



Learning from (failed) replications: Cognitive load manipulations and charitable giving[☆]



Judd B. Kessler^a, Stephan Meier^{b,*}

^a University of Pennsylvania, United States

^b Columbia University, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 December 2013

Accepted 6 February 2014

Available online 5 March 2014

Keywords:

Methodology

Cognitive load

Charitable giving

ABSTRACT

Replication of empirical studies is much more than a tool to police the field. Failed replications force us to recognize that seemingly arbitrary design features may impact results in important ways. We describe a study that used a cognitive load manipulation to investigate the role of the deliberative system in charitable giving and a set of failed replications of that study. While the original study showed large and statistically significant results, we failed to replicate using the same protocol and the same subject pool. After the first failed replication, we hypothesized that the order our study was taken in a set of unrelated studies in a laboratory session generated the differences in effects. Three more replication attempts supported this hypothesis. The study demonstrates the importance of replication in advancing our understanding of the mechanisms driving a particular result and it questions the robustness of results established by cognitive load tests.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Replication of empirical studies can help identify false positive results and uncover questionable research practices (see special section on replicability in *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, including [Pashler and Wagenmakers, 2012](#)). But running replications is about more than policing the field. Replications can elucidate how subtle differences in setting, subject pool, and protocol impact results. Specifically, failed replications force us to recognize that some seemingly arbitrary design features may be necessary for a result to arise, which can help us understand the mechanisms driving the effect (for a similar argument about laboratory and field experiments see [Kessler, 2013](#)).

This paper describes a set of studies in which we use a cognitive load manipulation to investigate the role of the deliberative system in charitable giving (for a discussion of mental processes on charitable giving, see [Loewenstein and Small, 2007](#)). Our original results suggested that people gave substantially more money to a charity when placed under high cognitive load, results that were consistent with other findings in the literature. [Schulz et al. \(in press\)](#) and [Rand et al. \(2012\)](#) have found similar effects; however, [Hauge et al. \(2009\)](#) found no impact of load on giving.

Given our large treatment effect and statistically significant results, we were confident that our findings had pushed forward the frontiers of knowledge (see manuscript in SOM). While we were conducting more research, however, we failed

[☆] We thank Theresa Kelly for excellent work. We thank The Wharton School for research support and the Wharton Behavioral Lab for administering the studies.

* Corresponding author at: Columbia University, Graduate School of Business, 710 Uris Hall, 3022 Broadway, New York, NY 10027, United States. Tel.: +1 212 851 1801.

E-mail address: sm3087@columbia.edu (S. Meier).

to replicate our original result. We hypothesized that a subtle difference between the original study and the failed replication attempt—the order our study was taken in an hour-long laboratory session—generated the difference in results. Three more replication attempts supported this hypothesis.

2. Method

The original study was a 2 (charity request or general request) \times 2 (low or high cognitive load) between-subjects design. The replication attempts kept the same design, but here we focus only on the charity requests (see SOM for results from all sessions). Each study was one of several unrelated studies in an hour-long session at the Wharton Behavioral Lab. Sometimes our study was first in the session and sometimes it followed other studies. We were initially indifferent about the session order. Subsequently, we explicitly asked to be at the start of the session or fourth in the session as explained below.

2.1. Subjects

We analyze 405 University of Pennsylvania undergraduates (53.3% female) who participated in our charity request condition. Subjects received \$10 payment for the hour-long session and whatever amount they chose to keep in our study. Across all studies, the subject pool and the instructions were kept the same.

2.2. Charity request

Subjects were placed under high or low cognitive load, given an endowment of \$3, and asked how much of their endowment they wanted to donate to the American Red Cross.

2.3. Cognitive load manipulation

Cognitive load manipulations often involve memorizing a sequence (e.g., Gilbert et al., 1995; Gilbert and Osborne, 1989; Shiv and Fedorikhin, 1999). Since subjects made numeric giving decisions, we used a sequence of letters to avoid anchoring effects (Tversky, 1974). Subjects were randomly assigned to memorize a 3-letter sequence (“GXN”) (low cognitive load), or a 9-letter sequence (“GXNTDPLRW”) (high cognitive load). We did not incentivize the load manipulation to avoid income effects.

3. Results

Fig. 1 shows donations by cognitive load condition in the original study and in four replication attempts. In the original study subjects under high load give twice as much (\$0.51 vs. \$1.12; 102 obs; t -test, $t = 2.99$, $p = 0.004$) and are 50% more likely to give (38% vs. 58%; 102 obs; pr -test, $z = 1.97$, $p = 0.048$). In Replications 1, 2 and 4 the sign of the effect is reversed and the effect on average donation is statistically significantly different from the effect in the original study ($p < 0.05$ for all tests). We only replicate in attempt 3: under high load probability of donation increases (60% vs. 79%; 101 obs; pr -test $z = 2.00$, $p = 0.046$) and average donation directionally increases (\$1.03 vs. \$1.35, t -test, $t = 1.39$, $p = 0.168$).

4. Order in session

After our first failed replication attempt, we hypothesized that the difference in results was due to when our study was conducted in the hour-long lab session. The original study was run fourth and Replication 1 was run first. Starting with Replication 2, we specifically asked to be run either first (Replication 2 and Replication 4) or fourth (Replication 3).

Our data confirms our hypothesis that session order matters. When our study is first in the session, cognitive load directionally reduces charitable giving (\$0.97 vs. \$0.78); when it is later in the session, cognitive load increases charitable giving (\$0.78 vs. \$1.23; 203 obs; t -test, $t = 2.84$, $p = 0.005$). The effect of load on giving statistically significantly interacts with session order (405 obs; OLS on average donation $p = 0.004$; OLS on probability of donation $p = 0.020$). The effect gets stronger when we control for the calendar date on which a session was run, allowing subjects who participate on different dates to have different baseline levels of generosity (405 obs; OLS on average donation $p = 0.001$; OLS on probability of donation $p = 0.006$).

This pattern of results holds when looking only at the three replications conducted after forming our session-order hypothesis (233 obs; without date controls: OLS on average donation $p = 0.053$; OLS on probability of donation $p = 0.024$; with date controls: OLS on average donation $p = 0.030$; OLS on probability of donation $p = 0.008$).

5. Discussion

What can we learn by comparing an original study to its failed replications? When another researcher fails to replicate a study, the lack of a result might arise from differences in methods, subject pool, environment, or some other factor (see, e.g., Harless, 1992, for a study where a subtle difference in the presentation of a choice problem significantly changes the

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/883530>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/883530>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)