Variable List for Short-Sighted Greed (Sjåstad, 2019, JDM)

Study 1: Hypothesis and Key Variables

- Study 1 is a between-subjects experiment with two conditions: Future-focus and Present-focus. The hypothesis is that participants in the future-focused (vs. present-focused) condition will on average share more money in the dictator game and more money in a donation scenario.

- 'Condition' is the independent variable, representing two different levels of time perspective (1=future, 2=present).

- 'Manipulation_Check' is the measure of intended time perspective, on a scale from 0 to 100 (0=the present, 100=the future)

- 'DV1_Dictator_Giving' is the first outcome measure, in which participants reported how much money they would be willing to give to the recipient in a hypothetical dictator game scenario ($0-$100).

- 'DV2_Donation_Giving' is the second outcome measure, in which participants reported how much money they would be willing to give to the Deworm the World Initiative in a hypothetical donation scenario ($0-$100).

Study 1: Statistical reproducibility of results

- The findings reported in Study 1 is that participants who focused on the future (vs. the present) were willing to 1) give significantly more money in the dictator game, and 2) give significantly more money to charity.

- To reproduce the statistical analysis that gave rise to this conclusion (as reported in the paper), compute one independent t-test with the 'Condition' variable as the independent variable and 'DV1_Dictator_Giving' as the dependent variable, and a second t-test with the same independent variable but this time with 'DV2_Donation_Giving' as the dependent variable.

- To reproduce the specific results reported in Study 2, this analysis can be easily conducted in SPSS, JASP or Jamovi -- or other statistical software packages for more advanced users (R, Stata, etc.).

Study 2: Hypothesis and Key Variables

- Study 2 is a between-subjects experiment with four conditions, in a 2 (future-focus vs. present-focused) x 2 (public vs. private choice framing) factorial design. The hypothesis is that participants in the future-focused (vs. present-focused) condition will on average share more money in the dictator game when the choice is framed as public (i.e. observable), but not when the choice is framed as private (i.e. anonymous).

- 'Condition_Time' is the first independent variable (factor), representing two different levels of time perspective (1=future, 2=present).

- 'Condition_Public' is the second independent variable (factor), representing different forms of choice framing (1=public, 2=private).

- 'Manipulation_Check' is the measure of experienced time perspective, on a scale from 0 to 100 (0=the present, 100=the future)

- 'DV_Dictator_Giving' is the only outcome measure in this study, in which participants reported how much money they would be willing to give to the recipient in a hypothetical dictator game scenario ($0-$100).

Study 2: Statistical reproducibility of results

- The findings reported in Study 2 is that participants who focused on the future (vs. the present) were willing to give significantly more money in the dictator game when the choice was framed as public, but not when it was framed private. Specifically, there was a significant interaction between time perspective (future-focus vs. present-focus) and choice framing (public vs. private).

- To reproduce the statistical analysis that gave rise to this conclusion (as reported in the paper), compute a one-way ANOVA with 'Condition_Time' as the first factor, and 'Condition_Public' as the second factor, and 'DV_Dictator_Giving' as the dependent variable. This analysis provides a test of the interaction effect. Then, this initial analysis can be followed by an analysis of simple main effects, using two independent t-tests: One test of the effect of future-focus vs. present focus on dictator giving in public choice framing, and a second t-test of the effect of future-focus vs. present-focus on dictator giving in private choice framing.

- To reproduce the specific results reported in Study 2, this analysis can be easily conducted in SPSS, JASP or Jamovi -- or other statistical software packages for more advanced users (R, Stata, etc.).

Study 3: Hypothesis and Key Variables

- Study 3 is a between-subjects experiment with two conditions: Future-focus and Present-focus. The hypothesis is that participants in the future-focused (vs. present-focused) condition will on average be willing to give more money to charity and be more willing to volunteer for the same charity.

- 'Condition' is the independent variable, representing two different levels of time perspective (2=future, 1=present).

- 'Manipulation_Check' is the measure of intended time perspective, on a scale from 0 to 10 (0=the present, 10=the future)

- 'DV1_Charity_Giving' is the first outcome measure, in which participants reported how much money they would be willing to give to the Against Malaria Foundation in a hypothetical donation scenario ($0-$100).

- 'DV2_Charity_Volunteering' is the second outcome measure, in which participants reported whether they would be willing to volunteer for the Against Malaria Foundation for an entire workday (1=no, 2=yes).

- 'Mediator1_Reputation_Scale' is the average of the first 4-item mediator measure, in relation to their choice in 'DV1_Charity_Giving' (1=totally disagree, 7=totally agree).

- 'Mediator2_Reputation_Scale' is the average of the second 4-item mediator measure, in relation to their choice in 'DV2_Charity_Volunteering' (1=totally disagree, 7=totally agree). On both of the

mediator measures, participants indicated to extent they made their previous change based on reputational concerns.

Study 3: Statistical reproducibility of results

- The findings reported in Study 3 is that participants who focused on the future (vs. the present) were willing to 1) give significantly more money to charity, and 2) were significantly more likely to volunteer for the same charity (hypothetical choice).

- To reproduce the statistical analysis that gave rise to this conclusion (as reported in the paper), do the following for the main effects on the two dependent variables. First, conduct an independent t-test with the 'Condition' variable as the independent variable and 'DV1_Charity_Giving' as the dependent variable. Second, conduct a qhi-square analysis with the 'Condition' variable as the independent variable (in SPSS: 'Row'), and 'DV2_Charity_Volunteering' as the dependent variable (in SPSS: 'column').

- For the mediation analyses, estimate Model 4 in the PROCESS macro (SPSS), using 10.000 bias-corrected bootstrap samples. For the first mediation model, use 'Condition' as the independent variable (X), 'Mediator1_Reputation_Scale' as the mediator variable (M), and 'DV1_Charity_Giving' as the dependent variable (Y). For the second mediation model, use same independent variable, but then use 'Mediator2_Reputation_Scale' as the mediator variable (M), and 'DV2_Charity_Volunteering as the dependent variable (Y).

- To reproduce the specific results reported in Study 3, the analysis of the main effects can be easily conducted in SPSS, JASP or Jamovi -- or other statistical software packages for more advanced users (R, Stata, etc.). For the mediation analysis, use the PROCESS macro for SPSS, or equivalent analyses in R or other software packages.

Open Science Resources

- For open data and materials for all three studies, see: https://osf.io/y6mct.

- For pre-registration of Study 3, see: https://aspredicted.org/q93ap.pdf.

- For author contact, please use this e-mail address: Hallgeir.Sjastad@snf.no.