

TESTING DIFFERENT METHODS TO MANIPULATE PARTICIPANTS' BELIEF IN FREE WILL

WIEBKE MELCHER, MARIE KRISTIN WETT, KATHARINA STÖBER, HANS-RÜDIGER PFISTER, RAINER HÖGER

INSTITUTE OF EXPERIMENTAL INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Belief in free will (FW) has been shown to have impacts on cognitive functions, behavior, emotions and attributions of moral responsibility, e. g. cheating (Vohs & Schooler, 2008), helping behavior (Baumeister, Masicampo, & DeWall, 2009), preconscious motor preparation (Rigoni, Kuhn, Sartori, & Brass, 2011), action monitoring (Rigoni, Wilquin, Brass, & Burle, 2013), conformity (Alquist, Ainsworth, & Baumeister, 2013), gratitude (MacKenzie, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2014), and support for retributive punishment (Shariff et al., 2014).

Published replication studies on these findings as well as empirical evidence from German speaking samples are sparse.

Aim of this work was to test whether methods to manipulate belief in FW will reported in the literature are still successful when adapted to German language.

METHOD & RESULTS

	STUDY 1	STUDY 2	STUDY 3
Data collection	Paper-pencil	Paper-pencil	Online questionnaire
Exp. manipulation	Reading of text passages from <i>The Astonishing Hypothesis</i> (Crick, 1995)	Velten-style procedure (Velten, 1968): Rephrasing of statements	Velten-style procedure (Velten, 1968): Rephrasing of statements
(adapted from Vohs & Schooler, 2008)			
Design	Two groups (deterministic vs. control)	Three groups (deterministic vs. control vs. FW)	Three groups (deterministic vs. control vs. FW)
Manipulation check	FAD-Plus (Paulhus & Carey, 2011) and one item regarding belief in FW (visual analogue scale)	FAD-Plus (Paulhus & Carey, 2011) and one item regarding belief in FW (five-point Likert scale)	Two items regarding belief in determinism and belief in FW (visual analogue scale)
Power analysis	$d=1.2$, $\alpha=.01$, Power=.99	$d=0.48$, $\alpha=.05$, Power=.95	$d=0.39$, $\alpha=.01$, Power=.99
Source of ES estimation	Vohs & Schooler (2008)	Vohs & Schooler (2008)	Alquist, Ainsworth, & Baumeister (2013)
Sample size required	n=32/each group	n=24/each group	n=63/each group
Sample	100% students; 73.2% ♀; age: M=21.9 yr (SD=4.2); n=34+36 (deterministic+control group)	100% students; 57.3% ♀; age: M = 21.7 yr (SD=3.03); n=25+26+24 (deterministic + control + FW group)	51.1% students; 71.1% ♀; age: M = 37.2 yr (SD=14.54); n=88+118+109 (deterministic + control + free will group)
Results	No significant differences found for the subscales of FAD+ and the single manipulation check item	No significant differences found for the subscales of FAD+ and the single manipulation check item	Determinism-Rating: H(2)=7.12, p=.028; Mdn=52.5 / 45.5 / 46.0 (deterministic / control / FW gr.) Free Will-Rating: H(2)=8.37, p=.015; Mdn=61.5 / 67.0/72.0 (deterministic / control / FW gr.)

DISCUSSION

Significant differences between experimental groups with respect to belief in FW and belief in determinism were found only in study 3 which was conducted as online experiment to achieve a higher sample size. Successful experimental manipulations among samples with smaller size as reported in literature could not be replicated. Reasons might be based on translation of the material, age or proportion of students in the sample. The sample in study 3 was more diverse regarding age and educational level indicating that belief in FW could be more successful manipulated in a sample different from the easily accessible undergraduate participants.

REFERENCES

- Alquist, J. L., Ainsworth, S. E., & Baumeister, R. F. (2013). Determined to conform: Disbelief in free will increases conformity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(1), 80–86.
 Baumeister, R. F., Masicampo, E. J., & DeWall, C. N. (2009). Prosocial benefits of feeling free: disbelief in free will increases aggression and reduces helpfulness. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, 35(2), 260–268.
 Crick, F. (1995). *The astonishing hypothesis: The scientific search for the soul* (1st Touchstone ed.). A Touchstone book. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
 MacKenzie, M. J., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2014). You didn't have to do that: belief in free will promotes gratitude. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, 40(11), 1423–1434.
 Paulhus, D. L., & Carey, J. M. (2011). The FAD-Plus: measuring lay beliefs regarding free will and related constructs. *Journal of personality assessment*, 93(1), 96–104.
 Rigoni, D., Kuhn, S., Sartori, G., & Brass, M. (2011). Inducing disbelief in free will alters brain correlates of preconscious motor preparation: the brain minds whether we believe in free will or not. *Psychological science*, 22(5), 613–618.
 Rigoni, D., Wilquin, H., Brass, M., & Burle, B. (2013). When errors do not matter: weakening belief in intentional control impairs cognitive reaction to errors. *Cognition*, 127(2), 264–269.
 Shariff, A. F., Greene, J. D., Karremans, J. C., Luguri, J. B., Clark, C. J., Schooler, J. W., . . . Vohs, K. D. (2014). Free will and punishment: a mechanistic view of human nature reduces retribution. *Psychological science*, 25(8), 1563–1570.
 Velten, E. (1968). A laboratory task for induction of mood states. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 6(4), 473–482.
 Vohs, K. D., & Schooler, J. W. (2008). The value of believing in free will: encouraging a belief in determinism increases cheating. *Psychological science*, 19(1), 49–54.

CONTACT

WIEBKE MELCHER
 Institute of Experimental
 Industrial Psychology
 Wilschenbrucher Weg 84a
 D-21335 Lüneburg
 Fon +49.4131.677-7877
 melcher@leuphana.de