

Ending on a familiar note: "Walking route" moderation (#76900)

Created: 10/13/2021 06:24 PM (PT)

Public: 06/15/2022 12:46 PM (PT)

Author(s)

Yuji Winet (University of Chicago) - yuji.winet@chicagobooth.edu

Ed O'Brien (University of Chicago) - eob@chicagobooth.edu

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

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

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

People will especially value a personally-meaningful experience in the context of endings.

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

The key DV is a desirability rating of a focal activity (-5 = "Terrible fit for this particular occasion; I'm especially bummed", 0 = "Doesn't matter; no strong feelings either way", 5 = "Perfect fit for this particular occasion; I'm especially thrilled"). All participants always evaluate the same single focal activity (going for a leisurely walk around town).

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

Participants will be randomly assigned to condition via a 2 (Condition, between-subjects: Control vs. Last Chance) x 2 (Sentimental connection offered by this particular walking route, between-subjects: high vs. low) x 2 (Exciting stimulation offered by this particular walking route, between-subjects: high vs. low) design.

All participants will imagine that they are heading for a walk around town, and they must take one particular route. Everything in the study is identical for all participants except the phrasings of our key manipulations:

1. For all Control conditions, participants will read that they will have many more chances to walk around town this season and that this particular walk is by no means their last opportunity to take a walk like this during this season. For all Last Chance conditions, participants will read that they will not be able to go for any more walks around town this season and that this is their last opportunity to take a walk like this during this season.

2. For all High Meaning conditions, participants will read that the walk they will go on is high on sentimental connection for them, meaning that it is related to their "life story" and "who they are" in this town. For all Low Meaning conditions, participants will read that the walk they will go on is low in sentimental connection for them, meaning that it is unrelated to these same things.

3. For all High Stimulation conditions, participants will read that the walk they will go on is high on exciting stimulation for them, meaning that it has many interesting sights, smells, and sounds to explore/enjoy. For all Low Stimulation conditions, participants will read that the walk they will go on is low in exciting stimulation for them, meaning that it has few interesting sights, smells, and sounds to explore/enjoy.

The presentation of all texts is randomized wherever possible for each participant (e.g., the order in which we present this condition information; the presentation order of the choice options).

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

We plan to conduct a Univariate GLM with Condition, Meaning, and Stimulation (and their interactions) as independent variables, and Desirability Rating as the DV. The key test of our hypothesis is a significant 3-way interaction, such that meaning matters especially much in the context of endings (i.e., that the difference between low vs. high meaning, across stimulation levels, is bigger among Last Chance participants than among Control participants; we will conduct individual pairwise comparisons across these sets of conditions to tease apart their specific significance levels). We are under the impression that any other effect in the output is incidental to this key hypothesis.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.

No plans at this time.

7) 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.

We will request 2,000 "Cloud Approved" participants from Cloud Research, to allow for ~250 per between-subjects cell.

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

At the end of the study, all participants will complete a single item whereby they drag-and-drop each of two options into one of two categories (mutually-exclusive – i.e., both options must be assigned to a category, and only one option can be assigned to a given category). The options are: "A route

that's HIGH in Sentimental Connection + LOW in Exciting Stimulation" and "A route that's LOW in Sentimental Connection + HIGH in Exciting Stimulation". The categories are "This one is more likely to be the "old" route (a route that a person has visited before)" and "This one is more likely to be the "new" route (a route that a person hasn't yet visited)". We are including this measure in order to confirm that participants indeed encode a route with high connection + low stimulation as an old repeat route, and a route with low connection + high stimulation as a novel route.

Also at the end of the study, all participants will complete 3 attention checks:

- One regarding what the study was about (single item, forced-choice from 3 options: taking leisurely strolls through town, reading books by William James, planning Halloween parties).
- One regarding the meaning and stimulation conditions they were assigned to (single item, forced-choice from 4 options that describe each combination of High/Low connection and High/Low stimulation).
- One regarding whether they were assigned to the control condition or last-chance condition (single item, forced-choice from 2 options, each re-pasting the key text of the Control and Last Chance prompts).

Also at the end of the study, all participants will complete demographic items (gender, race/ethnicity, age); will rate how confusing they found the study (1 = not confusing, 10 = very confusing); will rate their study engagement regarding whether mental images actually came to mind from the study prompts (1 = no, not really, 10 = yes, very much); and will complete an honesty check regarding whether we should trust their responses as genuine, with no penalty for honesty (forced-choice: yes vs. no).

Regarding all of these end-of-study items, we are collecting them simply for descriptive purposes and do not intend to exclude participants based on them; however, if the study works as hypothesized and ends up in a paper, we plan to reanalyze our results entering these items as covariates and will report the results in a Supplemental Materials document, simply for thoroughness (we assume to find generally similar patterns regardless).