Advice giving_Ability10 study (#175260)

Author(s)
This pre-registration is currently anonymous to enable blind peer-review.
It has 2 authors.

Pre-registered on: 05/15/2024 11:54 PM (PT)

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?
We predict that people want to avoid disappointing others and thus take into account their expectations when giving advice. Specifically, we hypothesize that people who communicate that they are capable of competing against strong competitors in an ability test are more likely to be advised to compete against a more competitive group.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Participants in Stage 1 complete an ability test consisting of 10 questions. We record how many questions they answer correctly ("Score"). We then ask participants which group they want to compete against, High or Low Performers ("Expectation"). Participants in Stage 2 give advice to ten Stage 1 participants on whether they should compete against a group of Top Performers or a group of Low Performers. We code as "1" advice to compete against the Top Performers and "0" advice to compete against the Low Performers. Returning participants from Stage 1 then make a binary decision which of the two groups to compete against. We code as "1" if they compete against the Top Performers and "0" if they compete against the Low Performers.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
Participants in Stage 1 will see a default choice made for them. They will be randomly assigned to have a default choice of either Low Performer Group ("Low Expectation Treatment") or High Performer Group ("High Expectation Treatment"), but they can change this response.
Participants in Stage 2 will observe either only the true Score of the Stage 1 participant when giving advice ("Baseline" treatment) or they will observe the Stage 1 participant's Score along with their Choice ("Information" treatment).

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
Looking only at Stage 2 participants: AdviseTopPerformers ~ b0 + b1 x Information + b2 x High_Expectation_Treatment. + b3 x Information x High_Expectation_Treatment. We cluster standard errors at the level of the Stage 2 participant, and predict that b3 > 0. That is, the high expectation treatment leads to receiving more advice on competing against a competitive group when they are shown to the advisers.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will include all participants who complete the survey.

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 recruit 200 participants for Stage 1 (Advisees) and 1,000 participants for Stage 2 (Advisers). We then re-invite all Advisees for Stage 3 and keep the survey open for 7 days following the launch of Stage 3.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will conduct a manipulation check to see if Stage 1 participants in the "High Expectation Treatment" group are more likely to pick the High Performer Group than those in the "Low Expectation Treatment" group, using a Chi-squared test.

We will examine the quality of advice by computing the expected bonus earnings for someone who followed the recommendations. For example, if an adviser suggested competing against the High Performer group, we will match the advisee against all 20 members of that group and determine how often their score matches or exceeds that of the member. We will then multiply this number by the respective bonus earnings and conduct the following OLS regression: ExpectedValueAdvice ~ b0 + b1 x Information + b2 x High_Expectation_Treatment + b3 x Information x High_Expectation_Treatment and cluster standard errors at the level of Stage 2 participants. This will tell us whether information with a low default (b1) or with a high default (b1 + b3) leads to better or worse advice than not observing the advisee's expectation, and whether being defaulted to high expectations leads to better or worse advice than being defaulted to low expectations when expectations are observed by the adviser (b2 + b3).