

Reproducible analysis of Schroeder & Epley, 2015: Do you come across as smarter when
people read what you say or hear what you say

Celia S. Florea¹

¹ Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

Author Note

Celia S. Florea, Department of Psychology, Brooklyn College of the City University
of New York.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Celia S. Florea, 2900
Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn NY. E-mail: celia.florea99@bcmail.cuny.edu

Abstract

10

11 This is a reproducible report based on a reanalysis of study 4 from Schroeder & Epley
12 (2015) entitled “Do you come across as smarter when people read what you say or hear
13 what you say?” Their analysis and the reproduced analysis here do indeed provide
14 compelling support for their hypothesis speech conveys information about a persons’
15 mental capacity which cannot be captured in text.

16

Keywords: communication, speech, mental capacity, reproducible analysis

17

Word count: 882

Reproducible analysis of Schroeder & Epley, 2015: Do you come across as smarter when people read what you say or hear what you say

Method

This report reproduces the analysis from experiment 4 in Schroeder & Epley (2015). The data were downloaded from the “open data” folder for this class, from the file named “SchroederEpley2015data.csv.” In experiment 4 Schroeder & Epley (2015) replicated the results of experiments 1-3 but here enlisted professional recruiters as participants to improve the ecological validity of their experiment.

Participants

The participants $N=39$ (mean age=30.85 years, $SD=6.24$, 30 females) in experiment 4 were professional recruiters from fortune 500 companies who had agreed to evaluate potential candidates at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business. The experimenters reached out to 66 recruiters who had attended such a jobs conference at the University of Chicago via email to request their participation in a survey. Of the 66 recruiters contacted, 39 responded and agreed to participate.

Materials

The stimuli which were developed for experiment 1, of which a subset were used here in experiment 4, were created from video recordings of MBA students spoken elevator pitches made for potential employers. It was predicted that evaluators would respond more positively to the pitches that they heard rather than those they read, as this would make the candidates appear more thoughtful and intelligent.

The survey then asked participants to rate each potential candidate on 3 dimensions: the candidate’s competence (as compared to the average candidate for a similar position),

their thoughtfulness, and intelligence. The recruiters were then asked to rate their general impressions of the candidates with questions that probed how much they liked the candidate, how positive and negative their overall impressions were and whether or not they would opt to hire the candidate.

Procedure

Participants responded to an online survey and were randomly assigned to either listen to recordings of spoken pitches (audio condition) or the same pitch in text (transcript condition) and answered survey questions. The materials were the same as experiment 1 (except that there was no video condition in experiment 4). The survey questions were rated on a likert type scale from 0-10 (e.g. 0 = much less thoughtful, 10 = much more thoughtful).

The recruiters ratings of the job candidates pitches were collapsed into into composite measures of intellect (cronbach's alpha = .92) and general impressions (cronbach's alpha = .93).

Data analysis

We used R [Version 4.0.2; R Core Team (2020)] and the R-packages *apaTables* [Version 2.0.8; Stanley (2021)], *crayon* [Version 1.4.0; Csárdi (2017)], *csvread* [Version 1.2.1; Izrailev (2018)], *data.table* [Version 1.13.6; Dowle and Srinivasan (2020)], *dplyr* [Version 1.0.3; Wickham, François, Henry, and Müller (2021)], *forcats* [Version 0.5.1; Wickham (2021)], *ggplot2* [Version 3.3.3; Wickham (2016)], *ggpmisc* [Version 0.3.8.1; Aphalo (2021)], *kableExtra* [Version 1.3.1; Zhu (2020)], *latex2exp* [Version 0.4.0; Meschiari (2015)], *latexpdf* [Version 0.1.6; Bergsma (2018)], *pandocfilters* [Version 0.1.4; Schwendinger and Hornik (2019)], *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth (2020)], *purrr* [Version 0.3.4; Henry and Wickham (2020)], *pwr* [Version 1.3.0; Champely (2020)], *readr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham,

65 Hester, and Francois (2018)], *stringr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham (2019)], *tibble* [Version 3.0.6;
 66 Müller and Wickham (2021)], *tidyr* [Version 1.1.2; Wickham (2020)], *tidyverse* [Version
 67 1.3.0; Wickham et al. (2019)], and *tinytex* [Version 0.29; Xie (2019)] for all our analyses.

68 Results

69 ## CONDITION Intellect_Rating

70 ## 1 transcript 3.648148

71 ## 2 audio 5.634921

72 ## CONDITION Impression_Rating

73 ## 1 transcript 4.074074

74 ## 2 audio 5.968254

75 ## CONDITION Hire_Rating

76 ## 1 transcript 2.888889

77 ## 2 audio 4.714286

78 ##

79 ## Two Sample t-test

80 ##

81 ## data: Intellect_Rating by CONDITION

82 ## t = -3.5259, df = 37, p-value = 0.001144

83 ## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0

84 ## 95 percent confidence interval:

85 ## -3.1284798 -0.8450652

86 ## sample estimates:

87 ## mean in group transcript mean in group audio

88 ## 3.648148 5.634921

```


89 ##
90 ## Two Sample t-test
91 ##
92 ## data: Impression_Rating by CONDITION
93 ## t = -2.8508, df = 37, p-value = 0.007091
94 ## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
95 ## 95 percent confidence interval:
96 ## -3.2404752 -0.5478846
97 ## sample estimates:
98 ## mean in group transcript      mean in group audio
99 ##                4.074074                5.968254



100 ##
101 ## Two Sample t-test
102 ##
103 ## data: Hire_Rating by CONDITION
104 ## t = -2.6201, df = 37, p-value = 0.01267
105 ## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
106 ## 95 percent confidence interval:
107 ## -3.2370242 -0.4137694
108 ## sample estimates:
109 ## mean in group transcript      mean in group audio
110 ##                2.888889                4.714286


```

111 The results of this analysis are consistent with the original authors in that the mean
 112 ratings of the professional recruiters were greater in each condition when they heard audio
 113 recordings than read the job seekers elevator pitch. As is also the case of studies 1-3, in
 114 study 4 the recruiters rated candidates as more intelligent in the audio than transcript

115 condition $\Delta M = -1.99$, 95% CI $[-3.13, -0.85]$, $t(37) = -3.53$, $p = .001$, likewise their
116 overall impression of the candidates $\Delta M = -1.89$, 95% CI $[-3.24, -0.55]$, $t(37) = -2.85$,
117 $p = .007$ and the likelihood that they would hire the candidate $\Delta M = -1.83$, 95% CI
118 $[-3.24, -0.41]$, $t(37) = -2.62$, $p = .013$ was greater in the audio than transcript condition.








Discussion

The results here conform with those found by Schroeder & Epley (2015) from experiment 4. Recruiters rated candidates more favorably across all dimensions when they heard rather than read candidates' elevator pitches. They argue convincingly that speech allows us to infer information, especially that of another person's mental capacity that cannot be captured in text alone.

#Powercurve



References

- Schroeder, J., & Epley, N. (2015). The Sound of Intellect: Speech Reveals a Thoughtful Mind, Increasing a Job Candidate's Appeal. *Psychological Science*, 1, 15.
- Aphalo, P. J. (2021). *Ggpmisc: Miscellaneous extensions to 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpmisc>
- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Bergsma, T. (2018). *Latexpdf: Convert tables to PDF or PNG*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=latexpdf>
- Champely, S. (2020). *Pwr: Basic functions for power analysis*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=pwr>
- Csárdi, G. (2017). *Crayon: Colored terminal output*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=crayon>
- Dowle, M., & Srinivasan, A. (2020). *Data.table: Extension of 'data.frame'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=data.table>
- Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>
- Izrailev, S. (2018). *Csvread: Fast specialized CSV file loader*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=csvread>
- Meschiari, S. (2015). *latex2exp: Use LaTeX expressions in plots*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=latex2exp>
- Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>

- R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Schwendinger, F., & Hornik, K. (2019). *Pandocfilters: Pandoc filters for r*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=pandocfilters>
- Stanley, D. (2021). *apaTables: Create american psychological association (APA) style tables*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=apaTables>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- Wickham, H. (2020). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- Wickham, H. (2021). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors)*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., . . . Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- Wickham, H., Hester, J., & François, R. (2018). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- Xie, Y. (2019). TinyTeX: A lightweight, cross-platform, and easy-to-maintain LaTeX distribution based on TeX live. *TUGboat*, (1), 30–32. Retrieved from <http://tug.org/TUGboat/Contents/contents40-1.html>

- 179 Zhu, H. (2020). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax*.
- 180 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>