Multiple studies estimate social or distributional preferences based on Andreoni & Miller (2002)’s method of using dictator choices. This literature has produced important results in, e.g., revealing distributional preferences future lawyers or physicians and linking distributional preferences to political decisions. However, this literature suffers from methodological concerns to the extent that, e.g., different samples are compared at different points in time and different samples have been exposed to different payment protocols for dictator decisions. We present brand new data from an experiment that disentangles the sample and protocol effects. Our analysis suggests much weaker between-sample effects than the literature has hitherto shown. Our results, therefore, cast doubt on important prior findings. Consequently, policy makers should account for the possibility that prior effects were biased upwards. (Please note: this very early work in progress — results may change as data analysis continues.)