

Fiction and Donations - MTurk April 2017 (#3848)

Author(s)

Martino Ongis (The New School for Social Research) - ongim671@newschool.edu
David Kidd (The New School for Social Research) - kidd305@newschool.edu
Alison Jane Martingano (The New School for Social Research) - smita204@newschool.edu
Emanuele Castano (The New School for Social Research) - castano@newschool.edu

Created: 04/24/2017 07:59 AM (PT)

Public: 04/24/2017 08:06 AM (PT)

1) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

1. Charitable donations: A novel donation paradigm will be tested that includes two factors: Victim (Single vs. Statistical) x Recipient (Single vs. Statistical)
 - a. Primary hypotheses: Main effect of Victim (higher donations for Single Victim) and main effect of Recipient (higher donations for Single Recipient)
 - b. Alternative hypothesis: Interaction indicating higher donations for Identified Victim + Identified Recipient than for all other conditions.
2. Familiarity with Fiction: Familiarity with literary but not genre fiction (when both are entered simultaneously as predictors along with number of selected foils on the Author Recognition Test(ART)) will predict:
 - a. Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RMET) performance - Positively.
 - b. Attributional Complexity Scale scores – Positively.
 - c. Endorsement of Individualizing (care, fairness) foundations on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) – Positively.
 - d. Endorsement of binding (loyalty, authority, purity) foundations on the MFQ – Negatively.
 - e. Greater adjustment for intentions (as opposed to outcomes) on a moral judgment task (MJT; see below).
 - f. False consensus – Negatively.
3. Exploratory Research
 - a. Exploring the factor structure of the Attributional Complexity Scale.
 - b. Predicting donations to individuals and groups using a variety of measures of social cognition, and self-reported measures of empathy, morality and engagement with fiction.

2) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

1. Charitable donations
 - a. Donation amount: “If given the chance, how much would you donate?” [response options are on a 9-point scale ranging from \$0 to \$8, with \$1 increments]
2. Familiarity with Fiction
 - a. Theory of Mind: Assessed using the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test
 - b. Attributional Complexity scale: Attributional Complexity Scale
 - c. Individualizing Morality: The individualizing subscale of the MFQ
 - a. Binding Morality: The binding subscale of the MFQ
 - b. Moral judgment task: Acceptability of Unintended Harms (3 trials) – Acceptability of Failed Harms (3 trials)
 - c. False consensus: Participants are presented with 20 statements taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index. Participants are asked: “For each item, please indicate whether YOU agree or disagree with that item.” Then, participants are asked: “For each item, please estimate the percentage (0-100%) of other people would agree with that item.” Scores will be calculated as described in Gollwitzer, Schworer, Stern, Gollwitzer, and Bargh (2017).

3) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

The donation paradigm will randomly allocate participants to read one of four short vignettes describing victim(s) of hunger. The victim(s) will be described as either a single individual (Bilan, a 7 year old girl from Somalia) or statistical (1.4 million children in Africa), the recipient of their donation will also either be described as single (Bilan) or statistical (children).

4) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

Charitable Donations Hypothesis 1a&b: A GLM will be conducted with donation amounts as the dependent variable. The independent variables will include Victim (Single vs. Statistical) and Recipient (Single vs. Statistical). To test the alternative hypothesis, the interaction term of Victim and Recipient will be added to the GLM.

Literary Fiction Hypotheses 2a-f: Separate GLMs will be conducted for each of the DVs specified above. As predictors, Literary and Genre familiarity scores (calculated as in Kidd & Castano, 2016) will be entered. In addition, the number of non-author foils selected on the ART will be included as a covariate. For Hypothesis 2e, the general moral judgment score (that based on congruent intentions and outcomes) will be included as a covariate.

Exploratory Research 3a: All 28 items from the Attributional Complexity scale will be entered into a rotated (oblimin) factor analysis constrained to 7 factors, reflecting the number of constructs included in the scale.

Exploratory Research 3b: Donation amounts, regardless experimental condition, will be entered as the DV in separate GLMs for each of the following predictors: RMET scores; Attributional Complexity scores; Individualizing and binding foundation endorsement on the MFQ; Attention to intentions in

moral judgments on a moral judgment task and general moral judgment; Familiarity with literary and genre fiction; Attitudes and feelings towards donating.

5) Any secondary analyses?

No. Any additional analyses will be reported as un-registered.

6) 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.

500 participants will be recruited from MTurk and will complete the study online via Qualtrics. In order to conduct the factor analysis of the Attributional Complexity scale, we hope to have at least 15 participants per item (totaling 420 participants). Since we anticipate up to 15% of recruited participants will not complete all measures or will be excluded based on the criteria described below, an initial sample of 500 is expected to be sufficient to ensure at least 15 participants per item on the Attributional Complexity scale.

7) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., data exclusions, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

Data exclusions

- Participants who do not complete the study
- Participants who select more foils than authors on the ART, or who select no authors
- Participants who fail both attention checks on the MFQ:
- Participants who perform at below-chance levels on the RMET
- Participants who rate negative intent + negative outcome actions as more acceptable than neutral intent + neutral outcome actions in the MJT.

8) Have any data been collected for this study already?

No, no data have been collected for this study yet