Correction to Stahl, Klauer, & Erdfelder (2008) 'Matching bias in the selection task is not eliminated by explicit negations'

Christoph Stahl[1], Karl Christoph Klauer[2], & Edgar Erdfelder[3]

[1] University of Cologne

[2] University of Freiburg

[3] University of Mannheim

Author Note

Christoph Stahl, Department of Psychology. Karl Christoph Klauer, Institute for Psychology. Edgar Erdfelder, Department of Psychology, School of Social Sciences.

We are grateful to Phil Johnson-Laird for bringing the discrepancies in the reported results to our attention.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christoph Stahl, Herbert-Lewin-Str. 2, D-50931 Cologne, Germany. E-mail: christoph.stahl@uni-koeln.de

Abstract

This document reproduces the analyses and corrects the results reported in Stahl, Klauer, & Erdfelder (2008). There were some reporting errors in the article (due to use of an incorrect data file version) that are corrected below. The corrections affect neither the pattern of results discussed nor the conclusions drawn in the article. Raw data and additional material can be obtained at http://osf.io/q5ssw.

Correction to Stahl, Klauer, & Erdfelder (2008) 'Matching bias in the selection task is not eliminated by explicit negations'

There were some reporting errors in Stahl et al. (2008) that were due to use of an incorrect data file version in the original analyses. They are corrected below. The corrections affect neither the pattern of results discussed nor the conclusions drawn in the article. Raw data and additional material can be obtained at http://osf.io/q5ssw.[1]

The correct number of participants in the 8 groups of Experiment 2 is 351, 343, 339, 308, 326, 348, 300, and 346 (p. 288). In Table 1 (p. 291), the correct values for AMI, CMI, and LI for Experiment 2 are 0.16, 0.20, and 0.37 for the implicit-negation condition, as well as 0.05, 0.10, and 0.31 for the explicit-negation condition (and the correct values of the rescaled indices discussed on p. 295 are therefore 0.64 and 0.80). The correct statistics for the t-tests against zero for these indices (reported on p. 292) are: 7.55, 9.83, and 12.79 (df=1340, all $ps < .001$) for the implicit-negation condition; and 2.61, 4.41, and 11.09 (df=1319, all $ps < .01$) for the explicit-negation condition. The correct statistics for the difference between implicit and explicit conditions are, for the AMI, $t = 3.36$, $p = .001$; for the CMI, $t = 3.60$, $p < .001$; and for the LI, $t = 1.62$, $p = .106$ ($df = 2659$). The correct effect sizes for AMI and CMI (discussed on p. 295) are $d = 0.07$ and $d = 0.12$, which (assuming $\alpha = .05$ and $\beta = .80$) require samples sizes of 1263 and 431 for detection; given $N = 32$ and $\alpha = .05$, these effect sizes can be detected with negligible power (0.10 and 0.16). In Table A2 (Appendix), the correct estimates (and 95% CIs) for parameter a in Experiment 1 are (for conditions A3, An3, nA3, nAn3, respectively): 0.79 (0.71, 0.87), 0.73 (0.62, 0.85), 0.55 (0.43, 0.66), 0.74 (0.64, 0.84); and the correct estimates for parameter sn in the explicit-negation groups of Experiment 2 are: 1 (0, 1), 0.32 (0, 1), 0 (0, 1), 0.45 (0.13, 0.77). None of the above corrections affected the article's substantive conclusions.

[1] The present analyses used R (3.3.1, R Core Team, 2016) and the R-packages *MPTinR* (1.10.3, Singmann & Kellen, 2013), *papaja* (0.1.0.9456, Aust & Barth, 2016), *snow* (Knaus, 2015; 0.4.2, Tierney, Rossini, Li, & Sevcikova, 2016), and *snowfall* (1.84.6.1, Knaus, 2015).

References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2016). *Papaja: Create apa manuscripts with rmarkdown*. Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

Knaus, J. (2015). *Snowfall: Easier cluster computing (based on snow)*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=snowfall

R Core Team. (2016). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Singmann, H., & Kellen, D. (2013). MPTinR: analysis of multinomial processing tree models in r. *Behavior Research Methods*, *45*(2), 560–575. doi:10.3758/s13428-012-0259-0

Stahl, C., Klauer, K. C., & Erdfelder, E. (2008). Matching bias in the selection task is not eliminated by explicit negations. *Thinking & Reasoning*, *14*(3), 281–303.

Tierney, L., Rossini, A. J., Li, N., & Sevcikova, H. (2016). *Snow: Simple network of workstations*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=snow