MAIN FINDINGS

Ghosted participants reported lower need satisfaction than included (H1) or rejected (H2) participants.

RESULTS

• Analyzed using multiple regression with condition variable dummy-coded (ghosted as reference group)
• Ghosted participants reported lower need satisfaction than included participants, $b = 3.46$, $t(542) = 34.35$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.47$, and rejected participants, $b = 0.37$, $t(542) = 3.59$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.15$
• Need for closure ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.96$) moderated the ghosted vs. included comparison, $b = 0.42$, $t(539) = 4.50$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.62], but not the ghosted vs. rejected comparison, $b = 0.01$, $t(539) = 0.12$, $p = .907$, 95% CI [-0.20, 0.22]
• Higher need for closure was associated with lower need satisfaction when ghosted, $t(539) = -3.29$, $p = .001$, 95% CI [-0.37, -0.09], and rejected, $t(539) = -2.82$, $p = .005$, 95% CI [-0.38, -0.07], and with greater need satisfaction when included, $t(539) = 2.45$, $p = .015$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.33]

SUMMARY & IMPACT

• Provides initial evidence that being ghosted may lead to worse outcomes than being directly rejected
• Results suggest that need for closure—which is rarely examined in close relationships—may exacerbate the effects of positive and negative relationship processes
• Generalizability is limited to U.S. emerging adults
• Future research should test immediate responses to being ghosted, including behavioral responses
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Introduction

• Self-compassion and compassion for others play paradoxical roles in buffering psychological distress (i.e., stress and anxiety) during the COVID-19 pandemic: self-compassion helps (Gutiérrez-Hernández et al., 2021), while compassion for others hurts (Cordaro et al., 2020).
• Women, relative to men, report lower self-compassion and higher compassion for others (e.g., Pommier et al., 2020). Such gender differences in compassion towards self and others are reflections of a rigid system of gender roles that socialize women to be compassionate toward others but not themselves.
• The present research explored whether young women college students’ higher psychological distress than the men counterparts during the COVID-19 pandemic could be explained by their low self-compassion (Study 1 & 2) and high compassion for others (Study 2).

Research Questions

Can gender differences in self-compassion and compassion for others explain gender differences in psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic?

Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>N = 281 college students (&lt;i&gt;M&lt;/i&gt;&lt;sub&gt;age&lt;/sub&gt; = 21.19, &lt;i&gt;SD&lt;/i&gt; = 4.80; 75.30% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>Self-compassion (Raes et al., 2011; α = .86), Compassion for others (Pommier et al., 2019; α = .85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic (adapted from Young et al., 2015; &lt;i&gt;r&lt;/i&gt; = .78, &lt;i&gt;p&lt;/i&gt; &lt; .001)</td>
<td>Psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic (adapted from Young et al., 2015; &lt;i&gt;r&lt;/i&gt; = .66, &lt;i&gt;p&lt;/i&gt; &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Note. *<i>p</i> ≤ .05, **<i>p</i> ≤ .01., ***<i>p</i> ≤ .001

Conclusion and Implication

• Our studies show how gender differences in self-compassion and compassion for others, which are rooted in a strong cultural system of gender roles, contribute to the psychological distress gap between women and men during a highly distressing context such as the COVID-19 pandemic.
• The current research calls once again for revisiting the gender roles imposed on women at the interpersonal and institutional levels.
• Future studies should experimentally manipulate self-compassion and compassion for others to test their direct effects on the gender psychological distress gap.
Every day, important scientific findings are rejected at large. From man-made climate change to the safety and efficacy of Covid-19 vaccinations, science skepticism has run rampant among lay consumers in modern society (Hornsey & Fielding, 2017). To increase public faith in science, some have proposed the use of crowd science (Silberzahn et al., 2018; Ulhmann et al., 2019).

We explore the effects of scientific findings emerging from a crowd of researchers (vs. a typical research collaboration) on lay perceptions of scientific findings. In line with social norm theory (Miller & Prentice, 2016), we expect that observing consensus among a crowd (the consistent crowd condition) will lead to increases in lay perceptions of certainty (vs. a single estimate) – increase conformity in opinion. Drawing from work on intuitive statistics (Gigerenzer & Murray, 2015), we also expect laypeople to intuitively accord to the logic of the wisdom of crowds: the ability of an aggregate of multiple estimates (rather than a single estimate) to reduce noise stemming from individual bias or error (Schweinsberg et al., 2021).

In contrast, when crowd estimates show low consensus and high variance (the inconsistent crowd condition), we predict that observers will be less swayed and more likely to attribute the findings to bias and error. In addition, due to the difficulty of lay reasoning about variation (Ben-Zvi & Garfield, 1999), we predict an aversion to variability: i.e., we expect that observing variable estimates will decrease lay confidence in the precise average parameter estimate in both crowd conditions.

**Introduction**

**Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Consistent crowd</th>
<th>Inconsistent crowd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Posterior beliefs in the phenomenon</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Credibility of the results</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Confidence in the precise estimate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scientific bias</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scientific error</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scientific discretion</td>
<td>No prediction</td>
<td>No prediction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Science:** Preregistration, survey, data, and code available at [github.com/shilaan/many-analysts](http://github.com/shilaan/many-analysts) and [osf.io/vedb4](http://osf.io/vedb4)

**Results**

**Conclusion**

**Future directions**

1. **Does variability aversion explain the findings?**
2. **Perceptions of scientists**
3. **Science communication and communicating uncertainty**
Cues About a Student’s Social Class Matter When Pandemic Meets School Discipline
Sierra R. Semko; Jason A. Okonofua, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION
Student socioeconomic status (SES) influences teachers’ decisions in the classroom. Low-SES students experience lesser expectations for their academic abilities, are judged to be less motivated and less able to concentrate, and experience disproportionate discipline. Low-income students experienced unprecedented difficulties during the COVID-19 pandemic, when classrooms across the country transitioned to virtual “distance learning.”

The current work explores how cues about a student’s SES inform teachers’ responses to classroom misbehavior. We hypothesize that (1) teachers will endorse more severe discipline for student misbehavior in the virtual classroom, as compared to the in-person classroom; (2) a misbehaving low-SES student will be prescribed more severe discipline, as compared to a mid-SES student, and particularly in the distance learning context. The two hypotheses were pre-registered at https://aspredicted.org/89h3u.pdf.

METHOD
N K-12 teachers = 396.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Latinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographics of our sample are similar to the national demographics of K-12 teachers.3

PROCEDURE
Teachers were shown either a picture of the in-person or virtual classroom context and asked to imagine themselves a teacher there. They then read and responded to one of four school records for a classroom context and asked to imagine themselves a teacher there. Teachers were shown either a picture of the in-person or virtual classroom; (2) a misbehaving low-SES student, and particularly in the distance learning context.

This study is the first to investigate how student SES and the COVID-19 pandemic affect discipline decisions which can affect access to education.

KEY TAKEAWAYS
While previous research based on in-person contexts suggests bias against low-SES students may explain their risk of more severe discipline, this research demonstrates that teachers in a distance learning context endorse more severe discipline for a student with mid-SES, as compared to low-SES.

| DISCUSSION |

Why might K-12 teachers behave more punitively toward mid-SES students than low-SES students in the distance learning classroom? One possibility is that observing a poorer child’s life circumstances firsthand, in a manner that in-person learning does not typically allow, may incite empathy to buffer against punitiveness. Attributes for a low-SES student’s misbehavior may seem indicative of the child’s circumstances and environment beyond their control. This process may, however, backfire for mid-SES students. With essential resources provided, the distance learning context for a mid-SES student may incite frustration — perhaps this student has enduring internal characteristics to which the misbehavior should be attributed.

FUTURE RESEARCH
Because some of the findings were unexpected, future research should seek to confirm the direction of this effect and explore the mechanisms by which these findings occur.
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