

Covert Attention Check Questions Employed in February 2019

Kateryna Sylaska & John D. Mayer

2 attention check questions embedded within the Test of Personal Intelligence-MINI-12

[TOPI-MINI-12 Manual Available at: <https://mypages.unh.edu/jdmayer/test-personal-intelligence-topi>]

1. *[to appear after item 3 of the TOPI-MINI 12]* A person was closely reading and understanding the items on a survey. If you also are reading them, please choose the alternative starting with the word prepare.
 - a. get mad and motivated.
 - b. as a child, suffering some teasing but getting over it.
 - c. an on-the-job project the person had done well on.
 - d. prepare to go to an athletic event.

2. *[to appear after item 8 of the TOPI-MINI 12]* Given that:
 - A researcher wants to better understand people's psychology.
 - It is important that people who complete surveys are understanding the questions.
 - The researcher would like to ask people who understand the questions to endorse the item below that contains the word blue.Most likely, the person should conclude that:
 - a. people usually are helpful.
 - b. people can become socially shy when they are threatened.
 - c. most people prefer the color blue over the sound of C major.
 - d. His friend knows better than he does.

7 attention check questions embedded within the Thinking About Major Scale *[Response scale on 1 to 5 Likert-type scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree to match other TAMS items. These questions to appear spaced throughout the 96-item extended TAMS survey.]*

1. These questions are about my choice of major.
2. College majors are typically selected in the 3rd grade.
3. I am currently attending a college/university that does not exist.
4. If I have ever thought about my major and am reading the questions on this survey, I will select strongly disagree below.
5. I have never thought about or been asked about my college major.
6. My college major has been asked about on this survey.
7. I know what a college major is.

4 attention check questions embedded within the Wordsumplus measure [The following initial words (and many of the incorrect alters) were selected from a Kindergarten vocabulary test – these items are intended to be very easy to solve for respondents paying attention and those for whom English is a fluent language. These questions to appear spaced throughout the Wordsumplus measure. The correct answer appears in red here]

MUDDY	1. Bumpy	2. Filthy	3. Gummy	4. Leafy	5. Cradle
SPARKLE	1. Silky	2. Edge	3. Glimmer	4. Disappear	5. Young
BLOOM	1. Gust	2. Flash	3. Shore	4. Burst	5. Blossom
WIGGLE	1. Twist	2. Row	3. Giggle	4. Tangle	5. Round

ARP 2019: MTurk & Covert Attention Checks Relevant References

- Aruguete, M. S., Huynh, H., Browne B. L., Jurs, B., Flint, E., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2019). How serious is the 'carelessness' problem on Mechanical Turk? *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. doi: 10.1080/13645579.2018.1563966
- Bai, H. (2018). Evidence that A Large Amount of Low Quality Responses on MTurk Can Be Detected with Repeated GPS Coordinates. Retrieved from:
<https://www.maxhuibai.com/blog/evidence-that-responses-from-repeating-gps-are-random>
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20, 351–368. doi: 10.1093/pan/mpr057
- Buhrmester, M. D., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 3–5. doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980
- Chandler, J., Mueller, P., & Paolacci, G. (2013). Nonnaïveté among Amazon Mechanical Turk workers: Consequences and solutions for behavioral researchers. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46, 112–130. doi:10.3758/s13428-013-0365-7
- Clifford, S., & Jerit, J. (2014). Is there a cost to convenience? An experimental comparison of data quality in laboratory and online studies. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1, 120-131, doi: 10.1017/xps.2014.5
- Curran, P. G. (2016). Methods for the detection of carelessly invalid responses in survey data. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 66, 4-19. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.07.006

- Dennis, S. A., Goodson, B. M., & Pearson, C. (March 14, 2019). Virtual Private Servers and the limitations of IP-based screening procedures: Lessons from the MTurk quality crisis of 2018. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3233954
- Goodman, J. K., Cryder, C. E., & Cheema, A. (2012). Data collection in a flat world: The strengths and weaknesses of Mechanical Turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 26, 213-224. doi: 10.1002/bdm.1753
- Gosling, S., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59, 93–104. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.93
- Hauser, D., Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. J. (2018, September 1). Common concerns with MTurk as a participant pool: Evidence and solutions. doi: 10.31234/osf.io/uq45c
- Hauser, D. J. & Schwarz, N. (2016). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavioral Research*, 48, 400-407. doi: 10.3758/s13428-015-0578-z
- Huang, J., Curran, P., Keeney, J., Poposki, E., & DeShon, R. (2012). Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27, 99-114. doi: 10.1007/s10869-014-9357-6
- Johnson, J. A. (2005). Ascertaining the validity of Web-based personality inventories. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 103–129. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2004.09.009
- Kennedy, R., Clifford, S., Burleigh, T., Jewell, R., & Waggoner, P. (October 24, 2018). The shape of and solutions to the MTurk quality crisis. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3272468
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, 17, 437-455. doi: 10.1037/a0028085

- Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 867–872. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.009
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making, 5*, 411–419.
- Permut, S., Fisher, M., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2019). TaskMaster: A tool for determining when subjects are on task. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 2*, 188–196. doi: 10.1177/2515245919838479
- Thomas, K. A., & Clifford, S. (2017). Validity and Mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments. *Computers in Human Behavior, 77*, 184–197. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.038