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**Editor First Decision: Revise & Resubmit**

May 27, 2021

Dear Chantelle Ivanski,

I have now reviewed your Stage 2 Registered Report submission, “Pets and Politics: Do liberals and conservatives differ in their preferences for cats versus dogs?”. In our email conversation, we discussed the surprising revelation about the AIID having fewer participants than expected when you first wrote the Stage 1 manuscript. In line with that conversation, I invite you to revise the Stage 2 manuscript following the pre-registered plan while relaxing the accuracy/reaction time exclusionary criterion we discussed. Be sure to explicitly note this and any other departures from the pre-registered plans. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this approach. I encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

In summary, I think this is a promising manuscript and, I hope you will revise it for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to resubmission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office [editorialoffice@collabra.org](mailto:editorialoffice@collabra.org).

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

William Chopik

**Author Response**  
Jul 15, 2021

Dear Dr. Chopik,

Thank you so much for the opportunity to resubmit our Stage 2 Registered Report, “Pets and Politics: Do Liberals and Conservatives Differ in Their Preferences for Cats Versus Dogs?”

As requested, we have now incorporated the additional data initially held back by the AIID group (Attitudes, Identities, and Individual Differences; Hussey et al., 2018), and also ran analyses using a more lax exclusion criterion for the IAT analyses. This resulted in a substantial to increase in our sample size for the IAT, and increases in the *n* for the mediator variables. The sample sizes for both Openness and Conscientiousness now approach the numberswe estimated in our Stage 1 submission. In this report, we note those situations where we have deviated from the preregistration, for full transparency.

The manuscript includes a Data Accessibility Statement and a link to all the anonymized data and code. The data from this study came from the Attitudes, Identities, and Individual Differences (AIID) Study (Hussey et al., 2018) and, as a result, we do not have a laboratory log outlining data collection. No data was analyzed prior to the Stage 1 acceptance, with the exception of the 15% of data we received in order to ensure our data question was testable, nor did we have access to the data or summary reports of the data.

If there is anything that is not clear in the manuscript or anything you would like us to change, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Chantelle Ivanski

Ronda Lo

Raymond A. Mar

**Editor Second Decision: Revise & Resubmit**

Aug 11, 2021

Dear Chantelle Ivanski,

I have now read your Stage 2 Registered Report submission, “Pets and Politics: Do liberals and conservatives differ in their preferences for cats versus dogs?” I had mostly positive reactions to your manuscript. I feel your manuscript has important strengths and also that there are some issues that need to be addressed. I therefore encourage you to submit a revised version for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology.

Thank you for revising the paper and including the additional analyses. I thought this version of the manuscript was significantly stronger. In revising, you also pre-empted many of the more minor concerns I had with the original Stage 2 version of the manuscript (e.g., there being two Table 1s, ambiguity about how missing data were treated). I am pleased to suggest that the manuscript will likely be published in Collabra following these few changes/revisions.

In the introduction, you state, “Taken together, this would suggest that those who voted for Trump in the 2016 election (i.e., conservatives) have more pets in general than those who voted for Hilary Clinton (i.e., liberals).” Technically, this statement does not follow exactly from the previous statements—it conflates something happening at one level (the state) for behavior happening at another level (the individual). Further, “have more pets” entails owning multiple pets rather than the percentage of a state that owns a particular pet (which I believe was the actual variable, not number of pets). A similar claim is made in the discussion (i.e., “voting for McCain in 2008…was predicted by ownership of all pets”). Also, I would recommend not interpreting an effect that isn’t significant—inattentive readers might conclude that cat ownership was associated with voting for Trump because it is reported twice—in the Intro and Discussion. In all, I would soften or reword these statements so that it more carefully/closely reflects the data and results found.

In the previous manuscript, I found it instructive to have a table that summarized the sample descriptives (the former Table 1s). I would recommend adding a table like this back into the manuscript.

In the description of the IAT, it can be debated that the pairing of stimuli doesn’t “trigger” attitudes per se (suggesting that it heavily aroused when seeing two words paired together). Rather, the IAT is thought to measure implicit associations between pairs of stimuli. I’d recommend rewording this slightly.

Reliabilities (e.g., Cronbach’s alphas) should be reported for all of the multi-item scales.

In the Discussion and possibly in the Results, I think it’d be worthwhile to note the small magnitude of the effects and (given this) appropriately characterize what the results mean for the association between political identities and pet preferences.

In the limitations section, it is a little unclear how measuring political orientations in different ways might affect the associations you studied. It might be useful to clarify why this is a limitation and why knowing about voting behavior would lend additional insight into the phenomenon.

In summary, I think this is a promising manuscript and, I hope you will revise it for further consideration at Collabra: Psychology. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to resubmission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact the editorial office [editorialoffice@collabra.org](mailto:editorialoffice@collabra.org).

We hope you can submit your revision within the next six weeks. Given the previous extensions and long duration of the review process (and how minimal the revisions are), I encourage you to stick to this timeline for the revision.

Sincerely,

William Chopik

**Author Response**  
Sep 22, 2021

Dear Dr. Chopik,

Thank you for your feedback on our Stage 2 Registered Report, “Pets and Politics: Do Liberals and Conservatives Differ in Their Preferences for Cats Versus Dogs?” Below we have highlighted how we addressed your concerns. Please let us know if anything is not clear here, or in the manuscript, or if there is anything else you would like us to change.

Sincerely,

Chantelle Ivanski

Ronda Lo

Raymond A. Mar

Editor Comments:

1. Reconcile the inconsistency between state-level data and how it is characterized in terms of individuals, for the following sentence, “those who voted for Trump in the 2016 election (i.e., conservatives) have more pets in general than those who voted for Hilary Clinton (i.e., liberals)” (pg. 3). There is also an error here in how the phrase “have more pets” characterizes the results of this study.

This sentence has now been removed.

1. Edit the sentence in discussion which claims that “voting for McCain in 2008…was predicted by ownership of all pets”

Changed this sentence on pg. 20 to say: “voting for McCain in 2008 (the conservative candidate) was related to state-level ownership of dogs, fish, horses, ferrets, and rodents, but not cats (Mutz, 2010)”

1. Clarify that the relations observed between voting for Trump and owning cats was not statistically significant.

This has now been emphasized in both the introduction and discussion:   
pg. 3. “When repeating the same analysis for cat ownership, there was no statistically significant relationship”  
pg. 20. “Interestingly, however, past findings associating liberalism with a liking for cats deviates from our own examination of state-level data, which found that cat ownership was not statistically significantly associated with voting for Trump.”

1. Add the descriptives table for the demographics back into the main manuscript.

This has been re-inserted as Table 2.

1. Reword the description of the IAT to clarify that it is thought to measure implicit associations between pairs of stimuli.

This has been edited to clarify that the IAT is a measure of implicit associations between pairs of stimuli:   
pg. 9-10. “The IAT measures implicit associations by pairing relevant stimuli (e.g., cats and dogs) with positive and negative words.”

1. Report Cronbach’s alpha for all established measured that were used.

Cronbach’s alpha has been added for the Social Dominance Orientation scale (α = .81), the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (α = .93), and the conscientious (α = .86) and openness (α = .85) subscales of the Big Five Inventory (pg. 11-12).

When calculating these internal reliabilities, we discovered an error in the AIID codebook: although items are described as not reverse-coded, they were indeed reverse-coded. (Internal reliabilities are very low when items are treated as not yet reverse-coded, and greatly improve when treated as already reverse-coded.) As a result, it was necessary to re-calculate our aggregate scores and re-run all of our analyses. Thankfully, the main outcome of all analyses does not much change, although all values have now been updated to correct for this error. In addition, the correct aggregate score for SDO correlated above *r* = 0.10 with our key variables, so we now include SDO in our mediator analyses for consistency. We are happy to provide further details regarding this discovery if that would be helpful.

1. Make note of the fact that the effects are small in magnitude.

We have noted this in both the results and discussion:  
pg. 16. “These effects, however, are generally small in magnitude.”  
pg. 19. “Importantly, however, the magnitude of these effects was small, with a one unit change in political identity (on a 7-point scale) predicting about a 1% to 2% change in pet evaluations and preferences. This is to be expected, as pet preference is likely a rather distal reflection of other, more specific, traits that are captured indirectly by political identity.”

1. In the limitations sections, elaborate on why including different measures of political orientation, including examining voting behavior, might improve the study.

We have now elaborated on these thoughts in the limitation section, focusing on the shortcomings of using a single item measure:   
pg. 21. “A second limitation is the measure of political identity employed in these archival data, which was a single item. Employing several items can help reduce measurement error and also allow for a greater breadth of construct coverage. Thus, studies designed to examine this question should include more items to measure political identity.”

In addition, after considering your comments, we agree that actual voting behavior is unlikely to provide a better measurement of political identity and this mention has now been removed.

**Editor Final Decision: Accept**

Sep 22, 2021

Dear Chantelle Ivanski,

I have now had a chance to read over your manuscript “Pets and Politics: Do liberals and conservatives differ in their preferences for cats versus dogs?”, along with the letter describing the changes you made. Thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns that the reviewers and I raised. I am happy to say that your paper is now officially accepted for publication in Collabra: Psychology. A special thanks for catching the coding/scoring error and editing/updating the manuscript accordingly; having accurate portrayals of data and the corresponding results are important.

Congratulations on this excellent work, I think it will make an important contribution to the literature and I look forward to seeing it published! I hope your experiences with Collabra: Psychology have been positive and that you will continue to consider it as an outlet for your work.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. Our managing editor will contact you in case there are any pre-prodution file related questions. You will have an opportunity to check the page proofs before we publish your article. Thank you again for publishing in Collabra: Psychology.

Sincerely,  
William Chopik