**Study 1a Online replication:**

* Human vs. Algorithm
  + Subject/theme: Do we see Algorithm Aversion?
* Data Collection Dates: 13 March 2020 – 30 March 2020
* Number of participants: 49

Hypotheses:

|  |
| --- |
| H1: Participants will choose human more after seeing algorithm err.   * Analysis: T-test, *t*(48) = -.73, *p* = .468 * Finding: No statistically significant advisor choice difference   + 52.4% human advisor choice |
| H2: Human advice will have a greater impact on participant confidence after seeing the algorithmic advisor err.  H2.1 We predict that advice type will have a significantly different effect on participant confidence.   * Analysis: 2x2 ANOVA (DV: Confidence Difference between cj1 and cj2) * Findings:   + No significant finding for advisor type     - *F*(1,48) = 0.756, *p* = .389   + Significant finding for advice type (agree vs. disagree)     - *F*(1,48) = 101.31, *p* < .001   + No significant finding for the interaction     - *F*(1,48) = 1.379, *p* = .246 |
| H3: Algorithm aversion will occur after observed algorithmic errors   * Analysis: 2x2 ANOVA (DV: Choosing algorithmic advisor in next choice trial) * Findings:   + No significant finding for advisor type (human vs. computer)     - *F*(1,48) = 3.356, *p* = .073   + No significant findings for advice type (previously correct or incorrect)     - F(1,48) = 0.075, p = .786   + No significant finding for the interaction     - *F*(1,48) = 3.661, p = .071 |

|  |
| --- |
| H3: (Continued)   * New Analysis 2: 2x2 ANOVA (DV: Choosing previous forced advisor in next choice trial) * Findings:   + No significant finding for advisor type (human vs. computer)     - *F(1,48) = 0.318, p = .575*   + No significant finding for advice type (previously correct or incorrect)     - *F*(1,24) = 15.12, *p* = .062   + No significant finding for the interaction     - *F* < 1 |
| H4: If the participant is not confident themselves, they will be more likely to choose the algorithmic advisor   * Analysis: 1x4 ANOVA (Sphericity Assumed, χ2 (5) = 40.702, *p* < .001) * Findings:   + No significant finding for confidence as a predictor of choosing the computer advisor. Very narrowly non-significant.     - F(1,46) = 3.156, p = .051 |

Follow-on analyses (FOA) for 1a:

|  |
| --- |
| FOA1: Participants will choose the advisor that more influences them, more often   * Analysis: Correlation, *r*(47) = 0.512, *p* < .001 * Findings: Significant finding for the correlation. The correlation shows that whichever advisor the participants were more influenced by is the one they chose more often. However, there is a large degree of variability. |
| FOA2: Observed early experience with an advisor will influence subsequent advisor choice   * Analysis: Correlation, *r*(47) = 0.355, *p* = 0.011 * Findings: The correlation shows that the more accurate an advisor was early in the study, the more likely the participant was to choose that advisor |

H5: As confidence increases, the objective accuracy of the participant increase

* Analysis: 1x4 ANOVA (Sphericity Assumed, χ2 (5) = 75.345, *p* < .001)
* Findings:
  + Significant finding that participant confidence are well-calibrated to their accuracy.
    - F(1,46) = 13.323, p < .001