Publication

Date added: 8.8.2024, 15:42:30

DOI

DOI

Paper title (automatically added via doi)

–

Year of publication (automatically added via doi)

–

Top papers: currently selected: 0/3

- [ ] This is one of my best papers.

Publication type (check all that apply)

- [x] Empirical: Quantitative (e.g., experiment, survey, etc.)
- [ ] Empirical: Qualitative (e.g., interviews, focus groups, manual content analysis, etc.)
- [ ] Meta-Analysis
- [ ] Computational (e.g., agent-based modelling, simulations, etc.)
- [ ] Theoretical contribution (Theory development, formal modelling, etc.)
- [ ] Non-empirical contribution (Systematic Review, Opinion Piece, Whitepaper, etc.)
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Publication format

- [ ] Published paper / Paper in press
- [ ] Preprint
- [ ] Conference proceeding
- [ ] Stage 1 registered report with IPA
- [ ] Monograph
- [ ] Book chapter
- [ ] Test or instrument
- [ ] Other (please specify)

What were the epistemic goals of the paper? (check all that apply)

Empirical phenomena (establish 'what exists' and consolidate stable patterns in data)

- [ ] Inventorizing
- [ ] Process or underlying structure
- [ ] Estimation
- [ ] Generality/boundary conditions
- [ ] Phenomena confirmation

Concept development (abstract from data and aim to find useful descriptive models and concepts)

- [ ] Concept revision
- [ ] Descriptive modelling

Theory (focus on a theoretical model rather than on explaining one specific phenomenon)

- [ ] Theory affirmation: Can we find evidence for the theory? (Not falsification)
- [ ] Theory development (new theory)
- [ ] Theory expansion of existing theory
- [ ] Testing of a theory

Other

- [ ] Measurement & auxiliaries
- [ ] Causal explanation for a single empirical phenomenon
- [ ] Application (Make it work - an engineering perspective)

Does this contribution fit well into the assessment scheme? (If 'No' All indicators are skipped but you can still add a Merit Statement and an Impact Statement. The paper will not be included in the scoring but processed manually)

- [ ] No, it should be processed manually (provide explanation)
- [ ] Yes

Is this paper a multi-study paper?

- [ ] Not applicable
- [ ] No (only a single study is reported)
- [ ] Yes

[Note: The section on 'Cited?' is automatically disabled as you indicated to be an external rater.]

Does this paper use any kind of data in a substantive way (new data, reuse of existing data, or simulated data?)

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

What kind of data do you use? (check all that apply)

- [x] Own new data collection
- [ ] Reuse of own existing data set
- [ ] Reuse of someone else's existing data set
- [ ] Aggregating (own or other's) existing data sets
- [ ] Simulated data

Type of sample

- [ ] (Predominantly) psychology students
- [ ] (Predominantly) students, interdisciplinary
- [ ] Non-specific general population
- [ ] Specific target population (e.g., working nurses)
- [ ] Specific target population, hard to acquire (e.g., babies, inmates, rare disorders)

Representativeness of sample

- [ ] Convenience sample
- [ ] Representative sample

WEIRDness of sample

- [ ] WEIRD: Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic
- [ ] non-WEIRD

Cultural diversity of sample / cross-cultural research

- [ ] Single cultural or ethnic background
- [ ] Multiple cultural or ethnic backgrounds

Type of data (check all that apply)

- [ ] Questionnaire (self report)
- [ ] Questionnaire (other/informant report)
- [x] Behavioral data (give details below)
- [x] Physiological (give details below)
- [ ] Interviews
- [ ] Content data (e.g., digital traces, text, audiovisual content)
- [ ] Content or behavioral coding (i.e., converting rich qualitative data into numeric scores)
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Type of behavioral data (check all that apply)

- [ ] Objective performance data (e.g., reaction times, intelligence scores, sales)
- [ ] Observed behavior (lab / artificial situation)
- [ ] Observed behavior (naturalistic situation)
- [ ] Behavioral residues (e.g., sick leave days, number of books)

Type of physiological data (check all that apply)

- [ ] EEG
- [ ] MEG
- [ ] (f)MRI
- [ ] Peripheral: EDA
- [ ] Peripheral: EMG
- [ ] Peripheral: ECG
- [ ] Eyetracking, pupillometry
- [ ] Endocrinology (hormones, cortisol, ...)
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Study design 1

- [ ] Cross-sectional / single session
- [ ] Longitudinal / multiple sessions

Experimental design

- [ ] Observational / non-experimental
- [ ] Experimental manipulation

Is the raw primary data available in an institutional repository?

- [ ] Not applicable [provide explanation]
- [ ] Not available
- [ ] Yes, parts of data [provide doi or URL]
- [ ] Yes, entire data [provide doi or URL]

DOI or URL

↳ DOI or URL

Access level

- [ ] ZA0 (open data)
- [ ] ZA1 (scientific use file)
- [ ] ZA2 (restricted access) [provide justification]

FAIR format

- [ ] The data set has a globally unique, citable and persistent identifier (e.g., DOI, PURL, ARK)
- [ ] All variables are comprehensively described in a codebook with a structured format
- [ ] The data set is stored in structured, open format (e.g., .csv, .tsv, .tab, .txt, .json; not .sav, .xlsx, .pdf)

Open reproducible scripts

- [ ] Not applicable [provide explanation]
- [ ] Not available
- [ ] Parts of scripts are available [provide doi or URL]
- [ ] The entire analysis pipeline is available, including preprocessing of the primary (raw) data [provide doi or URL]

DOI or URL of the script

↳ DOI or URL of the script

FAIR format

- [ ] The code has an explicitly stated open license (e.g., BSD, CC-BY, (L)GPL, MIT)
- [ ] Timestamped repository
- [ ] Version control
- [ ] Proper documentation of code
- [ ] Reproducible software environment (e.g. `conda` environment, `renv` or `groundhog` in R)
- [ ] (Almost) One-click reproducibility with a master script (or equivalent)
- [ ] Reproducible manuscripts (e.g. with R Markdown)

Correctness of computational results has been independently verified

- [ ] Not applicable [provide explanation]
- [ ] No / not published
- [ ] Workflow reproducibility / code completeness check
- [ ] Computational reproducibility of MAIN results has been independently verified using the original code
- [ ] Computational reproducibility of ALL numerical results has been independently verified using the original code
- [ ] Analysis replication (independent implementation & verification)

Open materials (beyond the open reproducible scripts entered above)

- [ ] Not applicable [provide explanation]
- [ ] Not available
- [ ] Yes, parts of material [provide doi or URL]
- [ ] Yes, all material necessary for a replication [provide doi or URL]

DOI or URL of the open materials

↳ DOI or URL of the open materials

Preregistration

- [ ] Not applicable [provide explanation]
- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes (but not RR) [provide doi or URL]
- [ ] Registered Report [provide doi or URL]

DOI or URL of the preregistration

↳ DOI or URL of the preregistration

What has been preregistered? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Sample size planning (typically: an a priori power analysis)
- [ ] Hypotheses
- [ ] Operationalizations
- [ ] Analysis Plan
- [ ] Inferential criteria (e.g., defining your alpha level)

The paper contains a preregistered replication attempt (either direct/close or conceptual)

- [ ] Not applicable
- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

Theory usage and development

[Note: So far, no scoring points have been assigned to the indicators on 'Theory']

In the following, the term 'theory' is used for a set of (interconnected) ideas that explain empirical phenomena. Theories may be expressed in a narrative and/or a more formalized manner. The term *'model'* is reserved for a (part of a) theory that is expressed mathematically or algorithmically.

Theory-guided research and theory development

- [ ] This research was purely descriptive, without clear reference to a theory
- [ ] In this research, at least one theory was (further) developed and/or evaluated
- [ ] Not applicable / cannot answer the question

The paper ...

- [ ] contains an **explicit narrative account** of the *phenomena* that are to be explained, and of one or more hypothetical *mechanisms* accounting for them (i.e., a theory).
- [ ] contains **explicit narrative definitions of each element** (concepts, relationships, etc.) in the theory. All of this is made easily findable (e.g., under a standard heading 'Definitions').
- [x] contains a **formalized account of the theory (i.e., a model)** using a commonly accepted standard notation (e.g., mathematical or logical operations, ODD protocol for ABMs). This includes all connections among the elements of the theory, and a formalization of the phenomena that are to be explained.

The formalization of the theory ...

- [ ] explicates the basic **mathematical properties** of all elements of the model (e.g., scalar vs. matric dimensionality; units carrying the information).
- [ ] explicates the **possible values for all elements** of the model (i.e., upper and lower bounds, scale level).
- [ ] explicitly derives predictions from that. The **derivation is objective**, in the sense that any person would come to the exact same predictions.
- [ ] all stated predictions are in principle **falsifiable** (before considering operationalizations).

In what language or system is the theory formulated?

- [ ] Narrative
- [ ] Mathematical
- [ ] Formal Logic
- [ ] Agent-based model
- [ ] Other (please specify)

How much did you personally contribute to this version of the theory?

- [ ] I did not contribute to this version of the theory *itself* (i.e., I did no theoretical work beyond testing a theory)
- [x] I did contribute significantly to this version of the theory

I significantly contributed to ...

- [ ] the overall development of an entire narrative theory
- [ ] the expansion or refinement of an existing narrative theory
- [ ] the first formalization of an existing narrative theory
- [ ] the overall development of an entire formal model of which there was no narrative version
- [ ] the expansion or refinement of an existing formal model

Did you do a confirmatory test of (a part of) the theory?

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

The paper ...

- [ ] describes all necessary assumptions that were necessary to make the theory testable (including ad-hoc assumptions).
- [ ] describes which, how, and why elements of the theory are measured, estimated, or fixed to specific values.
- [ ] makes clear how the tested hypotheses logically and stringently follow from the theory.
- [ ] evaluates the relative and/or absolute model fit with appropriate procedures (e.g., out-of-sample cross-validation, AIC, BIC, LOO, Bayes Factors).
- [ ] contains an explicit discussion as to what the results mean for the theory that was tested.

Sample size and power considerations

The boxes will expand when you enter text; you can simply copy and paste the relevant sections from the paper.

Please report all considerations regarding statistical power (assumed effect size, power, N, ...):

Sample size (if applicable, differentiate by levels / items / ...)

Multi-/interdisciplinarity: The research was conducted ...

- [ ] with researchers from psychology only
- [ ] in co-authorship with researchers or practitioners from different disciplines (beyond psychology)

Research Impact and Relevance

Practical Relevance

Does this research output have indirect or immediate practical relevance? Check all that apply:

- [ ] The practical relevance of the study is indirect (e.g., through theory development, mechanism testing, method development).
- [ ] The study provides immediate practical implications (e.g., for policy design, organizational decisions, environmental design, everyday life).
- [ ] The study evaluates one or multiple interventions in the field.

Merit Statement

A merit statement summarizes why this research output made an important *substantive* contribution to the field. Such statements could reflect upon, for example:

- an interdisciplinary setting
- a theory that was newly developed or tested for the first time
- a methodological set-up that was specifically innovative
- an unusually great effort was needed to collect the sample
- generalizability was particularly high

Do not provide impact or citation information here, but focus on the intrinsic quality of the research output itself - regardless whether it had impact yet or not.

Provide your Merit Statement here (narrative, max. 150 words. Box will expand):

0 / 150 words

Scientific Impact Statement

Age- and field-normalized citation statistics will be automatically retrieved for each submitted work. Here you can describe the scientific impact that this work made *beyond* these bibliometric indicators (e.g., explain how your methodological contribution was recommended as the go-to-approach in a consensus paper on best practice in the field).

Provide your Scientific Impact Statement here (narrative, max. 150 words. Box will expand):

0 / 150 words

(optional) General comments (max, 500 words)

0 / 500 words