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# Abstract

The abstract should provide a concise summary of the entire paper, allowing readers to quickly understand the main points and findings of your research. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*
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# Introduction

The introduction of your paper is crucial for setting the stage for your research. It should inform the reader about the broader context of your study, its significance, and how it contributes to the field.  *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

# Concepts

The concept section is where you define and elaborate on the key theories, models, or constructs that form the foundation of your research. It sets the theoretical basis for your study, explaining the conceptual underpinnings that guide your research questions, design, and analysis. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

# Measurement

The measurement section should detail the methods and tools used to collect and analyze data, ensuring readers can evaluate the reliability and validity of your findings. This section is critical for replicability and transparency in research. *Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Subtitle 1

You can add subtitles. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Subtitle 2

You can add subtitles. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Subtitle 3

You can add subtitles. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

**<Figure 1>**

# Inference

This section should seamlessly connect the findings to broader implications, showing how your work fills gaps in existing research, challenges current understanding, or provides new insights. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Issue 1

You can add issues. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Issue 2

You can add issues. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

## Issue 3

You can add issues. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*

**<Figure 2>**

# Findings and ways ahead

This section summarizes key results and their implications. Discuss limitations and suggest future research directions. Reflect on the broader impact of your work. Keep this section concise yet informative, aiming to inspire further inquiry and application of your findings. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*.

**<Table 3>**

# Conclusion

In the section, concisely summarize your study's main findings and their importance. Highlight the contribution your work makes to the existing body of knowledge and suggest directions for future research or practical applications. *[Please complete this section by adding your own content]*
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**Figure 1**

*True and False Politically Neutral Headlines Rated as Accurate Across Conditions*

*Note.* Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.

**Figure 2**

*True and False Political Headlines Rated as Accurate Across Conditions and Political Concordance*

*Note.* Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.

**Table 3**

*Median Scores Across the Course Offerings From Beginning to End of the Course*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Beginning of course | | | | End of course | | | |
| *Mdn* | Min. | | Max. | *Mdn* | Min. | Max. | |
| Social Justice Scale composite | 150.00 | | 119.00 | 171.00 | 152.32 | 123.00 | | 168.00 |
| Attitudes subscale | 74.50 | | 56.00 | 77.00 | 74.04 | 59.00 | | 77.00 |
| Behavioral Control subscale | 32.00 | | 20.00 | 41.00 | 32.49 | 25.00 | | 35.00 |
| Subjective Norms subscale | 19.00 | | 5.00 | 28.00 | 20.87 | 13.00 | | 28.00 |
| Behavioral Intentions subscale | 26.00 | | 17.00 | 28.00 | 25.47 | 16.00 | | 28.00 |

Note. Min. = minimum; Max. = maximum.