

# Replication of Study 3 by Kwan, Dai & Wyer, JR (2017, Journal of Consumer Research)

Elaine Young[s] (contact information)

2024-10-13

## Table of contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Introduction . . . . .                            | 2 |
| Justification: . . . . .                          | 2 |
| Procedure: . . . . .                              | 2 |
| Links . . . . .                                   | 2 |
| Methods . . . . .                                 | 3 |
| Power Analysis . . . . .                          | 3 |
| Planned Sample . . . . .                          | 3 |
| Materials . . . . .                               | 3 |
| Procedure . . . . .                               | 3 |
| Analysis Plan . . . . .                           | 3 |
| Differences from Original Study . . . . .         | 4 |
| Methods Addendum (Post Data Collection) . . . . . | 4 |
| Results . . . . .                                 | 4 |
| Data preparation . . . . .                        | 4 |
| Confirmatory analysis . . . . .                   | 4 |
| Exploratory analyses . . . . .                    | 4 |
| Discussion . . . . .                              | 5 |
| Summary of Replication Attempt . . . . .          | 5 |
| Commentary . . . . .                              | 5 |

## Introduction

### Justification:

My program is in Behavioral Marketing, and my research area is Judgment and Decision Making. The paper I chose for this replication project is from a top journal in my field. I would like to replicate it because I feel that it is difficult to find such a strong effect on persuasiveness by varying the peripheral aspects. Therefore, I'm interested in seeing if their results can be replicated. Additionally, one of my research interests is to investigate whether other contextual effects can influence the decision-making process. Thus, this paper is a good foundation for me to build on if I find that their results can be replicated.

### Procedure:

Participants first completed a survey called "Quotes-of-the-Year," during which they evaluated 10 statements sourced from social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook. These statements varied in length from 3 to 11 words and addressed various topics, including romance (e.g., "try to reason about love and you will lose your reason"), happiness (e.g., "life is too short for tears"), and personal values (e.g., "follow your heart"). All statements were presented in the same font type, size, text positioning, line spacing, paragraphing, and background graphics.

In the limited space condition, each quote was displayed in a box measuring between  $420 \times 315$  pixels and  $660 \times 165$  pixels, with no extra space around the border. In contrast, the empty space condition featured a box size ranging from  $960 \times 720$  pixels to  $960 \times 240$  pixels, surrounded by significant empty space.

Participants reviewed all 10 quotes in both conditions. After reading each quote, they indicated how much they liked it and how important they thought it was, using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Their responses were averaged to create a single measure of message persuasiveness ( $r = .88$ ). Additionally, the time spent evaluating each quote was recorded, with the total time serving as an indicator of message deliberation. Finally, participants reported their age and gender before being given the first few words of each quote as a cue and asked to recall it as accurately as possible.

### Links

[https://github.com/elelelyoung/kwan2017/tree/main/original\\_paper](https://github.com/elelelyoung/kwan2017/tree/main/original_paper)

<https://github.com/elelelyoung/kwan2017/tree/main/writeup>

[No abstract is needed.] Each replication project will have a straightforward, no frills report of the study and results. These reports will be publicly available as supplementary material

for the aggregate report(s) of the project as a whole. Also, to maximize project integrity, the intro and methods will be written and critiqued in advance of data collection. Introductions can be just 1-2 paragraphs clarifying the main idea of the original study, the target finding for replication, and any other essential information. It will NOT have a literature review – that is in the original publication. You can write both the introduction and the methods in past tense.

## **Methods**

### **Power Analysis**

Original effect size, power analysis for samples to achieve 80%, 90%, 95% power to detect that effect size. Considerations of feasibility for selecting planned sample size.

### **Planned Sample**

Planned sample size and/or termination rule, sampling frame, known demographics if any, preselection rules if any.

### **Materials**

All materials - can quote directly from original article - just put the text in quotations and note that this was followed precisely. Or, quote directly and just point out exceptions to what was described in the original article.

### **Procedure**

Can quote directly from original article - just put the text in quotations and note that this was followed precisely. Or, quote directly and just point out exceptions to what was described in the original article.

### **Analysis Plan**

Can also quote directly, though it is less often spelled out effectively for an analysis strategy section. The key is to report an analysis strategy that is as close to the original - data cleaning rules, data exclusion rules, covariates, etc. - as possible.

**Clarify key analysis of interest here** You can also pre-specify additional analyses you plan to do.

## **Differences from Original Study**

Explicitly describe known differences in sample, setting, procedure, and analysis plan from original study. The goal, of course, is to minimize those differences, but differences will inevitably occur. Also, note whether such differences are anticipated to make a difference based on claims in the original article or subsequent published research on the conditions for obtaining the effect.

## **Methods Addendum (Post Data Collection)**

You can comment this section out prior to final report with data collection.

## **Actual Sample**

Sample size, demographics, data exclusions based on rules spelled out in analysis plan

## **Differences from pre-data collection methods plan**

Any differences from what was described as the original plan, or “none”.

## **Results**

### **Data preparation**

Data preparation following the analysis plan.

### **Confirmatory analysis**

The analyses as specified in the analysis plan.

*Side-by-side graph with original graph is ideal here*

### **Exploratory analyses**

Any follow-up analyses desired (not required).

## **Discussion**

### **Summary of Replication Attempt**

Open the discussion section with a paragraph summarizing the primary result from the confirmatory analysis and the assessment of whether it replicated, partially replicated, or failed to replicate the original result.

### **Commentary**

Add open-ended commentary (if any) reflecting (a) insights from follow-up exploratory analysis, (b) assessment of the meaning of the replication (or not) - e.g., for a failure to replicate, are the differences between original and present study ones that definitely, plausibly, or are unlikely to have been moderators of the result, and (c) discussion of any objections or challenges raised by the current and original authors about the replication attempt. None of these need to be long.