Opposite-party influence] X [Low Incentive, High Incentive]. The influence’s identity is either a Republican participant who voted for Donald Trump in the 2020 election or a Democratic participant who voted for Joe Biden in the 2020 election. The incentive on the accuracy of the updated answer is either $0.01 or $10. The estimating party performance tasks also have four conditions: [low prior incentive, high prior incentive] X [pro-own party feedback, pro-opposite party feedback]. When stating their prior belief, each subject is assigned to either a low incentive or high incentive condition. After they stated their prior belief, they are randomly told either a subset of their co-partisans performed better or their out-partisans performed better. Subjects then provide their posterior belief given such pro-own-party feedback or pro-opposite-party feedback.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
For the news veracity task, we regress the amount of belief update on an influence party dummy, incentive level dummy, subject’s party (z-scored), and all 2- and 3-way interactions; as well as controls for age, gender, education (0=less than college, 1=college or more), z-scored initial rating, and news item fixed effects. We will examine net coefficients to decompose any significant interactions (e.g. separately examine the simple effects and 2-way interaction for Democrats versus Republicans.) For the prior belief of party performance task, we regress the prior probability of own party being more accurate on the interaction between the subject’s party dummy and the prior incentive level dummy, as well as controls for the condition a subject is assigned to in the previous news veracity task, z-scored initial rating, age, gender, and education. We examine net coefficients to decompose if the interaction is significant. For the belief update given party performance task, we regress the change in probability of own party being more accurate on the interaction between the prior incentive level dummy, the feedback condition, subject’s party dummy, and all 2-way and 3-way interactions. We control for the condition a subject is assigned to in the previous news veracity task, age, gender, and education. We examine net coefficients to decompose if the interaction is significant. In particular, we predict a positive interaction effect between prior incentive level and opposite-party-better feedback condition because we expect the relative difference of belief update given the opposite-party-better feedback across incentive level is more positive than the difference of belief update given the own-party-better feedback. We also expect subjects in the high prior incentive condition to update in the ‘wrong’ direction given opposite-party-better feedback and resulting in the same posterior belief across prior incentive conditions given opposite-party-better feedback. For the sub-sample of subjects who receive opposite-party-better feedback, we regress posterior probability on prior incentive level dummy, subject’s party dummy, and their interaction. We control for the condition in the news veracity task, as well as age, gender, education. We also re-run this regression on the sub-sample of subjects who receive own-party-better feedback. We expect the coefficient of prior incentive level to be insignificant. We also do a two-sample t-test as a robustness check for the regressions.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
Subjects self-report their political leaning on a 7-point scale (1 being extremely left, 4 being neutral, 7 being extremely right). We only recruit left-leaning (<4) Democrats and right-leaning Republicans (>4). We do not exclude outliers.

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 collect 1600 participants with right-leaning political views (Republicans) and 1600 participants with left-leaning political views (Democrats). That is...
roughly 40 Republicans and 40 Democrats per news per condition.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
All answers are incentivized using a quadratic scoring rule. The truth for the news stories is the average of fact-checker ratings from Allen et al. (2020). The truth of which party performed better is calculated from the two parties’ performance in a previous study. For the news veracity task, the rating given by the influence is the nearest integer of the average fact-checker rating (or the truth). None of the provided information is deception. For example, we indeed recruit subjects from pilot studies such that he or she is Republican who voted for Trump in 2020 and stated a rating of 3. For exploratory analysis, we will also examine the moderation effect of political extremeness.