Reply to PCIRR Stage 2 2nd R&R decision letter: Tsang (2006) Replication Registered Report

We would like to thank the editor for the useful feedback and below we provide a detailed response to each item.

A track-changes comparison of the previous submission and the revised submission can be found on: https://draftable.com/compare/JIgNbUcUvheW (https://osf.io/d2k5f)

A track-changes manuscript is provided with the file: PCIRR-S2-RNR2-Tsang2006-replication-extension-main-manuscript-v3-G-trackchanges.docx (https://osf.io/gv7ex)

Reply to Editor: Dr./Prof. Zhang Chen

> **Thank you for submitting your revised Stage 2 manuscript, titled "Revisiting the Effects of Helper Intention on Gratitude and Indebtedness: Replication and extensions Registered Report of Tsang (2006)", to PCI RR. All previous comments by the reviewers have been addressed very satisfactorily. There are, however, a few very minor textual issues (listed below) that I hope you could address, before I recommend this Registered Report. I read the version with tracked changes, so the page numbers below refer to the word document with tracked changes.**

Thank you for your feedback and the invitation to revise and resubmit. We are very grateful for the careful copyediting that helped us find issues we have somehow become blind to over the many revisions.

.1. Page 6:
"the helper's motivations". For consistency, should this be "the helper's intentions" instead?
"with weaker to no motivation for feelings of indebtedness": with weaker to no effects of the helpers' intentions on feelings of indebtedness?

Corrected. Thank you. We also did a more comprehensive overhaul of the use of "motivations" throughout the manuscript. More on that below.

.2. Page 15, Table 1:
"4 + 5 (2r+3r) [Regression complementary analysis] Benevolent favors result in more indebtedness than selfish-ulterior favors, even after controlling the magnitude of favor.
[Reframed from the target article's null hypothesis]"

I think Hypothesis 4 + 5 is meant to compare gratitude and indebtedness, so the text above quoted from the table is not correct?

Thank you for catching that, that is an important bad copy-paste oversight.

Corrected to the following:

> 4 + 5 (2r+3r): [Regression complementary analysis] The differences between benevolent and selfish-ulterior are stronger for gratitude (H4) than for indebtedness (H5), even after controlling the magnitude of favor.

.3. Page 18:
"To the best of our knowledge, there has been no research examining the impact of helper intention on reciprocation magnitude." It is unclear what "reciprocation magnitude" is. Perhaps you mean "inclination" rather than "magnitude"?

Indeed, thank you. Corrected to inclination.

.4. Page 24, Table 4:
"Independent variables (IV) Motives of helper in the provided in the paragraph (between-subject)"

Should be "Motives of helper provided in the paragraph"?

Thank you. We moved from framing these as motivations to helper intentions, so changed to simply be "Independent variable (IV): Helper intentions (between-subject)" to align with the

methods section “Manipulation of helper intentions”. We changed this in both Table 4 and Table 3.

> **.5. Page 25:**
> **“a statement indicating that they understand and agree and terms”**

Thank you, changed to:

> These were followed by writing or copy-pasting a statement indicating that they understand and agree to the terms, which participants had to enter correctly in order to proceed, with as many attempts as needed.

> **.6. Page 37:**
> **“We concluded support for Hypothesis 4 (2r) that helpers’ motives (benevolent vs. selfish-ulterior) and magnitude of favor predict gratitude, but - as expected - not for Hypothesis 5 (3r null hypothesis) that helpers’ motives and magnitude of favor predict indebtedness.”**
>
> **I think it's more accurate to not have “magnitude of favor” in there. After all, the predictions were about helpers’ motives only, and at the moment it sounds like the magnitude of favor does not predict indebtedness, which is not true.**

Thank you. Changed to:

> We concluded support for Hypothesis 4 (2r) that helpers’ intent (benevolent vs. selfish-ulterior) and magnitude of favor predict gratitude, but - as expected - not for Hypothesis 5 (3r null hypothesis) that helpers’ intent predict indebtedness.

We also realized that sometimes motives, motivations, and intent were used interchangeably, reflective of a similar use in the target article. We changed the helper manipulations throughout the manuscript to refer to intent rather than to motives or motivations. We still refer to helper motivations in the context of the motivations manipulation check dependent variable.

.7. Page 40:
"We conducted independent samples t-tests (Welch's; two-tailed) and found that the rated in the selfish-ulterior condition" Some words are missing after "rated".

Thank you, changed to:

> We conducted independent samples t-tests (Welch's; two-tailed) and found that the rated magnitude of favor in the selfish-ulterior condition (n = 254; M = 5.67, SD = 1.32) was lower than in the benevolent condition (n = 251; M = 6.27, SD = 0.99; Md = -0.60; t (469) = -5.8, p < .001; d = -0.52, 95% CI [-0.69, -0.34]) and in the ambiguous condition (n = 254; M = 6.16, SD = 1.09; Md = -0.49; t (489) = -4.5, p < .001; d = -0.40, 95% CI [-0.58, -0.22]).

.8. Page 49, Figure 9
"Note. Scale: 1 to 7; Higher values indicate higher expectations for reciprocity". The y axis is reciprocity inclination, not expectations.

Thank you for catching that.

There was a missing figure there. There are now the originally intended two figures, one for reciprocity expectations (Figure 9) and one for reciprocity inclination (Figure 10). We renumbered the former Figure 10 to become Figure 11.

We also realized some of the figures were not referred to from the text, and added that throughout. We checked the same for the tables, and realized it might be better to change the location of some of the tables to be closer to the text that references them.