**Lab Meeting 26 July 2023 (remote)**

**Attendees:** Liz Barnes, Katie O’Neill, Till Stowasser, Craig Anderson,   
 Jasmine Yang, Simon McCabe, Jayne Brown

**Absent:** Hector Gutierrez Rufrancos, Theodoros Diasakos

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Action** |
| **Lab admin** |  |
| Behavioural Science Reunion 14th Sept 2023 Liz sought some clarification about whether we should be doing anything but there was no further information. Liz will reach out to Dave Comerford.  [15.8.23 update, Dave suggested we prepare academic posters for the event if we can]. |  |
| **Simon** – explained that he has funding for a project about working after retirement age. The initial phase is qualitative. |  |
| **Till** mentioned conference from Academia in 3rd week of Oct with focus on regulatory bodies, consumer protection and anti-trust.  **All PhD candidates** – need to add conferences to CV and generally update CV (LinkedIn Profile) to reflect academic status. Plenty of resources out there to show what good looks like. |  |
|  |  |
| **Progress** |  |
| **Jasmine** |  |
| Continues with her Lit Review and is undertaking online courses including Econometrics and looking at some with Behavioural Finance. Till is expecting to be able to have more time after completing a project imminently. | Ongoing |
|  |  |
| **Katie** |  |
| Attending the Cambridge Disinformation Summit online (27 July – 28 July) | 27-28 July |
| Gathering different conspiracy theories and read article about how to frame CTs. Wants to include CTs with both left and right of centre political leanings. Will include some neutral political theories also.  Plan to audit the model ‘Development of Self’ in the Psychology faculty |  |
|  |  |
| **Jayne** |  |
| Finished Qualitative Research module and found it very useful, reflecting on the role of reflexivity. Her focus now is on the dissertation which is effectively an extended research proposal. Her thinking is moving on and she may wish to move beyond framing and carbon tax. |  |
|  |  |
| **Liz** |  |
| Has merged the x8 data sets (x1 pilot + x1 final for studies 2a, 2b, 3Clinic, 3Self), cleaned the data applying the same exclusion criteria and handled outliers in the same manner as Study 1 and built the code for analysis of Study 3. [Note, decision to adjust exclusion criteria for Study 1 to INCLUDE pregnant people and those intending to become pregnant, was made mid August]. |  |
| Liz shared spreadsheet which includes summary, descriptive stats by condition, summary stats of each DV, bivariate analysis and ANOVA analysis for each DV. Till suggested Liz shares the spreadsheet for others to consider adapting for their work. |  |
|  |  |
| Summary: Study 3 shows that the taxpayer message is having little effect, except for Likelihood-to use and Preference. We did not ask questions to ascertain reasons for this but one explanation could be that the Message may act as an endorsement of quality. Another explanation that the Message acts as a reminder that the test doesn't need to be paid for which increases preference and likelihood to use. |  |
| There is a main effect of Modality on all DVs (WTP, Est Cost, Subjective Valuation, Preference, Likelihood-to-Use) except for Adherence Intentions. There are no interaction effects. These effects are in the direction of self-testing scoring higher. |  |
| Study 3 shows the same direction as Study 2 (full data set), which is that WTP is approximately half of Estimated Costs. We didn’t collect data to explain this phenomenon but plausible that people may not be willing or expect to pay their estimated ‘full cost’ as they are used to receiving most healthcare free of charge and as experienced testers, most ppts received the service for free. |  |
| Additionally, as a % of Est Cost, WTP is HIGHER in the absence of the message p=.041, t=4.81. Whilst we have no evidence to support this, it is plausible that the message may be acting as a reminder that there is no need to pay and that the 'taxpayer' will pick up the bill – thus the message may operate counter to the original proposal. |  |
|  |  |
| Importantly, Likelihood to Use and Adherence Intention scores are very much lower in Study 3 than both Study 1 and Study 2 with very large effect size. [Subsequently found that Subjective Valuation lower and Cost Estimates higher in Study 3 than study 1, but smaller effect sizes]. No data to support why this may be. As this sample is more familiar with services than Study 1, one explanation could be that they may be assessing the webpage more critically in relation to their prior experience or expectations, but no evidence to support this.  Liz will investigate this in more depth and report back. |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Lab Meeting Weds 23 Aug 10am** |  |
| **Lab admin** |  |
| 1. |  |
| **Dept notices** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Student reports/Progress** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **AOB** [please feel free to add to this prior to the meeting] |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |