Greed and Inaction Inertia (Study 1) (#72460)

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

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, and test the following hypotheses.

[See "Preregistration – Figure 1" in the linked researchbox (researchbox.org).]
All paths in parentheses (a-g) refer to Figure 1 in the linked researchbox.

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) (c)

H2: Inaction inertia is mediated by the current offer's valuation (Mediation Hypothesis I) (a, b)

H3: High dispositional greed (vs. low dispositional greed) will reduce the inaction inertia effect … (Moderation Hypothesis) (d1)
-H3a: … in such a way that greedy people (vs. non-greedy) will overall display increased purchase likelihood (g is positive)
-H3b: … in such a way that greedy people (vs. non-greedy) will overall display reduced purchase likelihood (g is negative)

[See "Preregistration – Figure 2" in the linked researchbox (researchbox.org) for an illustration of H3]

H4: The effect in H3 (d1) is mediated by the current offer's valuation such that greed moderates the impact of value difference on valuation (Moderated Mediation Hypothesis) (d2)

H5: Dispositional greed influences purchase likelihood through overall levels of valuation (e, f) (Mediation Hypothesis II)

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
The participants will be responding to 6 scenarios. DV: Purchase Likelihood (= the self-reported intention to take up an offer): Measured on "How likely is it that you will take the offer?" (0 = not at all to 10 = extremely). Mediator Variable: Valuation (= the self-reported valuation of an offer): Measured on "Forgetting for a moment the initial offer that was available, how valuable would you rate the current offer now?" (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 within-participant conditions (value difference: large vs. small); Value Difference = the difference in value between the first offer that was missed, and the second offer. For each scenario, participants will be randomly assigned to one of the two value difference conditions (large vs. small). In total, each participant will be presented with 3 small and 3 large value difference scenarios.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
Multilevel models with repeated measures (level 1) nested in subjects (level 2) will be used. The models will be fitted by using Maximum Likelihood estimation and robust Huber-White standard errors within the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012). Indirect and direct effects will be estimated according to Hayes (2013) (Moderated Mediation) by using lavaan. The significance level will be set to α = .05 throughout all analyses. The dispositional greed variable will be centered. The value difference conditions will be coded with -1 and 1.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
Participants will be excluded if one (or more) of the following is true: Age below 18, Indications of English competencies that do not reach a B1 (intermediate) level of proficiency, The participant did not finish the study, Participant showed a total response time for the whole survey that is shorter than 1 minute, The participant reported major technical problems

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-within ANOVA interface (Faul et al., 2009) was conducted to

estimate the required sample size. For a small effect size of f = .08 and power of .95, a sample size of N = 510 participants would be necessary for a between-within interaction in G*Power. This effect size is roughly half of the inaction inertia main effect (~dz = .35), which one would expect based on the ordinal interaction effect size discussed by Roger Giner-Sorolla. (https://approachingblog.wordpress.com/2018/01/24/powering-your-interaction-2/). This N is also sufficient for a correlation of 0.15 to become significant, if there only is a main effect of greed. We decided to oversample to a total of 550 in case of drop outs due to our exclusion criteria. Data acquisition will be done via prolific (https://www.prolific.co/) and we will request 550 participants.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
Aside from the main variables, age, gender, country, English level, highest degree/ level of school, and additional comments will be recorded.