Study 1

The first attempt at replicating was an online study of Penn undergrads getting course credit.

Essentially this was an attempted replication of Zhong & Liljenquist's study #2, though the instructions were slightly modified because it was online. Also, there was a third condition. Whereas Z&L had two endings to the scenario with Chris (in one you shred his doc, in the other you put it on his desk), we added a third condition in which you do nothing and don't say anything about it (harm by omission but not commission). Here were the instructions:

"Imagine that the following scenario is about your own actions. Please read the following passage aloud and type it into the box. Please do not copy-and-paste the paragraph. Rather, first read the scenario aloud once through, and then go back and type it yourself."

After typing the scenario participants were asked three T/F questions to verify they read it. To illustrate, in the scenario in which you shred the doc, they're asked T/F "I was competing with Chris for a promotion," "I took the document Chris needed to the shredder," and "I intended to secure my own promotion by shredding Chris' document."

Then participants completed the hangman task from Z&L study 1 ("Following is a short game, in the style of hangman and crossword puzzles. Before moving on to the next part of the questionnaire, please complete these words. Write out the whole words."). There were 8 words (instead of 6), 4 of which could be washing words (instead of 3). They also rated the same products in Z&L study 2.

Here are the data ignoring our new harm-by-omission condition. So just the Z&L replication attempt. "Commission" refers to the group Z&L call Unethical and "Good guy" refers to the group they call Ethical. "WashWords Total" is the total number of washing-related words (out of 4 possible) in the hangman-style task.

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
WashWordsTotal	Commission	165	.8667	1.01533	.07904
	Good Guy	170	.8765	.94339	.07235
Dove shower soap	Commission	166	4.85	1.504	.117
	Good Guy	178	5.06	1.437	.108
Crest toothpaste	Commission	166	5.07	1.389	.108
	Good Guy	178	5.06	1.290	.097
Windex cleaner	Commission	166	4.34	1.500	.116
	Good Guy	178	4.40	1.367	.102
Lysol disinfectant	Commission	166	4.39	1.484	.115

	Good Guy	178	4.52	1.435	.108
Tide detergent	Commission	166	4.63	1.458	.113
	Good Guy	178	4.81	1.436	.108

Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
WashWordsTotal	-.092	333	.927	-.00980	.10704	-.22037	.20076
	-.091	329.490	.927	-.00980	.10716	-.22061	.20100
Dove shower soap	-1.304	342	.193	-.207	.159	-.519	.105
	-1.302	337.495	.194	-.207	.159	-.519	.106
Crest toothpaste	.031	342	.975	.004	.144	-.280	.289
	.031	335.065	.975	.004	.145	-.280	.289
Windex cleaner	-.359	342	.720	-.056	.155	-.360	.249
	-.358	333.192	.721	-.056	.155	-.361	.250
Lysol disinfectant	-.870	342	.385	-.137	.157	-.447	.173
	-.869	338.372	.385	-.137	.158	-.447	.173
Tide detergent	-1.167	342	.244	-.182	.156	-.489	.125
	-1.166	339.540	.244	-.182	.156	-.489	.125

Study 2

The second study was done pen-and-paper. Attached separately is a copy of the protocol. Only the first 6 pages are relevant, and of course any participant only received page 2 or page 3 or page 4 (not all three). Note that in every way possible I tried to replicate Z&L's methods exactly. For example, I used only the 6 hangman-style words they used. I also added the instructions, "We are interested in studying the association between handwriting and personality," which Z&L gave but we hadn't in the first attempt.

Here are the results from the ratings of the products (which is the DV used by Z&L in their second study). I believe that once I couldn't replicate this finding, I didn't examine the hangman words (which Z&L didn't use as a DV in their study with the Chris scenario).

Packet #1 is the Unethical scenario and Packet #3 is the Ethical scenario. Here are the data. You'll note two $p<.05$ values. They're both in the wrong direction.

Group Statistics

	Packet#	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Lysol	1	59	4.19	1.432	.186
	3	48	4.13	1.282	.185
Dove	1	60	5.02	1.142	.147
	3	48	5.46	.898	.130
Crest	1	59	5.22	1.035	.135
	3	48	5.15	.967	.140
Tide	1	60	4.57	1.294	.167
	3	48	5.06	1.119	.161
Windex	1	60	4.20	1.286	.166
	3	48	4.08	1.318	.190

Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Lysol	.231	105	.818	.061	.266	-.465	.588
	.234	104.005	.816	.061	.263	-.459	.582
Dove	-2.191	106	.031	-.442	.202	-.841	-.042
	-2.249	105.976	.027	-.442	.196	-.831	-.052
Crest	.381	105	.704	.075	.195	-.313	.462
	.384	102.952	.702	.075	.194	-.310	.459
Tide	-2.100	106	.038	-.496	.236	-.964	-.028
	-2.135	105.326	.035	-.496	.232	-.956	-.035
Windex	.463	106	.644	.117	.252	-.383	.616
	.462	99.759	.645	.117	.253	-.384	.618

Here are the data when combining the 5 products into a composite average (sorry for the weird formatting – had trouble fixing it for some reason):

Group Statistics

	Packet#	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AvgCleanProduct	1	60	4.6342	.80929	.10448
	3	48	4.7750	.74563	.10762

Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means						
						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
AvgCleanProduct	-.930	106	.354	-.14083	.15138	-.44095	.15928
	-.939	103.854	.350	-.14083	.14999	-.43828	.15662