# Comparison

Provide a deterministic, low creativity output: Temperature 0.1

In the following conversation, please respond as if you were a psychological researcher and peer reviewer concerned with replicable, transparent, and reliable research. In the pdf documents you will find two papers. The first is the Preregistration (PREREG). The second is the Published study (PUBSTUD). Please work step by step. Within the Study there can be several Studies, only focus on Study 4: The joint impact of agency and communion on humanness judgments of groups

I want you to **compare** the two pdf documents. Follow this structure of the questions bellow, do not skip any number, and answer the SET of questions regarding the concordance between the two texts with “yes” or “no”. Please be as critical as possible in your judgement. So, for each question state the question number, the first variable name (e.g MatchMI1) and then your answer. Do not summarize. Please be as critical and strict as possible in your judgement/comparison. The important differences sometimes lay in the wording! Keep the structure of the questions and the FORMAT-EXAMPLE at the end. It is an example of assements and its text. Use the FORMAT-EXAMPLE as an Example but for the comparison only take information of the pdf.

Questions

4. Operationalization of Dependent Variable, DV

4.1 MatchDV\_0: assess whether the operationalization of the DEPENDENT VARIABLE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. Which measure is used [specification] (Y/N)

4.2 MatchDV\_1: assess whether the operationalization of the DEPENDENT VARIABLE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. he procedure of measurement (e.g., information about the administration of an EEG, IQ test, or personality scale) [procedure] (Y/N)

4.3 MatchDV\_2: assess whether the operationalization of the DEPENDENT VARIABLE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The potential values of each component (e.g., the response options of individual items in a questionnaire) [values] (Y/N)

4.4 MatchDV\_3: assess whether the operationalization of the DEPENDENT VARIABLE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The procedure how they will construct the composite from its elements (e.g., arithmetic mean, weighted mean, sum) [construction] (Y/N)

6. Operationalization of Data collection procedure, dcp

6.1 MatchDCP\_1: assess whether the DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The exact number of participants the authors want to include / included in the study [sample size] (Y/N)

6.2 MatchDCP\_2: assess whether the DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The exact time frame (i.e., period, not exact dates) and situation in which participants will be/were invited [sampling frame] (Y/N)

7. Statistical Model, SM

7.1 MatchSM\_1: assess whether the STATISTICAL MODEL is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. the statistical model used (e.g., t-test, chi-squared test, linear / logistic regression, two-way ANOVA) [model] (Y/N)

7.2 MatchSM\_2: assess whether the STATISTICAL MODEL is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The relevant variables and their factor levels (including mediating, moderating, interacting, and control variables) [variables] (Y/N)

7.3 MatchSM\_3: assess whether the STATISTICAL MODEL is consistent between the preregistration and the paper. The manner in which the variables are used in the analysis (e.g., mean centered, SEM model specification including potential residual covariances, robust standard errors) [details] (Y/N)

PLEASE go step by step and answer only AFTER COMPLETION (4.1 – 7.3)

<<EXAMPLE:  
……

**PreReg Example**

< 1) Have any data been collected for this study already? No, no data have been collected for this study yet. 2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study? We are examining why giving advice, compared to receiving advice, motivates the advice-giver. Our hypothesis is that an increase in confidence mediates the effect. 3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured. The mediator is a binary variable: whether the participant found giving or receiving advice more confidence boosting. The outcome is also a binary variable: whether the participant found giving or receiving advice more motivating. 4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to? Participants will be assigned to two conditions. In the pursuer condition, they will give and receive advice, following which they will report on levels of confidence and motivation. In the predictor condition, they will learn about the advice activities (giving and receiving) and then predict which activity people will find more confidence-boosting and more motivating. 5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis. We will conduct a mediation analysis in order to assess whether the effect on motivation is mediated by the effect on confidence. 6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations. We will include all participants who did not attrit. 7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined. This is a 2-condition between subjects design. We will recruit 88 participants per cell, which gives us enough power to detect a medium-size effect (d = .50). 8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?>

**PubStud Example**

< Our hypothesis was that predictors underestimate the motivational power of giving because they overlook the fact that giving advice raises confidence (Experiment 4).

Experiment 4: Giving Advice Instills

Confidence

Across self-regulatory domains, people were more motivated by giving advice than receiving it (Experiments 1–3), a reality that predictors failed to anticipate (Experiments 2 and 3). In Experiment 4, we asked why predictors overlook the motivating power of giving. We hypothesized that advice giving motivated behavior by instilling confidence. That is, we expected pursuers to report that giving advice, more than receiving advice, raised both their confidence and their motivation. In contrast, we expected predictors to underestimate the degree to which advice giving raised confidence, and we expected this underestimate to explain why they overlooked the motivational power of giving. As in Experiment 2, we once again recruited overweight participants. We preregistered this study on AsPredicted (https://aspredicted.org/ni5z3.pdf).

*Method*

*Participants.* We recruited pursuers, followed by yoked predictors, who were struggling to lose weight (health domain). We opened recruitment to 176 participants (88 per condition). MTurk returned 174 respondents (60.3% female; age: *M* = 34.34 years, *SD* = 11.07). Participants of any nationality were allowed to participate provided their MTurk approval rating was at or above 50%. Participants were compensated $0.50 for participating. *Procedure.* Participants went through the procedure described in Experiment 2, with one exception: Before pursuers and predictors reported on motivation, they reported on confidence. Pursuers indicated which of the two activities (giving advice vs. receiving advice) made them feel more confident in their ability to lose weight (0 = *receiving advice*, 1 = *giving advice*). Yoked predictors forecasted which of the two activities would make someone else feel more confident in their ability to lose weight (0 = *receiving advice*, 1 = *giving advice*). Next, everyone reported on motivation using the measure from Experiment 2.

*Results*

In support of the first hypothesis (from Experiments 1–3), analyses showed that 65.52% of pursuers found giving advice more motivating, which is statistically greater than the 34.48% who found receiving advice more motivating, χ2(1, *N* = 87) = 8.38, *p* < .001, *d* = 0.65, 95% CI = [0.21, 1.10]. We found a similar pattern on confidence: 73.56% of pursuers felt more confident after giving advice, which is statistically greater than the 26.44% of pursuers who felt more confident after receiving advice, χ2(1, *N* = 87) = 10.23, *p* = .001, *d* = 0.73, 95% CI = [0.28, 1.18]. Among pursuers, confidence positively predicted motivation (*r* = .33, *p* = .002), which suggests that, indeed, one of the reasons that giving advice motivates is because it instills confidence. In support of the second hypothesis (from Experiments 2 and 3), participants mispredicted this phenomenon. Whereas 65.52% of pursuers felt more motivated to lose weight after giving advice, only 43.68% of predictors predicted that people would find giving advice more motivating, χ2(1, *N* = 174) = 8.37, *p* = .004, *d* = 0.45, 95% CI = [0.15, 0.75]. We found a similar pattern on confidence: Whereas 73.56% of pursuers felt that giving advice made them more confident than receiving advice, only 52.87% of predictors predicted this, χ2(1, *N* = 174) = 8.01, *p* < .001, *d* = 0.44, 95% CI = [0.14, 0.74]. Next, we tested whether confidence mediated the effect of condition (pursuer vs. predictor) on motivation. Pursuers found giving advice more motivating than predictors expected them to, odds ratio (*OR*) = 2.45, *p* = .004. Pursuers also reported that giving advice increased confidence more than predictors expected it to, *OR* = 2.48, *p* = .005. Controlling for confidence, we found that the effect of condition on motivation was significantly smaller, *OR* = 1.93, *p* = .052. Confidence mediated the effect of condition on motivation, Sobel test *z* = 2.45, *SE* = 0.62, *p* = .014, supporting our hypothesis.>

…….

Results example:

### Operationalization of Dependent Variable (DV)

4.1. MatchDV\_0: Yes.  
4.2. MatchDV\_1: Yes.  
4.3. MatchDV\_2: Yes.  
4.4. MatchDV\_3: No.

### Operationalization of Data Collection Procedure (DCP)

6.1. MatchDCP\_1: No.  
6.2. MatchDCP\_2: No.

### Statistical Model (SM)

7.1. MatchSM\_1: Yes.  
7.2. MatchSM\_2: Yes.  
7.3. MatchSM\_3: No.

*>>*