

Perceptions of Feedback Accuracy Partially Translate the Effects of Feedback Characteristics onto Affective Reactions and Goal Setting Behavior

Transparency Report 1.0 (full, 36 items)

Blinded

29 May, 2020

Corresponding author's email address: Blinded

Link to Project Repository: https://osf.io/2n7fz/?view_only=9d2164cf34f94ca1acd674eae5b44e6e

PREREGISTRATION SECTION

- (1) Prior to analyzing the complete data set, a time-stamped preregistration was posted in an independent, third-party registry for the data analysis plan. **No**

Comments about your Preregistration

Though our study was not preregistered using an independent, third-party registry, it was preregistered as part of the conventional dissertation process offered by Louisiana Tech University.

METHODS SECTION

The manuscript fully describes...

- | | |
|---|------------|
| (14) the rationale for the sample size used (e.g., an a priori power analysis). | Yes |
| (15) how participants were recruited. | Yes |
| (16) how participants were selected (e.g., eligibility criteria). | Yes |
| (17) what compensation was offered for participation. | Yes |
| (18) how participant dropout was handled (e.g., replaced, omitted, etc). | Yes |
| (19) how participants were assigned to conditions. | Yes |
| (20) how stimulus materials were randomized. | No |
| (21) whether (and, if so, how) participants, experimenters, and data-analysts were kept naive to potentially biasing information. | No |
| (22) the study design, procedures, and materials to allow independent replication. | Yes |
| (23) the measures of interest (e.g., friendliness). | Yes |
| (24) all operationalizations for the measures of interest (e.g., a questionnaire measuring friendliness). | Yes |

Comments about your Methods section

- (20) Regarding randomization, stimulus materials were randomized using the randomizer function that is built into Qualtrics.
- (21) The analysts were aware of the hypotheses that they were testing, but proceed in a manner that maintained integrity with what was proposed as part of the dissertation process. We described any deviations from this plan that are relevant for the paper in the manuscript. One exception though is that two variables that were part of the dissertation were dropped from the manuscript (i.e., psychological state and desire to respond). They were dropped to conserve space.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION SECTION

The manuscript...

- | | |
|--|------------|
| (26) distinguishes explicitly between “confirmatory” (i.e., prespecified) and “exploratory” (i.e., not prespecified) analyses. | Yes |
| (27) describes how violations of statistical assumptions were handled. | Yes |
| (28) justifies all statistical choices (e.g., including or excluding covariates; applying or not applying transformations; use of multi-level models vs. ANOVA). | Yes |
| (29) reports the sample size for each cell of the design. | Yes |
| (30) reports how incomplete or missing data were handled. | NA |
| (31) presents protocols for data preprocessing (e.g., cleaning, discarding of cases and items, normalizing, smoothing, artifact correction). | Yes |

Comments about your Results and Discussion

- (30) Once outliers were screened, no missing data emerged.

DATA, CODE, AND MATERIALS AVAILABILITY SECTION

The following have been made publicly available...

- | | |
|---|------------|
| (32) the (processed) data, on which the analyses of the manuscript were based. | Yes |
| (33) all code and software (that is not copyright protected). | Yes |
| (34) all instructions, stimuli, and test materials (that are not copyright protected). | NA |
| (35) Are the data properly archived (i.e., would a graduate student with relevant background knowledge be able to identify each variable and reproduce the analysis)? | Yes |
| (36) The manuscript includes a statement concerning the availability and location of all research items, including data, materials, and code relevant to the study. | Yes |

Comments about your Data, Code, and Materials

- (34) These can be made available upon request.