# Incidental Attitude Formation via the Surveillance Task: A Registered Replication Report of Olson and Fazio (2001)

Transparency Report 1.0 (full, 36 items)

Tal Moran; Sean Hughes; Ian Hussey; Miguel A. Vadillo; Michael A. Olson; Frederik Aust; Karoline Bad

17 June, 2020

Corresponding author's email address: [@tmo286@gmail.com](@tmo286@gmail.com)

Link to Project Repository: https://osf.io/hs32y/

#### 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.

  Yes
- (2) The manuscript includes a URL to all preregistrations that concern the present study. Yes
- (3) The study was preregistered...

before any data were collected

#### The preregistration fully describes...

- (4) all inclusion and exclusion criteria for participation (e.g., English speakers who achieved a certain cutoff score in a language test).

  Yes
- (5) all procedures for assigning participants to conditions.

Yes

(6) all procedures for randomizing stimulus materials.

- $\mathbf{Yes}$
- (7) any procedures for ensuring that participants, experimenters, and data-analysts were kept naive (blinded) to potentially biasing information.

  NA
- (8) a rationale for the sample size used (e.g., an a priori power analysis).

Yes

(9) the measures of interest (e.g., friendliness).

- $\mathbf{Yes}$
- (10) all operationalizations for the measures of interest (e.g., a questionnaire measuring friendliness). Yes
- (11) the data preprocessing plans (e.g., transformed, cleaned, normalized, smoothed).

 $\mathbf{Yes}$ 

(12) how missing data (e.g., dropouts) were planned to be handled.

- Yes
- (13) the intended statistical analysis for each research question (this may require, for example, information about the sidedness of the tests, inference criteria, corrections for multiple testing, model selection criteria, prior distributions etc.).

  Yes

#### Comments about your Preregistration

An updated preregistration (osf.io/uyng7) was made prior to study completion, in order to cover details and changes that were not covered by the original (https://osf.io/3hjpf). This is discussed in the deviations from preregistration section of the supplementary materials (https://osf.io/kzchq/).

| Some details were not described in text but were implemen   | ted in preregistered code, for example the handling |
|---|---|
| of missing data (i.e., complete data was required for inclu | usion).   |
|   |   |

### METHODS SECTION

#### The manuscript fully describes...

Yes (14) the rationale for the sample size used (e.g., an a priori power analysis). No (15) how participants were recruited. (16) how participants were selected (e.g., eligibility criteria). Yes (17) what compensation was offered for participation. No (18) how participant dropout was handled (e.g., replaced, omitted, etc). No (19) how participants were assigned to conditions. Yes (20) how stimulus materials were randomized. Yes (21) whether (and, if so, how) participants, experimenters, and data-analysts were kept naive to potentially biasing information. (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 (25) any changes to the preregistration (such as changes in eligibility criteria, group membership cutoffs, or experimental procedures)? Yes

#### Comments about your Methods section

Deviations from preregistration were documented in the supplementary materials: https://osf.io/kzchq/

Recruitment method, compensation, and participant dropout were all handled by each individual site and were not documented beyond stating that all participants were run locally in person rather than online.

#### 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.

NA

- (28) justifies all statistical choices (e.g., including or excluding covariates; applying or not applying transformations; use of multi-level models vs. ANOVA).

  No
- (29) reports the sample size for each cell of the design.

Yes

(30) reports how incomplete or missing data were handled.

Yes

(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

Justifications of analytic choices were not explicit. But, on the other hand, our analytic choices were dictated in large part by the fact that we were replicating an existing paper. However, additional justification of other details such as our specific meta-analytic model would have been more extensive in retrospect.

Sample sizes per site are in the supplementary materials, which also note the number of participants excluded for missing data: https://osf.io/kzchq/

Protocols for data preprocessing were not explicated in the written preregistration, but the code formalizing this processing was preregistered.

No tests for violations of assumptions were employed.

## 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). Yes
- (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

No comments.