Greetings SCP members,

Myself (Dan Schley), Evan Weingarten, and Gizem Yalcin are conducting a meta-analysis of numeric anchoring effects (i.e., anchoring effects where a numeric anchor is provided) across the behavioral sciences. Despite anchoring's ubiquity, there is relatively limited consensus of the theoretical processes underlying anchoring, experimental procedures used to assess it, or even a consistent nomenclature. We are currently in the process of collecting published and unpublished studies for a meta-analysis and review of this literature. We are primarily assessing moderators of anchoring effects across three general types of anchoring paradigms:

1) Any variant of High versus Low anchors, High versus Control, Low versus Control, or a combination (e.g., anchoring 70 or 3000 miles for length of the Mississippi river). For example, if the study manipulated only high anchors (e.g., 3000 miles in one condition and 5000 miles in another condition) it cannot be included in our analysis unless it has a low anchor or control condition. For each type of anchor (or control) there would be a mean, standard deviation, and sample size. For examples of these types of studies, see Jacowitz and Kahneman (1995, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*) or Strack and Mussweiler (1997, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*).
2) Use of the anchor-estimate gaps. This is where the absolute deviation between the numerical judgment and the anchor is calculated (e.g., the difference between an anchor of 1776 and a judgment of 1784 for when Washington was elected president). For each condition there would be a mean, standard deviation, and sample size. For examples of these types of studies, see Simmons, LeBoeuf, and Nelson (2010, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*) or Epley and Gilovich (2006, *Psychological Science*).
3) Correlations between anchors and numerical judgments. These studies often have a pseudo-randomly generated anchor that can take any level (rather than two levels; e.g., the last two digits of a social security number) and corresponding judgments. For each condition there is a correlation between anchors and judgments, and a sample size. For an example of this type of study see Ariely, Loewenstein, and Prelec (2003, Study 1, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*).

Would you be willing to help us locate some information? We are hoping you can provide **stats from unpublished studies – including classroom demonstrations of the anchoring effect.** Our goal in this meta-analysis is to understand some of the moderators to the effect, so any study, failed or not, is not failed to us.

If you are willing to help, please send us an email at anchoring_meta_analysis@rsm.nl.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,

Dan Schley