**Regarding Caruso et al:**

For readers interested in a recent replication (with extension by moderation) of Caruso et al. (2013), see Schuler & Wänke, in press, SPPS.

Schuler, J., & Wänke, M. (2016). A fresh look on money priming. Feeling privileged or not makes a difference. *Social Psychological and Personality Science,* Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1948550616628608

**Regarding Vohs et al. (2006), Study 3:**

The two studies contain many departures from Study 3’s methods, a few of which I detail below. Readers interested in replication studies of Vohs et al (2006) are directed to Vohs (2015, JEPG).

Tate reported that his study was a ’fairly direct replication.’ I count at least 12 notable differences (not all noted here). Tate’s participants completed a 20-minute packet of questionnaires (measuring anxiety, life engagement, materialism, satisfaction with life, locus of control, education, occupational prestige, subjective social status, sex, age, marital status, and ethnicity) before beginning the experimental part of the study. The manipulation of money priming did not resemble that used in Vohs et al.’s (2006) Study 3. After the manipulation, participants performed a 10-minute task and answered a series of questions before moving to the outcome task. The outcome task - offering help - did not pertain to helping the experimenter, as in Vohs et al., 2006, but rather peers.

Grenier et al.’s ’highly direct replication’ for which ‘no methodological differences are known’ contains multiple deviations from Vohs et al’s protocol. The study used an untested (and thus different from Vohs et al., 2006) priming method. It used a different context for the outcome measure of offering help (instead of the experimenter asking for help, as in Vohs et al., 2006, an unacquainted peer was the requestor). At the start of the study (a study that later would ask for willingness to volunteer as the DV), participants were instructed to report whether they participate in volunteer work. Additionally, it appears that a confederate was in the room while participants completed the manipulation task.

Moreover, the study seems not to have used random assignment to condition. The authors wrote that, “The subject's number gave which condition they were belonging to (odd number = control group, even number = experimental group).” There were 40 participants total and 20 in each condition, suggesting that participants were assigned to condition on an alternating basis, and thus not at random.

Last, I see that the website with details of the study, <http://www.psychfiledrawer.org/replication.php?attempt=MTQ2>, incorrectly states that “the nonsignificant trend observed lies in the opposite direction to predictions.“ The means were the predicted direction.
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