Greed and Inaction Inertia (Study 2) (#152825)

Author(s)
Vanessa Rettkowski (University of Mannheim) - vrettkow@mail.uni-mannheim.de
marcel Zeelenberg (Tilburg University) - M.Zeelenberg@uvt.nl
Moritz Ingendahl (Ruhr-Universität Bochum) - moritz.ingendahl@rub.de

Pre-registered on: 11/28/2023 07:26 AM (PT)

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
We will examine the role of greed in the inaction inertia effect by testing the following hypotheses. The naming of the hypotheses (H1, H3) is chosen to be consistent with another study.

H1: Participants are less likely to act on an offer if the value difference between the missed offer and the current offer is large (vs. small) (Replication of Inaction Inertia)
H3: High dispositional greed (vs. low dispositional greed) will reduce the inaction inertia effect … (Moderation Hypothesis)
- H3a: … in such a way that greedy people (vs. non-greedy) will overall display increased action likelihood
- H3b: … in such a way that greedy people (vs. non-greedy) will overall display reduced action likelihood

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
The participants will be responding to the gym scenario (Tykocinski et al., 1995, p. 796).
DV: Action Likelihood (= the self-reported intention to take up an offer; also referred to as Purchase Likelihood): Measured on "How likely is it that you will join the fitness club located 30 minutes away?" (0 = Not at all to 10 = Extremely).
Moderator Variable: Dispositional Greed: Assessed via the Dispositional Greed Scale; Seuntjens et al., 2015.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
There are two experimental between-participant conditions (value difference: large vs. small); Value Difference = the difference in value between the first offer that was missed, and the second offer.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
The significance level will be set to $\alpha = .05$ throughout all analyses. The dispositional greed variable will be standardized. The value difference conditions will be coded with -0.5 and 0.5.
We will conduct the following regression model:
lm(purchase.z~difference + greed.z + difference*greed.z)

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We do not plan any exclusions.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
As a rough approximation, a conservative power analysis with G*Power 3.1.9.4 in the between-between ANOVA interface (Faul et al., 2009) was conducted to estimate the required sample size. For a small effect size of f = .1 and power of .9, a sample size of N = 1053 participants would be necessary for an interaction in G*Power. This N is also sufficient for a correlation of 0.1 to become significant if there only is a main effect of greed. We decided to oversample to a total of 1100 in case of dropouts due to our exclusion criteria. Data acquisition will be done via prolific (https://www.prolific.co/) and we will request 1100 participants.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
Nothing else to pre-register.