Translation of Central Materials of the German Studies 1, 3, and 4

**Study** 1

*Note.* No introductory explanation of preprints and peer-review was provided.

**Independent Variable / Manipulation**

**Condition Preprint**

In the following, we will present you with five short summaries of research findings that were each published as preprints. We kindly ask you to thoroughly read the summaries and then answer a question about the credibility of each result.

**Condition Peer-Review**

In the following, we will present you with five short summaries of research findings that all went through a peer-review process and were published in a scientific journal. We kindly ask you to thoroughly read the summaries and then answer a question about the credibility of each result.

**Dependent Variable**

**Claim 1**

Do people preserve common resources for future generations if they make collective decisions? In a game, participants chose how many resources they would extract from a pool, and how many they wanted to preserve for future game players. In one group, each participant made their own decision on how many resources they want to extract from the pool. In the other group, participants voted for the combined amount of resources they would extract.

Study result: If people had to vote on the combined amount of resources they would extract from the pool, more resources were preserved for future generations of game players.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 2**

Are groups less likely to reduce inequality if the group members know the wealth of each other? In a game, participants could share resources with co-players or keep it to themselves. At the start of the game, the resources were distributed unevenly between the players. In one group, participants saw the amount of resources of other players. In the other group, participants only saw their own resources.

Study result: If participants knew the amount of resources from other players, the inequality between the players remained higher.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 3**

Does analytic thinking trigger religious disbelief? Participants looked at an image. One group looked at an image of “The Thinker”, that is a sculpture of a person in a thinking position. The other group looked at an image that depicted a sculpture of a discus thrower. Afterward, they answered questions about their religiosity. Study result: Participants who had seen “The Thinker” reported lower religious belief compared to people who had seen the sculpture of a discus thrower.

Study result: Participants who had seen “The Thinker” reported lower religious belief compared to people who had seen the sculpture of a discus thrower.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 4**

Do people enjoy doing nothing? Participants spent a short amount of time by themselves in an empty room. In one group, participants were instructed to spend their time on a non-social activity (e.g., listening to music, reading a book, surfing the Web). In the other group, participants were instructed to entertain themselves with their thoughts (without any external activity). Afterward, participants answered questions about how enjoyable this experience was.

Study result: If participants had just their thoughts to entertain themselves, they enjoyed themselves less.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 5**

Does poverty drain people’s attention? Participants played the game “Wheel of Fortune”, a game in which people have to guess letters in word puzzles. In one group, participants were given 6 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘poor’ players). In the other group, participants were given 20 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘rich’ players). Afterward, they completed an attention task.

Study result: If participants were given only a few chances per round to guess letters, they performed worse in the subsequent attention task.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Study** 3

**Introductory Explanation**

Usually, scientific articles are subject to an extensive peer-review process. This means that other scientists anonymously review articles submitted to a scientific journal. They then speak out for or against a publication and provide important suggestions for article improvement. This procedure is considered the gold standard of scientific journals. Only articles that receive positive reviews have a chance of being published. This procedure is intended to ensure that the articles are of particularly high quality. However, some articles are now published online as preprints without having been peer-reviewed. This allows scientists to make their results available to the public very rapidly, whereas the time-consuming peer-review process can take several months. Normally, peer-review is then carried out after the article has been submitted to a scientific journal.

**Dependent Variable**

We are now interested in your opinion about research findings which are either published as preprints or as journal articles. What do you think?

*How credible are research findings that are published as preprints (without peer-review)?*

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

*How credible are research findings that are published as journal articles (with peer-review)?*

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Study** 4

**Introductiory Explanation**

Usually, scientific articles are subject to an extensive peer-review process. This means that other scientists anonymously review articles submitted to a scientific journal. They then speak out for or against a publication and provide important suggestions for article improvement. This procedure is considered the gold standard of scientific journals. Only articles that receive positive reviews have a chance of being published. This procedure is intended to ensure that the articles are of particularly high quality. However, some articles are now published online as preprints without having been peer-reviewed. This allows scientists to make their results available to the public very rapidly, whereas the time-consuming peer-review process can take several months. Normally, peer-review is then carried out after the article has been submitted to a scientific journal.

**Independent Variable / Manipulation**

**Condition Preprint**

In the following, we will present you with five short summaries of research findings that were each published as preprints. We kindly ask you to thoroughly read the summaries and then answer a question about the credibility of each result.

**Condition Peer-Review**

In the following, we will present you with five short summaries of research findings that all went through a peer-review process and were published in a scientific journal. We kindly ask you to thoroughly read the summaries and then answer a question about the credibility of each result.

**Dependent Variable**

**Claim 1**

Do people preserve common resources for future generations if they make collective decisions? In a game, participants chose how many resources they would extract from a pool, and how many they wanted to preserve for future game players. In one group, each participant made their own decision on how many resources they want to extract from the pool. In the other group, participants voted for the combined amount of resources they would extract.

Study result: If people had to vote on the combined amount of resources they would extract from the pool, more resources were preserved for future generations of game players.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 2**

Are groups less likely to reduce inequality if the group members know the wealth of each other? In a game, participants could share resources with co-players or keep it to themselves. At the start of the game, the resources were distributed unevenly between the players. In one group, participants saw the amount of resources of other players. In the other group, participants only saw their own resources.

Study result: If participants knew the amount of resources from other players, the inequality between the players remained higher.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 3**

Does analytic thinking trigger religious disbelief? Participants looked at an image. One group looked at an image of “The Thinker”, that is a sculpture of a person in a thinking position. The other group looked at an image that depicted a sculpture of a discus thrower. Afterward, they answered questions about their religiosity. Study result: Participants who had seen “The Thinker” reported lower religious belief compared to people who had seen the sculpture of a discus thrower.

Study result: Participants who had seen “The Thinker” reported lower religious belief compared to people who had seen the sculpture of a discus thrower.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 4**

Do people enjoy doing nothing? Participants spent a short amount of time by themselves in an empty room. In one group, participants were instructed to spend their time on a non-social activity (e.g., listening to music, reading a book, surfing the Web). In the other group, participants were instructed to entertain themselves with their thoughts (without any external activity). Afterward, participants answered questions about how enjoyable this experience was.

Study result: If participants had just their thoughts to entertain themselves, they enjoyed themselves less.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)

**Claim 5**

Does poverty drain people’s attention? Participants played the game “Wheel of Fortune”, a game in which people have to guess letters in word puzzles. In one group, participants were given 6 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘poor’ players). In the other group, participants were given 20 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘rich’ players). Afterward, they completed an attention task.

Study result: If participants were given only a few chances per round to guess letters, they performed worse in the subsequent attention task.

How credible is this study result?

Not at all credible (1) to Very credible (7)