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set1field1 = Do people think differently about advertising campaigns when they are induced to send them themselves compared to when they receive them?

set1field2 = Participants read about a fictional new email client that allows its early adopters to send referral invitations to their friends to sign up for the service. In one group, participants had to imagine that they were the person sending the referral invitations. In the other group, participants had to imagine that they were the person receiving the referral invitations. Afterwards, participants indicated how acceptable the act of sending the product referral was.

set1field3 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*more\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set1field4 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*less\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set1field5 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*equally\* acceptable when they send the product referral themselves as when they are the receiver

set1field6 = Imagine that the first team of researchers found that participants think the act of sending the product referral is less acceptable when they send the referral themselves. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does watching an advertisement for a company affect the viewer’s decision to recommend the company, the advertised product and other products from that company?

set1field2 = While watching a video, participants were shown an advertisement. In one group, this was an advertisement for McDonald’s. In the other group, this was an advertisement for another company (Prudential). Participants were later asked a number of questions about their own and others’ preferences and habits related to McDonald’s and its products.

set1field3 = Participants were \*more\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set1field4 = Participants were \*less\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set1field5 = Participants were \*equally\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Do people respond to personal questions more or less socially desirably when they are asked to answer questions quickly or slowly?

set1field2 = Participants had to answer questions about their personality and personal attitudes. In one group, participants had to read and answer each question in less than 11 seconds. In the other group, participants had to read and answer each question for more than 11 seconds.

set1field3 = Participants responded to personal questions \*more\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set1field4 = Participants responded to personal questions \*less\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set1field5 = Participants responded to personal questions \*equally\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly as when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants responded to personal questions more socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does seeing past election data including information about the state of the country at the time of election affect predictions about future election outcomes?

set1field2 = Participants were asked to make predictions about what conditions predict election outcomes for Republicans in the United States House of Representatives. In one group, participants provided their predictions without any additional information. In the other group, participants provided their predictions after seeing a table that listed the results of past elections and information such as unemployment, economic growth, and inflation. For each listed condition (e.g. whether average GDP growth was relatively high or low), participants were asked to indicate whether they thought that condition would lead to Republicans winning seats, losing seats, or being unrelated to election outcomes.

set1field3 = Participants make \*more\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set1field4 = Participants make \*less\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set1field5 = Participants make \*equally\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with or without the opportunity to explore past election data

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants make less complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does the gender of a person interacting in a same-sex sexual act influence how their sexual orientation is rated?

set1field2 = Participants read twelve scenarios describing partly sexual interactions between a person and someone of the same sex. In one group, the person described in the scenarios was a man. In the other group, the person described in the scenarios was a woman. After each scenario, participants were asked to assess the sexual orientation of the person.

set1field3 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*more\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set1field4 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*less\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set1field5 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*equally\* indicative of homosexuality of men as that of women

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants assess same-sex interactions as more indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Do people judge the fairness of a punishment based on the absolute penalty or on the relative penalty?

set1field2 = Participants read about two men Alan (who earns 50$ an hour) and Bob (who earns 25$ an hour), who were issued traffic tickets for running a red light. In one group, Alan gets a ticket of $150 and Bob gets a ticket of $100. In the other group, Alan gets a ticket requesting 3 hours of community service and Bob gets a ticket requesting 4 hours of community service. Participants first rated how fair they think this arrangement is. Participants are then told that time and money sometimes is considered interchangeable and that Alan’s $50/hour salary makes his $150 traffic ticket equivalent to 3 hours of working time, while Bob’s $25/hour salary makes his $100 traffic ticket equivalent to 4 hours of working time. After this, participants are asked to make the same judgment of fairness again.

set1field3 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set1field4 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants did not update their judgment once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set1field5 = Participants thought the punishment was equally fair to both Alan and Bob, regardless of the framing.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.
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set1field1 = Does a moment of feeling ostracized have an impact on people’s general trust in others?

set1field2 = Participants played an online game where they virtually toss a ball in a playground. In one group, participants played with two (computer-controlled) players who first tossed the ball twice to the participant and then solely tossed the ball to each other, so that the participants in this group were ostracized. In the other group, participants received the ball as often as the two other players. After thirty throws, the game was over and participants were asked to report in general how much they trust other people, how fairly other people treat them and how helpful other people are to them.

set1field3 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*more\* than participants who were not ostracized

set1field4 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*less\* than participants who were not ostracized

set1field5 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*as much\* as participants who were not ostracized

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were ostracized trust others less than participants who were not ostracized. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does experiencing an Aha! moment in relation to a claim affect people’s tendency to agree with that claim?

set1field2 = In one group, participants were asked to unscramble words that were part of a claim. In the other group, participants were presented with the claim without any scrambled words. Afterwards, participants had to rate how likely the claims were to be true.

set1field3 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*more\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set1field4 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*less\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set1field5 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*equally\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as more likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does a change in appearance affect the perception of remorse for past transgressors?

set1field2 = Participants read about 4 targets who committed different transgressions (drug use, DUI, burglary, violent assault). For each target, participants viewed two photos, the first taken right after the transgression and the second a few years later. In one group, the photos showed that the targets had incurred an appearance change since the transgression (weight gain or loss, or hair growth or cut). In the other group, there was no change in the targets’ appearance. Afterwards, participants rated how remorseful the targets seemed.

set1field3 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*more\* remorseful

set1field4 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*less\* remorseful

set1field5 = Targets with and without appearance change were perceived as \*equally\* remorseful

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as more remorseful. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does the framing of a comparison between teams affect qualification ratings?

set1field2 = Participants had to imagine that they were a manager at a large technology firm and that they needed to choose a team for a project. In one group, participants read that “Team A is more qualified than Team B”. In the other group, participants read that “Team B is less qualified than Team A”. Afterwards, participants had to rate how qualified they found Team B.

set1field3 = Participants who read that Team A is \*more\* qualified than Team B will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set1field4 = Participants who read that Team B is \*less\* qualified than Team A will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set1field5 = Participants in both groups will rate Team B \*equally\* qualified

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rate Team B as less qualified when Team B is described as less qualified than Team A than when Team A is described as more qualified than Team B. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does the variety of taken objects affect perceptions of greed?

set1field2 = Participants had to imagine they were attending an event where coffee and three different types of cookies were provided. They also read that the norm was to take one cookie per person. In one group, participants then read that the person in front of them took three cookies, one of each flavor. In the other group, participants read that the person in front of them took three cookies of the same flavor. Afterwards, participants had to indicate how greedy they found the person in front of them.

set1field3 = Participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group.

set1field4 = Participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group.

set1field5 = Participants in both groups judged the person taking the cookies as \*equally\* greedy.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants judged a person taking three of the same cookies greedier than a person taking three cookies of different flavors. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does a warning about follow-up questions affect whether people report engaging in activities?

set1field2 = Participants completed an online questionnaire on various topics. In one group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and received no additional information. In the other group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and were then warned that if they answered that they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, they would receive 20 follow-up questions. Afterwards, all participants answered the question on whether they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, and if yes, they also answered the 20 follow-up questions.

set1field3 = Participants who \*were not\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set1field4 = Participants who \*were\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set1field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Do people think that the difficulty to control behavior is affected by whether the cause is neurological damage or genetic damage?

set1field2 = Participants read a scenario in which someone causes a serious bodily injury in a fight. In one group, that person is born with a gene defect causing them to have below-average self-control. In the other group, that person suffered a minor brain damage as an adult causing them to have below-average self-control. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they would find that person guilty of assault.

set1field3 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*more\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set1field4 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*less\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set1field5 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*as often\* as participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty more often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does using the word “denier” to describe people who don't believe in global warming affect judgments about whether the person describing himself believes in global warming?

set1field2 = Participants had to read a scenario in which a researcher describes peoples’ opinions about global warming. In one group, the researcher in the scenario describes people who do not believe global warming is happening as “deniers”. In the other group, the researcher in the scenario is not using the term “denier”. Afterwards, participants indicated whether they thought the researcher believed that global warming is happening.

set1field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*more\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set1field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*less\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set1field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*equally\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it more likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than targets who read the scenario in which the term "denier" was not used. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Are people more likely to blame an uncontrollable factor as the cause of bad behavior or as the cause of good behavior?

set1field2 = Participants had to read a scenario about a person who was diagnosed with a brain tumor. In one group, the person in the scenario was behaving well (i.e., donating money to charity). In the other group, the person in the scenario was behaving badly (i.e., shoplifting). Afterwards, the participants rated to what extent the person in the scenario was responsible for their actions.

set1field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*more\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set1field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*less\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set1field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*equally\* responsible as targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them more responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set1field1 = Does changing group membership affect people’s attachment to a group?

set1field2 = Participants had to memorize a list of names from people who were part of the “green group” and the “blue group”. Participants in one group were told that they are part of the green group. Participants in the other group were told that they were part of the blue group. After the participants spent some time learning the names, they were assigned to either the green or the blue group again. This time, half of the participants were assigned to the same group. The other half of the participants were assigned to the other group. They then spent some time learning the names again. Afterwards, they had to complete a task in which they should indicate how strongly they would agree to different options on how bonus points should be distributed to each group (e.g., 220 bonus points to the green group and 180 bonus points to the blue group).

set1field3 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*more\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set1field4 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*less\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set1field5 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options in which their current group receives more bonus points \*as much\* as participants who were assigned to the same group

set1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options less in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is people’s ability to solve difficult reasoning problems influenced by how easy-to-read the font of the questionnaire is?

oset1field2 = Participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire with reasoning problems. In one group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was easy to read. In the other group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was difficult to read.

oset1field3 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*easy\* to read

oset1field4 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*hard\* to read

oset1field5 = Participants solved \*equally\* many of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was easy to read as when it was difficult to read

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was hard to read. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Do social comparisons influence people’s well-being?

oset1field2 = Participants were shown a ladder with 10 rungs and were told: “Think of the ladder above as representing where people stand in the important groups to which they belong.” In one group, participants were asked to compare themselves in terms of their own respect, admiration and influence to the people at the bottom rung of the ladder. In the other group, participants were asked to compare themselves to the people at the top rung of the ladder. Afterwards, participants had to report their subjective well-being.

oset1field3 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*higher\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset1field4 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*lower\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset1field5 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report the \*same\* level of subjective well-being as those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants reported higher subjective well-being when comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Do people trust others more or less when a resource dilemma is framed as participants being consumers rather than individuals?

oset1field2 = Participants read about a water crisis that affects four individuals, and were asked to role-play one of the participants. In one group, the persons involved in the crisis were referred to as consumers (Consumer A, Consumer B, etc). In the other group, these persons were instead referred to as individuals (Individual A, Individual B, etc). Participants were given information about how much of the shared water they had used up already and were told that they had used up more water than the others. Participants were then asked to report how much they trusted the other parties involved to use less water.

oset1field3 = Participants trust others \*more\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset1field4 = Participants trust others \*less\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset1field5 = Participants trust others \*equally\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers or as individuals

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants trust others less when participants are framed as consumers compared to individuals. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Are people’s estimations of numbers influenced by unrelated numbers that are incidentally present in the environment?

oset1field2 = Participants read a description about a new cell phone. In one group, the cell phone was called P17. In the other group, the cell phone was called P97. Afterwards, participants predicted its proportion of sales.

oset1field3 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*higher\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset1field4 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*lower\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset1field5 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted the \*same\* proportion of sales as targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a higher proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is perceived power related to the vertical location of a person?

oset1field2 = Participants studied a schematic display of the hierarchy within an organization, including a manager and his team. In one group, the vertical line connecting the manager to the team was long (i.e., 7 cm). In the other group, the vertical line was short (i.e., 2 cm). Afterwards, participants estimated how much power they thought the manager held within the organization.

oset1field3 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*more\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset1field4 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*less\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset1field5 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*as much\* power within the organization as targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold more power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is the perceived responsibility of someone doing harm influenced by how old the person is?

oset1field2 = Participants read a short text about a harm-doer (Sam) and a victim (Roger): “Imagine that Sam pushes a tray of glasses off a table. They shatter and one of the shards cuts into Roger’s leg.” In one group, participants see the harm doer as a 5-year-old while the victim is 25 years old. In the other group, the harm doer is instead 25 years old, while the victim is 5 years old. Participants then indicate how responsible the harm doer was for his behavior.

oset1field3 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*more\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset1field4 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*less\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset1field5 = Participants believe that the older harm doer and the younger harm doer are \*equally\* responsible

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants believe that the older harm doer is more responsible than the younger harm doer. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot4 = Other

Effect4 = Gray2001

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer4 Is Equal to 7

EmbeddedData

oset1field1 = Is the permissibility of harming an individual for the greater good affected by whether the action of harming is a direct means or a foreseen side effect of the action?

oset1field2 = Participants read two moral scenarios in which a train is about to hit and kill five people on the tracks. In the first scenario, the target (Denise) can pull a switch to turn the train to another track that will only kill one person instead of five. In the second scenario, the target (Frank) can shove a large man from a footbridge onto the tracks, killing only this man instead of five. For both scenarios, participants are asked to indicate whether or not it is morally permissible to act (pull the switch / shove the man) rather than refrain from acting.

oset1field3 = Participants are \*more\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset1field4 = Participants are \*less\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset1field5 = Participants are \*equally\* likely to say that shoving the man and pulling the switch are morally permissible

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants are less likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot4 = Other

Effect4 = Hauser2007

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer4 Is Equal to 8

EmbeddedData

oset1field1 = Do people evaluate someone’s generosity with respect to a gift based on its absolute cost or its relative cost?

oset1field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to study abroad and had received a goodbye gift from a friend. In one group, the gift was a wool coat from a store with wool coats in the price range of $50-$500 (with the worst coat being the cheapest and the best coat the most expensive), with the gift costing $55. In the other group, the gift was a wool scarf from a store with wool scarfs in the price range of $5-$50 (with the worst scarf being the cheapest and the best scarf the most expensive) with the gift costing $45. Participants were then asked to rate how generous their friend was.

oset1field3 = Participants rate their friend as \*more\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset1field4 = Participants rate their friend as \*less\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset1field5 = Participants rate their friend as \*equally\* generous in the two groups

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rated their friend as less generous in the wool coat group than in the scarf group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is people’s willingness to achieve a goal affected by whether the concept of structure or the concept of randomness is active in their minds?

oset1field2 = Participants were asked to list their most important long-term goal. Then, the participants had to read a short article on the growth of tree leaves. In one group, the article described the growth of tree leaves as a structured process. In the other group, the article described the growth of trees as a random process. Afterwards, participants were asked to indicate their willingness to pursue their long-term goal.

oset1field3 = Participants in the structured process group were \*more\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset1field4 = Participants in the structured process group were \*less\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset1field5 = Participants in the two groups were \*equally\* motivated to pursue their goal

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more motivated to pursue their goal in the structured process group than in the random process group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does reading literary fiction affect people's understanding of other people's emotions?

oset1field2 = Participants read a short text passage. In one group, the text passage was literary fiction. In the other group, the text passage was non-fiction. Afterwards, participants had to identify people's expressed emotion (e.g., happy, angry) based on images of the eyes only.

oset1field3 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*better\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset1field4 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*worse\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset1field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* good at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that people who read literary fiction were better at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is the perception of intentionality of actions affected by whether the consequences are positive or negative?

oset1field2 = People in a Manhattan park were told about a company chairman who started a new program to increase profits. In one group, participants heard that the program would also harm the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. In the other group, participants heard that the program would also help the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they thought the chairman intentionally harmed/helped the environment.

oset1field3 = Participants in the ‘harm’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment than participants in the ‘help’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment.

oset1field4 = Participants in the ‘help’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment than participants in the ‘harm’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment.

oset1field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to see the chairman’s decision as intentional.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in the harm group were more likely to say that the chairman’s decision was intentional than participants in the help group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does knowing the wealth of one’s group members affect decisions to reduce inequality?

oset1field2 = In a game, participants could share resources with co-players or keep it to themselves. At the start of the game, the resources were distributed unevenly between the players. In one group, participants saw the amount of resources of other players. In the other group, participants only saw their own resources. Participants played 10 rounds in which they could either cooperate with the other players, or keep their own money.

oset1field3 = If participants knew the amount of resources from other players, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset1field4 = If participants only knew their own resources, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset1field5 = Inequality stayed \*equally\* high when participants did and didn’t know the resources of the other players

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that inequality stayed higher when the wealth of other players was visible than when it was invisible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does imagining to tempt fate affect people’s estimation of the likelihood of negative consequences?

oset1field2 = Participants imagined a scenario in which they would come to a lecture in which the professor picks out one student to answer a difficult question in front of the entire class. In one group, participants imagined that they tempted fate by coming to the lecture unprepared. In the other group, participants imagined that they came to the lecture prepared. Afterwards, participants had to estimate how likely it was that they would get chosen.

oset1field3 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*more\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset1field4 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*less\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset1field5 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*equally\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was more likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Is people’s own preference related to their estimation of consensus?

oset1field2 = Participants read one out of four scenarios in which they have to make a choice between two actions. For instance, when leaving a supermarket, they are asked to give their opinion and state that they are positive about this supermarket. In the story, they are then asked whether they would sign a contract to use their opinion for a commercial for the supermarket. First, participants had to indicate what percentage of their peers they thought would choose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse). Afterwards, participants indicated which option they would choose themselves (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse).

oset1field3 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*higher\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset1field4 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*lower\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset1field5 = People’s own choice was \*unrelated\* to their estimation of the percentage of peers that would choose either option.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who chose one action themselves, also estimated the percentage of peers to choose that option as higher than people who chose the other action. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does the certainty of receiving a prize affect the choice between a high emotionally valued prize and a low emotionally valued prize?

oset1field2 = Participants had to indicate which of two options they preferred: the opportunity to meet and kiss their favorite movie star (high emotionally valued), or $50 in cash (low emotionally valued). In one group, participants read that they would certainly get their choice of the two options (100% probability). In the other group, participants read that they would have a 1% chance to get their choice of the options. Afterwards, participants indicated which of the two options they preferred.

oset1field3 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash).

oset1field4 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star).

oset1field5 = The certainty of getting either prize was not related to participants’ choices for the high or low emotionally valued prize.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that under uncertainty, participants preferred the high emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the low emotionally valued option ($50 in cash). If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot4 = Other

Effect4 = Rottenstreich2001

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer4 Is Equal to 16

EmbeddedData

oset1field1 = Do conversational norms affect the way that people use the accessibility of specific and general information?

oset1field2 = Participants had to complete a survey on well-being. In one group, participants first answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life. In the other group, participants answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life, their work life and leisure time. Afterwards, all participants answered how satisfied they were with their life as a whole.

oset1field3 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives (marriage and dating) reported \*higher\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives (marriage and dating, work, and leisure).

oset1field4 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported \*lower\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset1field5 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported the \*same\* amount of satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported higher satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does poverty affect people’s attention?

oset1field2 = Participants played the game “Wheel of Fortune”, a game in which people have to guess letters in word puzzles. In one group, participants were given 6 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘poor’ players). In the other group, participants were given 20 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘rich’ players). Afterwards, they completed an attention task.

oset1field3 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*worse\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset1field4 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*better\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset1field5 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed the \*same\* as participants who were given a lot of chances in the subsequent attention task.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed worse in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Are people’s judgements of how similar two concepts are influenced by the order in which they were mentioned?

oset1field2 = Participants rated how similar two countries were to each other (e.g., “How similar is the USA to Lebanon?”). One of the countries was well-known to the participants (e.g., the USA). The other country was less familiar to the participants (e.g., Lebanon). In one group, the well-known country was mentioned first. In the other group, the less known country was mentioned first.

oset1field3 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*more\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset1field4 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*less\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset1field5 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*equally\* similar as targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as less similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Do relative price differences affect buying decisions?

oset1field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to buy a jacket and a calculator when a salesperson informed them that the calculator was $5 cheaper in a store 20 minutes away. In one group, participants were told that the prices were $125 for the jacket and $15 for the calculator in the current store and $10 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 33%). In the other group, participants were told that the prices were $15 for the jacket and $125 for the calculator in the current store and $120 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 4%). Afterwards, the participants were asked whether they would make the trip to the other store.

oset1field3 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*more\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset1field4 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*less\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset1field5 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*equally\* likely to drive to the second store as participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were more likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset1field1 = Does feeling morally dirty affect people’s need to wash themselves?

oset1field2 = Participants hand copied a story written in the first person. In one group, participants rewrote an unethical short story about sabotaging a co-worker. In the other group, participants rewrote an ethical short story about helping a co-worker. Afterwards, participants expressed their desire for cleaning products (e.g., soap, toothpaste).

oset1field3 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*higher\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset1field4 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*lower\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset1field5 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had the \*same\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset1field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a higher desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Do people think differently about advertising campaigns when they are induced to send them themselves compared to when they receive them?

set2field2 = Participants read about a fictional new email client that allows its early adopters to send referral invitations to their friends to sign up for the service. In one group, participants had to imagine that they were the person sending the referral invitations. In the other group, participants had to imagine that they were the person receiving the referral invitations. Afterwards, participants indicated how acceptable the act of sending the product referral was.

set2field3 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*more\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set2field4 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*less\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set2field5 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*equally\* acceptable when they send the product referral themselves as when they are the receiver

set2field6 = Imagine that the first team of researchers found that participants think the act of sending the product referral is less acceptable when they send the referral themselves. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does watching an advertisement for a company affect the viewer’s decision to recommend the company, the advertised product and other products from that company?

set2field2 = While watching a video, participants were shown an advertisement. In one group, this was an advertisement for McDonald’s. In the other group, this was an advertisement for another company (Prudential). Participants were later asked a number of questions about their own and others’ preferences and habits related to McDonald’s and its products.

set2field3 = Participants were \*more\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set2field4 = Participants were \*less\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set2field5 = Participants were \*equally\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Do people respond to personal questions more or less socially desirably when they are asked to answer questions quickly or slowly?

set2field2 = Participants had to answer questions about their personality and personal attitudes. In one group, participants had to read and answer each question in less than 11 seconds. In the other group, participants had to read and answer each question for more than 11 seconds.

set2field3 = Participants responded to personal questions \*more\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set2field4 = Participants responded to personal questions \*less\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set2field5 = Participants responded to personal questions \*equally\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly as when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants responded to personal questions more socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does seeing past election data including information about the state of the country at the time of election affect predictions about future election outcomes?

set2field2 = Participants were asked to make predictions about what conditions predict election outcomes for Republicans in the United States House of Representatives. In one group, participants provided their predictions without any additional information. In the other group, participants provided their predictions after seeing a table that listed the results of past elections and information such as unemployment, economic growth, and inflation. For each listed condition (e.g. whether average GDP growth was relatively high or low), participants were asked to indicate whether they thought that condition would lead to Republicans winning seats, losing seats, or being unrelated to election outcomes.

set2field3 = Participants make \*more\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set2field4 = Participants make \*less\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set2field5 = Participants make \*equally\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with or without the opportunity to explore past election data

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants make less complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does the gender of a person interacting in a same-sex sexual act influence how their sexual orientation is rated?

set2field2 = Participants read twelve scenarios describing partly sexual interactions between a person and someone of the same sex. In one group, the person described in the scenarios was a man. In the other group, the person described in the scenarios was a woman. After each scenario, participants were asked to assess the sexual orientation of the person.

set2field3 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*more\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set2field4 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*less\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set2field5 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*equally\* indicative of homosexuality of men as that of women

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants assess same-sex interactions as more indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Do people judge the fairness of a punishment based on the absolute penalty or on the relative penalty?

set2field2 = Participants read about two men Alan (who earns 50$ an hour) and Bob (who earns 25$ an hour), who were issued traffic tickets for running a red light. In one group, Alan gets a ticket of $150 and Bob gets a ticket of $100. In the other group, Alan gets a ticket requesting 3 hours of community service and Bob gets a ticket requesting 4 hours of community service. Participants first rated how fair they think this arrangement is. Participants are then told that time and money sometimes is considered interchangeable and that Alan’s $50/hour salary makes his $150 traffic ticket equivalent to 3 hours of working time, while Bob’s $25/hour salary makes his $100 traffic ticket equivalent to 4 hours of working time. After this, participants are asked to make the same judgment of fairness again.

set2field3 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set2field4 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants did not update their judgment once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set2field5 = Participants thought the punishment was equally fair to both Alan and Bob, regardless of the framing.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.
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set2field1 = Does a moment of feeling ostracized have an impact on people’s general trust in others?

set2field2 = Participants played an online game where they virtually toss a ball in a playground. In one group, participants played with two (computer-controlled) players who first tossed the ball twice to the participant and then solely tossed the ball to each other, so that the participants in this group were ostracized. In the other group, participants received the ball as often as the two other players. After thirty throws, the game was over and participants were asked to report in general how much they trust other people, how fairly other people treat them and how helpful other people are to them.

set2field3 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*more\* than participants who were not ostracized

set2field4 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*less\* than participants who were not ostracized

set2field5 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*as much\* as participants who were not ostracized

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were ostracized trust others less than participants who were not ostracized. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does experiencing an Aha! moment in relation to a claim affect people’s tendency to agree with that claim?

set2field2 = In one group, participants were asked to unscramble words that were part of a claim. In the other group, participants were presented with the claim without any scrambled words. Afterwards, participants had to rate how likely the claims were to be true.

set2field3 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*more\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set2field4 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*less\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set2field5 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*equally\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as more likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does a change in appearance affect the perception of remorse for past transgressors?

set2field2 = Participants read about 4 targets who committed different transgressions (drug use, DUI, burglary, violent assault). For each target, participants viewed two photos, the first taken right after the transgression and the second a few years later. In one group, the photos showed that the targets had incurred an appearance change since the transgression (weight gain or loss, or hair growth or cut). In the other group, there was no change in the targets’ appearance. Afterwards, participants rated how remorseful the targets seemed.

set2field3 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*more\* remorseful

set2field4 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*less\* remorseful

set2field5 = Targets with and without appearance change were perceived as \*equally\* remorseful

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as more remorseful. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does the framing of a comparison between teams affect qualification ratings?

set2field2 = Participants had to imagine that they were a manager at a large technology firm and that they needed to choose a team for a project. In one group, participants read that “Team A is more qualified than Team B”. In the other group, participants read that “Team B is less qualified than Team A”. Afterwards, participants had to rate how qualified they found Team B.

set2field3 = Participants who read that Team A is \*more\* qualified than Team B will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set2field4 = Participants who read that Team B is \*less\* qualified than Team A will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set2field5 = Participants in both groups will rate Team B \*equally\* qualified

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rate Team B as less qualified when Team B is described as less qualified than Team A than when Team A is described as more qualified than Team B. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does the variety of taken objects affect perceptions of greed?

set2field2 = Participants had to imagine they were attending an event where coffee and three different types of cookies were provided. They also read that the norm was to take one cookie per person. In one group, participants then read that the person in front of them took three cookies, one of each flavor. In the other group, participants read that the person in front of them took three cookies of the same flavor. Afterwards, participants had to indicate how greedy they found the person in front of them.

set2field3 = Participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group.

set2field4 = Participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group.

set2field5 = Participants in both groups judged the person taking the cookies as \*equally\* greedy.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants judged a person taking three of the same cookies greedier than a person taking three cookies of different flavors. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does a warning about follow-up questions affect whether people report engaging in activities?

set2field2 = Participants completed an online questionnaire on various topics. In one group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and received no additional information. In the other group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and were then warned that if they answered that they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, they would receive 20 follow-up questions. Afterwards, all participants answered the question on whether they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, and if yes, they also answered the 20 follow-up questions.

set2field3 = Participants who \*were not\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set2field4 = Participants who \*were\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set2field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Do people think that the difficulty to control behavior is affected by whether the cause is neurological damage or genetic damage?

set2field2 = Participants read a scenario in which someone causes a serious bodily injury in a fight. In one group, that person is born with a gene defect causing them to have below-average self-control. In the other group, that person suffered a minor brain damage as an adult causing them to have below-average self-control. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they would find that person guilty of assault.

set2field3 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*more\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set2field4 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*less\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set2field5 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*as often\* as participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty more often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does using the word “denier” to describe people who don't believe in global warming affect judgments about whether the person describing himself believes in global warming?

set2field2 = Participants had to read a scenario in which a researcher describes peoples’ opinions about global warming. In one group, the researcher in the scenario describes people who do not believe global warming is happening as “deniers”. In the other group, the researcher in the scenario is not using the term “denier”. Afterwards, participants indicated whether they thought the researcher believed that global warming is happening.

set2field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*more\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set2field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*less\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set2field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*equally\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it more likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than targets who read the scenario in which the term "denier" was not used. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Are people more likely to blame an uncontrollable factor as the cause of bad behavior or as the cause of good behavior?

set2field2 = Participants had to read a scenario about a person who was diagnosed with a brain tumor. In one group, the person in the scenario was behaving well (i.e., donating money to charity). In the other group, the person in the scenario was behaving badly (i.e., shoplifting). Afterwards, the participants rated to what extent the person in the scenario was responsible for their actions.

set2field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*more\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set2field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*less\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set2field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*equally\* responsible as targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them more responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set2field1 = Does changing group membership affect people’s attachment to a group?

set2field2 = Participants had to memorize a list of names from people who were part of the “green group” and the “blue group”. Participants in one group were told that they are part of the green group. Participants in the other group were told that they were part of the blue group. After the participants spent some time learning the names, they were assigned to either the green or the blue group again. This time, half of the participants were assigned to the same group. The other half of the participants were assigned to the other group. They then spent some time learning the names again. Afterwards, they had to complete a task in which they should indicate how strongly they would agree to different options on how bonus points should be distributed to each group (e.g., 220 bonus points to the green group and 180 bonus points to the blue group).

set2field3 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*more\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set2field4 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*less\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set2field5 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options in which their current group receives more bonus points \*as much\* as participants who were assigned to the same group

set2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options less in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is people’s ability to solve difficult reasoning problems influenced by how easy-to-read the font of the questionnaire is?

oset2field2 = Participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire with reasoning problems. In one group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was easy to read. In the other group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was difficult to read.

oset2field3 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*easy\* to read

oset2field4 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*hard\* to read

oset2field5 = Participants solved \*equally\* many of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was easy to read as when it was difficult to read

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was hard to read. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Do social comparisons influence people’s well-being?

oset2field2 = Participants were shown a ladder with 10 rungs and were told: “Think of the ladder above as representing where people stand in the important groups to which they belong.” In one group, participants were asked to compare themselves in terms of their own respect, admiration and influence to the people at the bottom rung of the ladder. In the other group, participants were asked to compare themselves to the people at the top rung of the ladder. Afterwards, participants had to report their subjective well-being.

oset2field3 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*higher\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset2field4 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*lower\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset2field5 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report the \*same\* level of subjective well-being as those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants reported higher subjective well-being when comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Do people trust others more or less when a resource dilemma is framed as participants being consumers rather than individuals?

oset2field2 = Participants read about a water crisis that affects four individuals, and were asked to role-play one of the participants. In one group, the persons involved in the crisis were referred to as consumers (Consumer A, Consumer B, etc). In the other group, these persons were instead referred to as individuals (Individual A, Individual B, etc). Participants were given information about how much of the shared water they had used up already and were told that they had used up more water than the others. Participants were then asked to report how much they trusted the other parties involved to use less water.

oset2field3 = Participants trust others \*more\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset2field4 = Participants trust others \*less\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset2field5 = Participants trust others \*equally\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers or as individuals

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants trust others less when participants are framed as consumers compared to individuals. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Are people’s estimations of numbers influenced by unrelated numbers that are incidentally present in the environment?

oset2field2 = Participants read a description about a new cell phone. In one group, the cell phone was called P17. In the other group, the cell phone was called P97. Afterwards, participants predicted its proportion of sales.

oset2field3 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*higher\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset2field4 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*lower\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset2field5 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted the \*same\* proportion of sales as targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a higher proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is perceived power related to the vertical location of a person?

oset2field2 = Participants studied a schematic display of the hierarchy within an organization, including a manager and his team. In one group, the vertical line connecting the manager to the team was long (i.e., 7 cm). In the other group, the vertical line was short (i.e., 2 cm). Afterwards, participants estimated how much power they thought the manager held within the organization.

oset2field3 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*more\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset2field4 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*less\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset2field5 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*as much\* power within the organization as targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold more power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is the perceived responsibility of someone doing harm influenced by how old the person is?

oset2field2 = Participants read a short text about a harm-doer (Sam) and a victim (Roger): “Imagine that Sam pushes a tray of glasses off a table. They shatter and one of the shards cuts into Roger’s leg.” In one group, participants see the harm doer as a 5-year-old while the victim is 25 years old. In the other group, the harm doer is instead 25 years old, while the victim is 5 years old. Participants then indicate how responsible the harm doer was for his behavior.

oset2field3 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*more\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset2field4 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*less\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset2field5 = Participants believe that the older harm doer and the younger harm doer are \*equally\* responsible

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants believe that the older harm doer is more responsible than the younger harm doer. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is the permissibility of harming an individual for the greater good affected by whether the action of harming is a direct means or a foreseen side effect of the action?

oset2field2 = Participants read two moral scenarios in which a train is about to hit and kill five people on the tracks. In the first scenario, the target (Denise) can pull a switch to turn the train to another track that will only kill one person instead of five. In the second scenario, the target (Frank) can shove a large man from a footbridge onto the tracks, killing only this man instead of five. For both scenarios, participants are asked to indicate whether or not it is morally permissible to act (pull the switch / shove the man) rather than refrain from acting.

oset2field3 = Participants are \*more\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset2field4 = Participants are \*less\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset2field5 = Participants are \*equally\* likely to say that shoving the man and pulling the switch are morally permissible

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants are less likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Do people evaluate someone’s generosity with respect to a gift based on its absolute cost or its relative cost?

oset2field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to study abroad and had received a goodbye gift from a friend. In one group, the gift was a wool coat from a store with wool coats in the price range of $50-$500 (with the worst coat being the cheapest and the best coat the most expensive), with the gift costing $55. In the other group, the gift was a wool scarf from a store with wool scarfs in the price range of $5-$50 (with the worst scarf being the cheapest and the best scarf the most expensive) with the gift costing $45. Participants were then asked to rate how generous their friend was.

oset2field3 = Participants rate their friend as \*more\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset2field4 = Participants rate their friend as \*less\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset2field5 = Participants rate their friend as \*equally\* generous in the two groups

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rated their friend as less generous in the wool coat group than in the scarf group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is people’s willingness to achieve a goal affected by whether the concept of structure or the concept of randomness is active in their minds?

oset2field2 = Participants were asked to list their most important long-term goal. Then, the participants had to read a short article on the growth of tree leaves. In one group, the article described the growth of tree leaves as a structured process. In the other group, the article described the growth of trees as a random process. Afterwards, participants were asked to indicate their willingness to pursue their long-term goal.

oset2field3 = Participants in the structured process group were \*more\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset2field4 = Participants in the structured process group were \*less\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset2field5 = Participants in the two groups were \*equally\* motivated to pursue their goal

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more motivated to pursue their goal in the structured process group than in the random process group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does reading literary fiction affect people's understanding of other people's emotions?

oset2field2 = Participants read a short text passage. In one group, the text passage was literary fiction. In the other group, the text passage was non-fiction. Afterwards, participants had to identify people's expressed emotion (e.g., happy, angry) based on images of the eyes only.

oset2field3 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*better\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset2field4 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*worse\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset2field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* good at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that people who read literary fiction were better at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is the perception of intentionality of actions affected by whether the consequences are positive or negative?

oset2field2 = People in a Manhattan park were told about a company chairman who started a new program to increase profits. In one group, participants heard that the program would also harm the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. In the other group, participants heard that the program would also help the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they thought the chairman intentionally harmed/helped the environment.

oset2field3 = Participants in the ‘harm’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment than participants in the ‘help’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment.

oset2field4 = Participants in the ‘help’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment than participants in the ‘harm’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment.

oset2field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to see the chairman’s decision as intentional.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in the harm group were more likely to say that the chairman’s decision was intentional than participants in the help group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does knowing the wealth of one’s group members affect decisions to reduce inequality?

oset2field2 = In a game, participants could share resources with co-players or keep it to themselves. At the start of the game, the resources were distributed unevenly between the players. In one group, participants saw the amount of resources of other players. In the other group, participants only saw their own resources. Participants played 10 rounds in which they could either cooperate with the other players, or keep their own money.

oset2field3 = If participants knew the amount of resources from other players, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset2field4 = If participants only knew their own resources, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset2field5 = Inequality stayed \*equally\* high when participants did and didn’t know the resources of the other players

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that inequality stayed higher when the wealth of other players was visible than when it was invisible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does imagining to tempt fate affect people’s estimation of the likelihood of negative consequences?

oset2field2 = Participants imagined a scenario in which they would come to a lecture in which the professor picks out one student to answer a difficult question in front of the entire class. In one group, participants imagined that they tempted fate by coming to the lecture unprepared. In the other group, participants imagined that they came to the lecture prepared. Afterwards, participants had to estimate how likely it was that they would get chosen.

oset2field3 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*more\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset2field4 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*less\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset2field5 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*equally\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was more likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Is people’s own preference related to their estimation of consensus?

oset2field2 = Participants read one out of four scenarios in which they have to make a choice between two actions. For instance, when leaving a supermarket, they are asked to give their opinion and state that they are positive about this supermarket. In the story, they are then asked whether they would sign a contract to use their opinion for a commercial for the supermarket. First, participants had to indicate what percentage of their peers they thought would choose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse). Afterwards, participants indicated which option they would choose themselves (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse).

oset2field3 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*higher\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset2field4 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*lower\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset2field5 = People’s own choice was \*unrelated\* to their estimation of the percentage of peers that would choose either option.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who chose one action themselves, also estimated the percentage of peers to choose that option as higher than people who chose the other action. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does the certainty of receiving a prize affect the choice between a high emotionally valued prize and a low emotionally valued prize?

oset2field2 = Participants had to indicate which of two options they preferred: the opportunity to meet and kiss their favorite movie star (high emotionally valued), or $50 in cash (low emotionally valued). In one group, participants read that they would certainly get their choice of the two options (100% probability). In the other group, participants read that they would have a 1% chance to get their choice of the options. Afterwards, participants indicated which of the two options they preferred.

oset2field3 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash).

oset2field4 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star).

oset2field5 = The certainty of getting either prize was not related to participants’ choices for the high or low emotionally valued prize.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that under uncertainty, participants preferred the high emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the low emotionally valued option ($50 in cash). If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Do conversational norms affect the way that people use the accessibility of specific and general information?

oset2field2 = Participants had to complete a survey on well-being. In one group, participants first answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life. In the other group, participants answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life, their work life and leisure time. Afterwards, all participants answered how satisfied they were with their life as a whole.

oset2field3 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives (marriage and dating) reported \*higher\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives (marriage and dating, work, and leisure).

oset2field4 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported \*lower\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset2field5 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported the \*same\* amount of satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported higher satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does poverty affect people’s attention?

oset2field2 = Participants played the game “Wheel of Fortune”, a game in which people have to guess letters in word puzzles. In one group, participants were given 6 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘poor’ players). In the other group, participants were given 20 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘rich’ players). Afterwards, they completed an attention task.

oset2field3 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*worse\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset2field4 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*better\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset2field5 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed the \*same\* as participants who were given a lot of chances in the subsequent attention task.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed worse in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Are people’s judgements of how similar two concepts are influenced by the order in which they were mentioned?

oset2field2 = Participants rated how similar two countries were to each other (e.g., “How similar is the USA to Lebanon?”). One of the countries was well-known to the participants (e.g., the USA). The other country was less familiar to the participants (e.g., Lebanon). In one group, the well-known country was mentioned first. In the other group, the less known country was mentioned first.

oset2field3 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*more\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset2field4 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*less\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset2field5 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*equally\* similar as targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as less similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Do relative price differences affect buying decisions?

oset2field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to buy a jacket and a calculator when a salesperson informed them that the calculator was $5 cheaper in a store 20 minutes away. In one group, participants were told that the prices were $125 for the jacket and $15 for the calculator in the current store and $10 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 33%). In the other group, participants were told that the prices were $15 for the jacket and $125 for the calculator in the current store and $120 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 4%). Afterwards, the participants were asked whether they would make the trip to the other store.

oset2field3 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*more\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset2field4 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*less\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset2field5 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*equally\* likely to drive to the second store as participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were more likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset2field1 = Does feeling morally dirty affect people’s need to wash themselves?

oset2field2 = Participants hand copied a story written in the first person. In one group, participants rewrote an unethical short story about sabotaging a co-worker. In the other group, participants rewrote an ethical short story about helping a co-worker. Afterwards, participants expressed their desire for cleaning products (e.g., soap, toothpaste).

oset2field3 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*higher\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset2field4 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*lower\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset2field5 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had the \*same\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset2field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a higher desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Do people think differently about advertising campaigns when they are induced to send them themselves compared to when they receive them?

set3field2 = Participants read about a fictional new email client that allows its early adopters to send referral invitations to their friends to sign up for the service. In one group, participants had to imagine that they were the person sending the referral invitations. In the other group, participants had to imagine that they were the person receiving the referral invitations. Afterwards, participants indicated how acceptable the act of sending the product referral was.

set3field3 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*more\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set3field4 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*less\* acceptable when they send the referral themselves compared to when they are the receiver

set3field5 = Participants think the act of sending the product referral is \*equally\* acceptable when they send the product referral themselves as when they are the receiver

set3field6 = Imagine that the first team of researchers found that participants think the act of sending the product referral is less acceptable when they send the referral themselves. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does watching an advertisement for a company affect the viewer’s decision to recommend the company, the advertised product and other products from that company?

set3field2 = While watching a video, participants were shown an advertisement. In one group, this was an advertisement for McDonald’s. In the other group, this was an advertisement for another company (Prudential). Participants were later asked a number of questions about their own and others’ preferences and habits related to McDonald’s and its products.

set3field3 = Participants were \*more\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set3field4 = Participants were \*less\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set3field5 = Participants were \*equally\* likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more likely to recommend McDonald's and its products if they saw an advertisement for McDonald's. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Do people respond to personal questions more or less socially desirably when they are asked to answer questions quickly or slowly?

set3field2 = Participants had to answer questions about their personality and personal attitudes. In one group, participants had to read and answer each question in less than 11 seconds. In the other group, participants had to read and answer each question for more than 11 seconds.

set3field3 = Participants responded to personal questions \*more\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set3field4 = Participants responded to personal questions \*less\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set3field5 = Participants responded to personal questions \*equally\* socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly as when they were asked to answer questions slowly

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants responded to personal questions more socially desirably when they were asked to answer questions quickly compared to when they were asked to answer questions slowly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does seeing past election data including information about the state of the country at the time of election affect predictions about future election outcomes?

set3field2 = Participants were asked to make predictions about what conditions predict election outcomes for Republicans in the United States House of Representatives. In one group, participants provided their predictions without any additional information. In the other group, participants provided their predictions after seeing a table that listed the results of past elections and information such as unemployment, economic growth, and inflation. For each listed condition (e.g. whether average GDP growth was relatively high or low), participants were asked to indicate whether they thought that condition would lead to Republicans winning seats, losing seats, or being unrelated to election outcomes.

set3field3 = Participants make \*more\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set3field4 = Participants make \*less\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data

set3field5 = Participants make \*equally\* complicated predictions when asked to do so with or without the opportunity to explore past election data

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants make less complicated predictions when asked to do so with the opportunity to explore past election data. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot3 = Decline

Effect3 = DeclinePrediction

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer3 Is Equal to 5

EmbeddedData

set3field1 = Does the gender of a person interacting in a same-sex sexual act influence how their sexual orientation is rated?

set3field2 = Participants read twelve scenarios describing partly sexual interactions between a person and someone of the same sex. In one group, the person described in the scenarios was a man. In the other group, the person described in the scenarios was a woman. After each scenario, participants were asked to assess the sexual orientation of the person.

set3field3 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*more\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set3field4 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*less\* indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women

set3field5 = Participants assess same-sex interactions as \*equally\* indicative of homosexuality of men as that of women

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants assess same-sex interactions as more indicative of homosexuality of men compared to that of women. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Do people judge the fairness of a punishment based on the absolute penalty or on the relative penalty?

set3field2 = Participants read about two men Alan (who earns 50$ an hour) and Bob (who earns 25$ an hour), who were issued traffic tickets for running a red light. In one group, Alan gets a ticket of $150 and Bob gets a ticket of $100. In the other group, Alan gets a ticket requesting 3 hours of community service and Bob gets a ticket requesting 4 hours of community service. Participants first rated how fair they think this arrangement is. Participants are then told that time and money sometimes is considered interchangeable and that Alan’s $50/hour salary makes his $150 traffic ticket equivalent to 3 hours of working time, while Bob’s $25/hour salary makes his $100 traffic ticket equivalent to 4 hours of working time. After this, participants are asked to make the same judgment of fairness again.

set3field3 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set3field4 = Participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants did not update their judgment once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.

set3field5 = Participants thought the punishment was equally fair to both Alan and Bob, regardless of the framing.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of money thought it was more unfair to Alan and participants who first saw the punishment framed in terms of time thought it was more unfair to Bob, but participants updated their judgement once the punishment was reframed in the alternate currency.
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set3field1 = Does a moment of feeling ostracized have an impact on people’s general trust in others?

set3field2 = Participants played an online game where they virtually toss a ball in a playground. In one group, participants played with two (computer-controlled) players who first tossed the ball twice to the participant and then solely tossed the ball to each other, so that the participants in this group were ostracized. In the other group, participants received the ball as often as the two other players. After thirty throws, the game was over and participants were asked to report in general how much they trust other people, how fairly other people treat them and how helpful other people are to them.

set3field3 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*more\* than participants who were not ostracized

set3field4 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*less\* than participants who were not ostracized

set3field5 = Participants who were ostracized trust others \*as much\* as participants who were not ostracized

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were ostracized trust others less than participants who were not ostracized. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does experiencing an Aha! moment in relation to a claim affect people’s tendency to agree with that claim?

set3field2 = In one group, participants were asked to unscramble words that were part of a claim. In the other group, participants were presented with the claim without any scrambled words. Afterwards, participants had to rate how likely the claims were to be true.

set3field3 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*more\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set3field4 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*less\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set3field5 = Participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as \*equally\* likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were asked to unscramble words rated the claims as more likely to be true than participants who had received the complete claims. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does a change in appearance affect the perception of remorse for past transgressors?

set3field2 = Participants read about 4 targets who committed different transgressions (drug use, DUI, burglary, violent assault). For each target, participants viewed two photos, the first taken right after the transgression and the second a few years later. In one group, the photos showed that the targets had incurred an appearance change since the transgression (weight gain or loss, or hair growth or cut). In the other group, there was no change in the targets’ appearance. Afterwards, participants rated how remorseful the targets seemed.

set3field3 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*more\* remorseful

set3field4 = Targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as \*less\* remorseful

set3field5 = Targets with and without appearance change were perceived as \*equally\* remorseful

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that targets who had incurred an appearance change were perceived as more remorseful. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does the framing of a comparison between teams affect qualification ratings?

set3field2 = Participants had to imagine that they were a manager at a large technology firm and that they needed to choose a team for a project. In one group, participants read that “Team A is more qualified than Team B”. In the other group, participants read that “Team B is less qualified than Team A”. Afterwards, participants had to rate how qualified they found Team B.

set3field3 = Participants who read that Team A is \*more\* qualified than Team B will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set3field4 = Participants who read that Team B is \*less\* qualified than Team A will give higher quality ratings for Team B

set3field5 = Participants in both groups will rate Team B \*equally\* qualified

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rate Team B as less qualified when Team B is described as less qualified than Team A than when Team A is described as more qualified than Team B. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does the variety of taken objects affect perceptions of greed?

set3field2 = Participants had to imagine they were attending an event where coffee and three different types of cookies were provided. They also read that the norm was to take one cookie per person. In one group, participants then read that the person in front of them took three cookies, one of each flavor. In the other group, participants read that the person in front of them took three cookies of the same flavor. Afterwards, participants had to indicate how greedy they found the person in front of them.

set3field3 = Participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group.

set3field4 = Participants in the ‘three of the same cookies’ group judged the person taking the cookies greedier than participants in the ‘three different cookies’ group.

set3field5 = Participants in both groups judged the person taking the cookies as \*equally\* greedy.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants judged a person taking three of the same cookies greedier than a person taking three cookies of different flavors. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot3 = Decline

Effect3 = DeclineCookies

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer3 Is Equal to 12

EmbeddedData

set3field1 = Does a warning about follow-up questions affect whether people report engaging in activities?

set3field2 = Participants completed an online questionnaire on various topics. In one group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and received no additional information. In the other group, participants answered items about interest in watching sports events and were then warned that if they answered that they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, they would receive 20 follow-up questions. Afterwards, all participants answered the question on whether they had watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months, and if yes, they also answered the 20 follow-up questions.

set3field3 = Participants who \*were not\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set3field4 = Participants who \*were\* forewarned about the 20 follow-up questions were more likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set3field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to say that they watched five or more sports events during the past 12 months. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Do people think that the difficulty to control behavior is affected by whether the cause is neurological damage or genetic damage?

set3field2 = Participants read a scenario in which someone causes a serious bodily injury in a fight. In one group, that person is born with a gene defect causing them to have below-average self-control. In the other group, that person suffered a minor brain damage as an adult causing them to have below-average self-control. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they would find that person guilty of assault.

set3field3 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*more\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set3field4 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*less\* often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set3field5 = Participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty \*as often\* as participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read that the person was born with a gene defect found them guilty more often than participants who read that the person who had suffered a minor brain damage. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does using the word “denier” to describe people who don't believe in global warming affect judgments about whether the person describing himself believes in global warming?

set3field2 = Participants had to read a scenario in which a researcher describes peoples’ opinions about global warming. In one group, the researcher in the scenario describes people who do not believe global warming is happening as “deniers”. In the other group, the researcher in the scenario is not using the term “denier”. Afterwards, participants indicated whether they thought the researcher believed that global warming is happening.

set3field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*more\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set3field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*less\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set3field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it \*equally\* likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than participants who read the scenario in which the term “denier” was not used.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the researcher uses the term “denier” thought it more likely that the researcher believed global warming is happening than targets who read the scenario in which the term "denier" was not used. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Are people more likely to blame an uncontrollable factor as the cause of bad behavior or as the cause of good behavior?

set3field2 = Participants had to read a scenario about a person who was diagnosed with a brain tumor. In one group, the person in the scenario was behaving well (i.e., donating money to charity). In the other group, the person in the scenario was behaving badly (i.e., shoplifting). Afterwards, the participants rated to what extent the person in the scenario was responsible for their actions.

set3field3 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*more\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set3field4 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*less\* responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set3field5 = Participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them \*equally\* responsible as targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly.

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read the scenario in which the person behaved well held them more responsible for their actions than targets who read the scenario in which the person behaved badly. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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set3field1 = Does changing group membership affect people’s attachment to a group?

set3field2 = Participants had to memorize a list of names from people who were part of the “green group” and the “blue group”. Participants in one group were told that they are part of the green group. Participants in the other group were told that they were part of the blue group. After the participants spent some time learning the names, they were assigned to either the green or the blue group again. This time, half of the participants were assigned to the same group. The other half of the participants were assigned to the other group. They then spent some time learning the names again. Afterwards, they had to complete a task in which they should indicate how strongly they would agree to different options on how bonus points should be distributed to each group (e.g., 220 bonus points to the green group and 180 bonus points to the blue group).

set3field3 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*more\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set3field4 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options \*less\* in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group

set3field5 = Participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options in which their current group receives more bonus points \*as much\* as participants who were assigned to the same group

set3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were assigned to a different group preferred options less in which their current group receives more bonus points than participants who were assigned to the same group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Is people’s ability to solve difficult reasoning problems influenced by how easy-to-read the font of the questionnaire is?

oset3field2 = Participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire with reasoning problems. In one group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was easy to read. In the other group, the font in which the questionnaire was written was difficult to read.

oset3field3 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*easy\* to read

oset3field4 = Participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was \*hard\* to read

oset3field5 = Participants solved \*equally\* many of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was easy to read as when it was difficult to read

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants solved more of the difficult questions when the questionnaire was hard to read. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other

Effect6 = Alter2007
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oset3field1 = Do social comparisons influence people’s well-being?

oset3field2 = Participants were shown a ladder with 10 rungs and were told: “Think of the ladder above as representing where people stand in the important groups to which they belong.” In one group, participants were asked to compare themselves in terms of their own respect, admiration and influence to the people at the bottom rung of the ladder. In the other group, participants were asked to compare themselves to the people at the top rung of the ladder. Afterwards, participants had to report their subjective well-being.

oset3field3 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*higher\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset3field4 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report \*lower\* subjective well-being than those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset3field5 = Participants comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence report the \*same\* level of subjective well-being as those comparing themselves to people with the highest level of respect, admiration and influence

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants reported higher subjective well-being when comparing themselves to people with the lowest level of respect, admiration and influence. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other
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oset3field1 = Do people trust others more or less when a resource dilemma is framed as participants being consumers rather than individuals?

oset3field2 = Participants read about a water crisis that affects four individuals, and were asked to role-play one of the participants. In one group, the persons involved in the crisis were referred to as consumers (Consumer A, Consumer B, etc). In the other group, these persons were instead referred to as individuals (Individual A, Individual B, etc). Participants were given information about how much of the shared water they had used up already and were told that they had used up more water than the others. Participants were then asked to report how much they trusted the other parties involved to use less water.

oset3field3 = Participants trust others \*more\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset3field4 = Participants trust others \*less\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers compared to individuals

oset3field5 = Participants trust others \*equally\* to conserve water when others are framed as consumers or as individuals

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants trust others less when participants are framed as consumers compared to individuals. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other
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oset3field1 = Are people’s estimations of numbers influenced by unrelated numbers that are incidentally present in the environment?

oset3field2 = Participants read a description about a new cell phone. In one group, the cell phone was called P17. In the other group, the cell phone was called P97. Afterwards, participants predicted its proportion of sales.

oset3field3 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*higher\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset3field4 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a \*lower\* proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset3field5 = Participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted the \*same\* proportion of sales as targets for which the cell phone was called P17.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants for which the cell phone was called P97, predicted a higher proportion of sales compared to targets for which the cell phone was called P17. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other

Effect6 = Critcher2008
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oset3field1 = Is perceived power related to the vertical location of a person?

oset3field2 = Participants studied a schematic display of the hierarchy within an organization, including a manager and his team. In one group, the vertical line connecting the manager to the team was long (i.e., 7 cm). In the other group, the vertical line was short (i.e., 2 cm). Afterwards, participants estimated how much power they thought the manager held within the organization.

oset3field3 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*more\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset3field4 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*less\* power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset3field5 = Participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold \*as much\* power within the organization as targets who were shown a short vertical line

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were shown a long vertical line that connected the manager to the team estimated the manager to hold more power within the organization than targets who were shown a short vertical line. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Is the perceived responsibility of someone doing harm influenced by how old the person is?

oset3field2 = Participants read a short text about a harm-doer (Sam) and a victim (Roger): “Imagine that Sam pushes a tray of glasses off a table. They shatter and one of the shards cuts into Roger’s leg.” In one group, participants see the harm doer as a 5-year-old while the victim is 25 years old. In the other group, the harm doer is instead 25 years old, while the victim is 5 years old. Participants then indicate how responsible the harm doer was for his behavior.

oset3field3 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*more\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset3field4 = Participants believe that the older harm doer is \*less\* responsible than the younger harm doer

oset3field5 = Participants believe that the older harm doer and the younger harm doer are \*equally\* responsible

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants believe that the older harm doer is more responsible than the younger harm doer. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other

Effect6 = Gray2001

Branch: New Branch

If

If randomizer6 Is Equal to 7

EmbeddedData

oset3field1 = Is the permissibility of harming an individual for the greater good affected by whether the action of harming is a direct means or a foreseen side effect of the action?

oset3field2 = Participants read two moral scenarios in which a train is about to hit and kill five people on the tracks. In the first scenario, the target (Denise) can pull a switch to turn the train to another track that will only kill one person instead of five. In the second scenario, the target (Frank) can shove a large man from a footbridge onto the tracks, killing only this man instead of five. For both scenarios, participants are asked to indicate whether or not it is morally permissible to act (pull the switch / shove the man) rather than refrain from acting.

oset3field3 = Participants are \*more\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset3field4 = Participants are \*less\* likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible

oset3field5 = Participants are \*equally\* likely to say that shoving the man and pulling the switch are morally permissible

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants are less likely to say that shoving the man (i.e., harm as a direct means) is morally permissible than they are likely to say that pulling the switch (i.e., harm as a side effect) is morally permissible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?

DeclineOrNot6 = Other
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oset3field1 = Do people evaluate someone’s generosity with respect to a gift based on its absolute cost or its relative cost?

oset3field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to study abroad and had received a goodbye gift from a friend. In one group, the gift was a wool coat from a store with wool coats in the price range of $50-$500 (with the worst coat being the cheapest and the best coat the most expensive), with the gift costing $55. In the other group, the gift was a wool scarf from a store with wool scarfs in the price range of $5-$50 (with the worst scarf being the cheapest and the best scarf the most expensive) with the gift costing $45. Participants were then asked to rate how generous their friend was.

oset3field3 = Participants rate their friend as \*more\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset3field4 = Participants rate their friend as \*less\* generous in the wool coat group where the gift cost $55 while coats were in the price range of $50-$500 compared to participants in the scarf group where the gift cost $45 while scarfs were in the price range of $5-$50

oset3field5 = Participants rate their friend as \*equally\* generous in the two groups

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants rated their friend as less generous in the wool coat group than in the scarf group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Is people’s willingness to achieve a goal affected by whether the concept of structure or the concept of randomness is active in their minds?

oset3field2 = Participants were asked to list their most important long-term goal. Then, the participants had to read a short article on the growth of tree leaves. In one group, the article described the growth of tree leaves as a structured process. In the other group, the article described the growth of trees as a random process. Afterwards, participants were asked to indicate their willingness to pursue their long-term goal.

oset3field3 = Participants in the structured process group were \*more\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset3field4 = Participants in the structured process group were \*less\* motivated to pursue their goal than participants in the random process group

oset3field5 = Participants in the two groups were \*equally\* motivated to pursue their goal

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants were more motivated to pursue their goal in the structured process group than in the random process group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does reading literary fiction affect people's understanding of other people's emotions?

oset3field2 = Participants read a short text passage. In one group, the text passage was literary fiction. In the other group, the text passage was non-fiction. Afterwards, participants had to identify people's expressed emotion (e.g., happy, angry) based on images of the eyes only.

oset3field3 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*better\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset3field4 = Participants who read literary fiction were \*worse\* at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes than participants who read non-fiction.

oset3field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* good at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that people who read literary fiction were better at recognizing emotions from images of people’s eyes. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Is the perception of intentionality of actions affected by whether the consequences are positive or negative?

oset3field2 = People in a Manhattan park were told about a company chairman who started a new program to increase profits. In one group, participants heard that the program would also harm the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. In the other group, participants heard that the program would also help the environment, but that the chairman did not care about that. Afterwards, participants had to indicate whether they thought the chairman intentionally harmed/helped the environment.

oset3field3 = Participants in the ‘harm’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment than participants in the ‘help’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment.

oset3field4 = Participants in the ‘help’ group were more likely to say that the chairman intentionally helped the environment than participants in the ‘harm’ group were to say that the chairman intentionally harmed the environment.

oset3field5 = Participants in both groups were \*equally\* likely to see the chairman’s decision as intentional.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants in the harm group were more likely to say that the chairman’s decision was intentional than participants in the help group. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does knowing the wealth of one’s group members affect decisions to reduce inequality?

oset3field2 = In a game, participants could share resources with co-players or keep it to themselves. At the start of the game, the resources were distributed unevenly between the players. In one group, participants saw the amount of resources of other players. In the other group, participants only saw their own resources. Participants played 10 rounds in which they could either cooperate with the other players, or keep their own money.

oset3field3 = If participants knew the amount of resources from other players, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset3field4 = If participants only knew their own resources, the inequality between the players stayed high

oset3field5 = Inequality stayed \*equally\* high when participants did and didn’t know the resources of the other players

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that inequality stayed higher when the wealth of other players was visible than when it was invisible. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does imagining to tempt fate affect people’s estimation of the likelihood of negative consequences?

oset3field2 = Participants imagined a scenario in which they would come to a lecture in which the professor picks out one student to answer a difficult question in front of the entire class. In one group, participants imagined that they tempted fate by coming to the lecture unprepared. In the other group, participants imagined that they came to the lecture prepared. Afterwards, participants had to estimate how likely it was that they would get chosen.

oset3field3 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*more\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset3field4 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*less\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset3field5 = Participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was \*equally\* likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who imagined that they tempted fate thought it was more likely that they would get chosen by the professor than participants who imagined that they had not tempted fate. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Is people’s own preference related to their estimation of consensus?

oset3field2 = Participants read one out of four scenarios in which they have to make a choice between two actions. For instance, when leaving a supermarket, they are asked to give their opinion and state that they are positive about this supermarket. In the story, they are then asked whether they would sign a contract to use their opinion for a commercial for the supermarket. First, participants had to indicate what percentage of their peers they thought would choose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse). Afterwards, participants indicated which option they would choose themselves (e.g., sign the contract vs. refuse).

oset3field3 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*higher\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset3field4 = People who chose one action vs. the other (e.g., sign the contract) themselves, estimated the percentage of peers that would choose that action as \*lower\* than people who chose the other action (e.g., refuse to sign the contract).

oset3field5 = People’s own choice was \*unrelated\* to their estimation of the percentage of peers that would choose either option.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who chose one action themselves, also estimated the percentage of peers to choose that option as higher than people who chose the other action. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does the certainty of receiving a prize affect the choice between a high emotionally valued prize and a low emotionally valued prize?

oset3field2 = Participants had to indicate which of two options they preferred: the opportunity to meet and kiss their favorite movie star (high emotionally valued), or $50 in cash (low emotionally valued). In one group, participants read that they would certainly get their choice of the two options (100% probability). In the other group, participants read that they would have a 1% chance to get their choice of the options. Afterwards, participants indicated which of the two options they preferred.

oset3field3 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash).

oset3field4 = Under a low probability of getting the prize (1%), participants preferred the \*low\* emotionally valued option ($50 in cash), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the \*high\* emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star).

oset3field5 = The certainty of getting either prize was not related to participants’ choices for the high or low emotionally valued prize.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that under uncertainty, participants preferred the high emotionally valued option (kissing a movie star), while under certainty (100%) participants preferred the low emotionally valued option ($50 in cash). If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Do conversational norms affect the way that people use the accessibility of specific and general information?

oset3field2 = Participants had to complete a survey on well-being. In one group, participants first answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life. In the other group, participants answered how satisfied they were with respect to their marriage and dating life, their work life and leisure time. Afterwards, all participants answered how satisfied they were with their life as a whole.

oset3field3 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives (marriage and dating) reported \*higher\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives (marriage and dating, work, and leisure).

oset3field4 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported \*lower\* satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset3field5 = Participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported the \*same\* amount of satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in one area of their lives reported higher satisfaction with regards to their life as a whole compared to participants who had previously indicated their satisfaction in three areas of their lives. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does poverty affect people’s attention?

oset3field2 = Participants played the game “Wheel of Fortune”, a game in which people have to guess letters in word puzzles. In one group, participants were given 6 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘poor’ players). In the other group, participants were given 20 chances per round to guess letters (i.e., ‘rich’ players). Afterwards, they completed an attention task.

oset3field3 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*worse\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset3field4 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed \*better\* in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances.

oset3field5 = Participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed the \*same\* as participants who were given a lot of chances in the subsequent attention task.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were given few chances per round to guess letters performed worse in the subsequent attention task than participants who were given a lot of chances. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Are people’s judgements of how similar two concepts are influenced by the order in which they were mentioned?

oset3field2 = Participants rated how similar two countries were to each other (e.g., “How similar is the USA to Lebanon?”). One of the countries was well-known to the participants (e.g., the USA). The other country was less familiar to the participants (e.g., Lebanon). In one group, the well-known country was mentioned first. In the other group, the less known country was mentioned first.

oset3field3 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*more\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset3field4 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*less\* similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset3field5 = Participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as \*equally\* similar as targets who read about the less familiar country first.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who read about the well-known country first judged the two countries as less similar than targets who read about the less familiar country first. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Do relative price differences affect buying decisions?

oset3field2 = Participants were asked to imagine that they were about to buy a jacket and a calculator when a salesperson informed them that the calculator was $5 cheaper in a store 20 minutes away. In one group, participants were told that the prices were $125 for the jacket and $15 for the calculator in the current store and $10 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 33%). In the other group, participants were told that the prices were $15 for the jacket and $125 for the calculator in the current store and $120 for the calculator in the other store (i.e., price was reduced by 4%). Afterwards, the participants were asked whether they would make the trip to the other store.

oset3field3 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*more\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset3field4 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*less\* likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset3field5 = Participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were \*equally\* likely to drive to the second store as participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who were told that the calculator initially cost $15 were more likely to drive to the second store than participants who were told that the calculator would initially cost $125. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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oset3field1 = Does feeling morally dirty affect people’s need to wash themselves?

oset3field2 = Participants hand copied a story written in the first person. In one group, participants rewrote an unethical short story about sabotaging a co-worker. In the other group, participants rewrote an ethical short story about helping a co-worker. Afterwards, participants expressed their desire for cleaning products (e.g., soap, toothpaste).

oset3field3 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*higher\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset3field4 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a \*lower\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset3field5 = Participants who rewrote an unethical story, had the \*same\* desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story.

oset3field6 = Imagine the first team of researchers found that participants who rewrote an unethical story, had a higher desire for cleansing products than targets who rewrote an ethical story. If an independent team of researchers repeated this study with a large number of participants, using the same materials, will they find convincing evidence for the same effect?
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