

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Supplemental Tables A. Additional Tables in Study 3

Table A1. Results of a conditional logistic regression analysis.

Variables	<i>B</i>	SE (<i>B</i>)	β	SE (β)	<i>Z</i>	P> <i>z</i>
Positivity	.75	.22	.58	.17	3.41	.001
Expertise	2.29	.75	.44	.15	3.04	.002
Experience show	-.15	.21	-.13	.18	-.71	.480
Experience industry ¹	.05	.34	.15	.99	.15	.883
Decision certainty	.01	.01	.35	.20	1.76	.079
Coach gender ²	.68	1.01	.28	.41	.68	.496
Coach ethnicity	.98	2.28	.46	1.06	.43	.667
<i>N</i>	315					

Pseudo $R^2 = .21$, $\chi^2 = 23.47$. Both unstandardized (*B*) and standardized (β) regression coefficients are reported. Both standard errors are clustered at the artist level.

¹We included additional experience variable in the analysis as unlike the alternative-specific conditional logistic regression analysis, the conditional logistic regression allows us to include coach (i.e., alternative) specific, fixed variables, including coach's industry experience, gender, and ethnicity. Regarding the experience industry variable, we measured it by calculating how long they had been in the field. That is, we calculated the number of years passed between their debut as popular artists until the competition.

²We included the coaches' gender (1 = male; 0 = female) and ethnicity (1 = Caucasian; 0 = African American) in the analysis. We did not include their age as a control variable because it was one of the significant factor determining their industry experience, and the correlation between their ages and industry experience was high, $r = .62$, $p < .001$, indicating that the two variables account for overlapping variance. Thus, including both variables could bias results from the analysis. We further clustered standard errors at the artist level to control for unobserved individual differences among the artists.

Table A2. Results of alternative-specific conditional logistic regression analysis for binary choices

Variables	<i>B</i>	SE (<i>B</i>)	β	SE (β)	<i>Z</i>	P> <i>z</i>
Behavioral positivity	1.08	.66	.69	.42	1.63	.104
Verbal positivity	.18	.11	.68	.39	1.73	.083
Expertise	3.76	2.10	.69	.38	1.79	.073
Decision certainty	.02	.02	.43	.36	1.19	.236
Experience	-1.20	1.26	-1.04	1.09	-.95	.340
Adam: Age	-.03	.11	-.24	1.03	-.23	.819
Blake: Age	-.02	.07	-.22	.60	-.37	.715
Christina: Age	-.02	.08	-.19	.78	-.24	.809
Adam: Gender	-1.63	1.82	-.81	.91	-.90	.370
Black: Gender	1.91	1.15	.95	.57	1.66	.096
Christina: Gender	.11	1.62	.05	.80	.07	.948
Adam: Season	.85	.60	1.29	.92	1.40	.160
Blake: Season	.98	1.10	1.48	1.68	.88	.376
Christina: Season	-.39	.41	-.59	.63	-.94	.346
<i>N</i>	120					

We further analyzed the data in more depth and examined whether there was any difference in advisor selection between when artists made a dichotomous choice and when they chose among three coaches. We thus split the artists into two groups: those who chose between two coaches ($N = 120$; dichotomous choices) and those who chose among three or four coaches ($N = 195$; multiple options). With each group of artists, we conducted the same regression analysis with the two positivity scores as independent variables. Table A2 shows the result with the group with two options (McFadden $R^2 = .65$, $\chi^2 = 105.7$). We include the same variables with the analysis with all artists. Both unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients are reported.

Table A3. Results of alternative-specific conditional logistic regression analysis for multiple choices

Variables	<i>B</i>	SE (<i>B</i>)	β	SE (β)	<i>Z</i>	P> <i>z</i>
Behavioral positivity	1.08	.48	.77	.34	2.27	.023
Verbal positivity	.02	.07	.07	.24	.30	.764
Expertise	3.21	1.17	.64	.23	2.73	.006
Decision certainty	.01	.01	.25	.30	.84	.399
Experience	.50	1.18	.43	1.02	.43	.669
Adam: Age	.05	.08	.32	.51	.63	.529
Blake: Age	.19	.11	1.19	.70	1.70	.089
Christina: Age	.06	.10	.41	.61	.66	.509
Adam: Gender	-.43	1.03	-.21	.52	-.41	.679
Black: Gender	-3.07	1.44	-1.54	.72	-2.12	.034
Christina: Gender	-.24	1.16	-.12	.58	-.21	.836
Adam: Number	1.41	1.27	.68	.61	1.11	.267
Blake: Number	1.06	1.46	.51	.71	.73	.466
Christina: Number	-.57	1.53	-.28	.74	-.38	.707
Adam: Season	.36	.44	.46	.56	.82	.414
Blake: Season	-.57	1.25	-.73	1.60	-.45	.650
Christina: Season	.28	.46	.36	.59	.60	.546
<i>N</i>	195					

Table A3 shows the result with the group with multiple options (McFadden $R^2 = .41$, $\chi^2 = 60.98$). We include the same variables with the analysis with all artists. Both unstandardized (*B*) and standardized (β) regression coefficients are reported.

Table A4. Results of conditional logistic regression analyses for binary (contestants choosing among two coaches) vs. multiple choices (contestants choosing among three coaches)

Variables	<i>B</i>	SE	Z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
<i>Binary choices</i>						
Behavioral positivity	.35	.46	.76	.448	-.56	1.26
Verbal positivity	.24	.08	3.13	.002	.09	.39
Expertise	2.14	1.37	1.56	.119	-.55	4.82
Experience show	.03	.32	.08	.937	-.61	.66
Experience industry	.73	.60	1.22	.222	-.44	1.90
Decision certainty	.03	.01	2.03	.042	.00	.05
Coach gender	2.43	1.70	1.43	.153	-.90	5.76
Coach ethnicity	5.02	3.83	1.31	.191	-2.49	12.53
<i>N</i>	120					
<i>Multiple choices</i>						
Behavioral positivity	.83	.40	2.09	.037	.05	1.61
Verbal positivity	.01	.06	.13	.900	-.12	.13
Expertise	2.81	.97	2.92	.004	.92	4.71
Experience show	-.17	.31	-.55	.583	-.79	.44
Experience industry	-.27	.46	-.58	.564	-1.17	.64
Decision certainty	.01	.01	.63	.531	-.01	.03
Coach gender	-.13	1.39	-.09	.927	-2.85	2.59
Coach ethnicity	-1.14	3.19	-.36	.722	-7.39	5.12
<i>N</i>	195					

We conducted the same additional conditional logistic regression analyses with the two split groups (binary choices and multiple choice). We include the same control variables, such as expertise, experience, decision certainty, and coach demographics. Standard errors are clustered at the artist level.

Supplemental Analyses B1. Results in Study 1B

We also conducted a different version of Study 1 with the same sample, sample size, and instructions, but using Likert scales instead of rankings. Specifically, we recruited 150 adults via Amazon's Mechanical Turk service (65 females; $M_{\text{age}} = 35.04$, $SD = 10.06$). A power analysis indicated that this sample size was sufficient to provide adequate power, $1 - \beta > .80$, to detect a medium sized effect $d = .50$. As in Study 1, we listed five characteristics of advisors: expertise, advising experience, personality fit, honest criticism, and expressed positivity. Then participants were asked to predict to what extent they would rely on each of the five characteristics when selecting an advisor (1 = "*Not at all*"; 7 = "*Very much*").

The results show that participants predicted they would be less willing to work with an advisor with expressed positivity ($M = 5.75$, $SD = 1.27$) than an advisor with expertise ($M = 6.23$, $SD = 1.00$), $F(1, 149) = 19.79$, $p < .001$, and an advisor who provided honest feedback ($M = 6.15$, $SD = 1.05$), $F(1, 149) = 12.65$, $p = .001$. They also indicated that they would be less willing to work with an advisor who expressed positivity than one with advising experience ($M = 5.83$, $SD = 1.32$), but the difference did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 149) = .39$, $p = .531$. They indicated they would be more willing to work with an advisor with expressed positivity than one with personality fit ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 1.34$), but the difference did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 149) = 1.48$, $p = .226$.

Supplemental Analyses B2. Additional results in Study 2B

Twenty-nine participants in Study 2B interpreted our rank item wrong and read it as a continuous measure. We thus attempted to replicate this study with a clearer instruction that they need to rank the advisor characteristics instead of rating them. We pre-registered the study with a pre-planned sample size of 40 regional audition applicants. However, due to rain on the day of data collection, which is the one day of the regional audition of *The Voice*, we were unable to meet our pre-registered sample size goal as contestants were moved off of the public sidewalk and onto private property to avoid rain, which violated the terms of our IRB agreement. The researchers were limited to approach participants only when they were in public space.

As results, we were only able to recruit 15 participants (12 females; $M_{\text{age}} = 21.71$, $SD = 3.63$). Despite this small sample size, we replicate our results of Study 2B: participants predicted they would be less likely to rely expressed positivity when selecting their advisors on the competition. Specifically, participants ranked expressed positivity ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.18$) significantly lower than expertise ($M = 1.87$, $SD = 1.13$), $Z = -3.25$, $p = .001$, personality fit ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.55$), $Z = -2.20$, $p = .028$, and honest criticism ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.23$), $Z = -2.95$, $p = .003$. They also ranked expressed positivity lower than advising experience ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .96$), but the difference did not reach statistical significance, $Z = -.84$, $p = .400$.

Supplemental Analyses C1. Pre-test results in Study 5

As we changed the advisor domain to social skills, we conducted a pre-test to ensure the validity of our revised measures. We recruited 101 participants (60 females; $M_{\text{age}} = 38.03$, $SD = 10.89$) via Amazon's Mechanical Turk service to complete a study about ranking advisors who give people personal coaching on social skills. Participants ranked advisors based on their philosophies, specifically: (1) expressed positivity: "I always find a positive thing to say to encourage my advisees, with an emphasis on pointing out their strengths"; (2) expertise: "I apply my expertise in interpersonal behaviors to my advisee's specific situation, in order to help them achieve the most successful outcome"¹³; (3) honest feedback: "I try to give my advisees honest and critical feedback, with an emphasis on pointing out their weaknesses"; and (4) experience: "I have years of experience helping advisees form better relationships". We dropped the personality fit dimension in the study as it was difficult to operationalize in this choice setting.

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Tests revealed that expressed positivity ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.02$) was ranked significantly lower than expertise ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.01$), $Z = -5.35$, $p < .001$, $r = -.37$, honest feedback ($M = 2.03$, $SD = 1.05$), $Z = -6.08$, $p < .001$, $r = -.43$ and experience ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 0.99$), $Z = -3.73$, $p < .001$, $r = -.26$. Therefore, the findings from our previous prediction studies appear to generalize to this new empirical context.

Supplemental Analyses C2. Pre-test results in Study 6

We completed two pre-tests of this advice on Mechanical Turk. The materials for these pretests are available via our OSF page. In the first pre-test ($N = 242$), we successfully manipulated positivity ($t = 2.54, p = .012$) and positivity was unrelated to perceptions of expertise ($t = 1.02, p = .310$).

In our second pre-test ($N = 148$), after some revisions to our expertise measures, we successfully manipulated expertise related to singing specifically ($t = 2.93, p = .018$) and expertise was unrelated to perceptions of positivity ($t = .35, p = .56$), perceived effort to implement the advice ($t = .21, p = .649$), perceived difficulty of understanding the advice ($t = -0.51, p = .611$), the perceived intelligence of the advisor ($t = 1.11, p = .213$), or the perceived accuracy of the advice ($t = 0.78, p = .149$). Thus, our expertise manipulation affects perceptions of domain-specific advice specifically, but not perceptions of general expertise or the potential confounds assessed in our pretest.

Supplemental Analyses D1. Additional analyses with the full sample in Study 6

Even when we advertised Study 6 to recruit individuals who had experience in singing, twenty-six participants indicated that they “never sing.” We reported analyses excluding these participants in the manuscript but conducted and reported the same analyses including them.

Manipulation Check. We first tested the effects of the expertise manipulation on perceived expertise in music generally. A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a main effect for our expertise manipulation on perceptions of advisors’ general expertise, $F(1, 183) = 14.86, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$. Neither the positivity manipulation or the interaction was significant, $F_s < .29, p_s > .743$. Those in the higher-expertise condition ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.24$) rated the advisor significantly higher in general expertise than participants assigned to the lower-expertise condition ($M = 4.26, SD = 1.41$). Likewise, an ANOVA revealed a main effect for our expertise manipulation on perceptions of advisors’ singing-specific expertise, $F(1, 183) = 24.49, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$. There was no effect of the positivity manipulation or the interaction, $F_s < .12, p_s > .732$. Those in the higher-expertise condition ($M = 5.07, SD = 1.20$) rated the advisor significantly higher in expertise than did participants assigned to the lower-expertise condition ($M = 4.11, SD = 1.43$).

Next, we tested the effectiveness of our positivity manipulation. An ANOVA revealed a significant effect for the positivity manipulation, $F(1, 183) = 10.65, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$ and a significant interaction effect, $F(1, 183) = 4.91, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .03$. Expertise did not emerge as a main effect, $F_s < .16, p_s > .691$. Specifically, at higher levels of expertise, higher ($M = 5.66, SD = 1.19$) and lower ($M = 5.48, SD = 1.30$) positivity advisors did not differ significantly, $F(1, 92) = 0.51, p = .479, \eta_p^2 = .005$. At lower levels of expertise, higher ($M = 6.12, SD = 1.20$) and lower ($M = 5.16, SD = 1.08$) positivity differed significantly, $F(1, 91) = 16.42, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .153$.

Advisor Evaluations. We first analyzed participants' affective evaluations of their advisors (satisfaction, liking; $\alpha = .83$). A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for expertise, $F(1, 183) = 6.41, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = .03$, as well as an interaction between expertise and positivity, $F(1, 183) = 6.36, p = .013, \eta_p^2 = .03$. No main effect for positivity emerged, $F_s < .88, ps > .351$. Decomposing the interaction, at lower levels of positivity, advisors with higher expertise ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.34$) received higher evaluations than did those with lower expertise ($M = 3.97, SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 92) = 14.87, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .14$. At higher levels of positivity, higher ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.27$) and lower ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.50$) expertise did not differ significantly, $F(1, 91) = .00, p = .994, \eta_p^2 = .00$. Likewise, at lower level of expertise, higher- positivity advisors ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.33$) were given more favorable evaluations than lower-positivity advisors ($M = 3.97, SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 91) = 6.00, p = .016, \eta_p^2 = .06$, while at higher level of expertise, advisor positivity did not have an effect, $F(1, 92) = 1.25, p = .266, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

We next analyzed the evaluations of advisor effectiveness; to what extent they believed that the advice they received was helpful and improved their performance ($\alpha = .88$). A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for expertise, $F(1, 183) = 4.35, p = .038, \eta_p^2 = .04$. The main effect for positivity nor the interaction effect emerged, $F_s < 1.49, ps > .224$. Advisors with higher levels of expertise ($M = 4.08, SD = 1.44$) received more credit for performance improvement than advisors with lower levels of expertise ($M = 3.64, SD = 1.44$).

Participants also rated the extent to which they believed their advisor was invested in them (how much they wanted to work with participant, how invested they were in success; $\alpha = .84$). No significant effects emerged, $F_s < 1.67, ps > .199$.

Finally, we analyzed their willingness to receive further feedback from their advisor. A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for expertise, $F(1, 182) = 9.82, p = .002, \eta_p^2$

= .05. No other effects emerged, $F_s < 1.10$, $ps > .298$. Participants with higher-expertise advisors ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.65$) indicated stronger desire to receive more feedback than those with lower-expertise advisors ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.61$). Also, throughout the study, we employed various measures to see if our manipulations influenced participant's perceptions of their performances and skills. Repeated measures ANOVAs did not reveal any significant effects, suggesting that participants' self-perceptions were not affected by our manipulations.

Affective States. We analyzed affective states measured at the beginning and end of the study. A repeated measures ANOVA on negative affect (nervous, anxious; $\alpha_{t1} = .92$, $\alpha_{t2} = .94$) found no significant effects, $F_s < .32$, $ps > .575$. Next, a repeated measures ANOVA on excitement revealed a significant effect for expertise, $F(1, 182) = 6.49$, $p = .012$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, while no effects emerged for positivity or interactions, $F_s < .40$, $ps > .532$. That is, excitement decreased when working with the higher-expertise advisor ($\Delta -.09$) compared with lower-expertise advisors ($\Delta .40$).

Task Enjoyment. Additionally, at the end of the study, we asked whether participants found the task enjoyable. A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a marginally significant effect for positivity, $F(1, 183) = 3.51$, $p = .063$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The other main effect and the interaction did not emerge, $F_s < 1.18$, $ps > .281$. Specifically, participants with the higher-positivity advisor ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.37$) enjoyed the task more than those with the lower-positivity advisor ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.39$).

Vocal Performance. We conducted a repeated measures 2×2 ANOVAs for Time 1 and Time 2 ratings of pitch, tempo, enthusiasm, and overall quality. No significant effects emerged for pitch, $F_s < 1.07$, $ps > .303$, tempo, $F_s < .49$, $ps > .489$, or enthusiasm, $F_s < 1.87$, $ps > .174$. An ANOVA for overall quality showed the effect in the predicted direction but the difference did

not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 183) = 2.39, p = .124, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Neither positivity nor the interaction effect did not reach significance, $F_s < .38, p_s > .540$.

Supplemental Analyses D2. Additional variables from Study 6.

Advisor Evaluations. We assessed participants' affective evaluations of their advisors (satisfaction, liking; $\alpha = .82$). A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for expertise, $F(1, 157) = 8.23, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = .05$, as well as an interaction between expertise and positivity, $F(1, 157) = 4.87, p = .029, \eta_p^2 = .03$. No main effect for positivity emerged, $F_s < .25, p_s > .619$. Decomposing the interaction, at lower levels of positivity, participants in the high-expertise condition ($M = 5.08, SD = 1.31$) liked their advisor more than those in the low-expertise condition ($M = 4.06, SD = 0.96$), $F(1, 82) = 16.47, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .17$. At higher levels of positivity, the higher ($M = 4.73, SD = 1.13$) and lower ($M = 4.60, SD = 1.65$) expertise conditions did not differ significantly, $F(1, 76) = .18, p = .676, \eta_p^2 = .002$.

We next analyzed perceived advisor effectiveness: the extent to which they believed that the advice they received was helpful and improved their performance ($\alpha = .88$). A 2×2 ANOVA only revealed a significant main effect for expertise, $F(1, 157) = 6.74, p = .010, \eta_p^2 = .04$. No main effect for positivity or an interaction effect emerged, $F_s < .98, p_s > .325$. Participants in the high-expertise condition ($M = 4.20, SD = 1.39$) found their advisor more helpful for their performance improvement than those in the low-expertise condition ($M = 3.61, SD = 1.45$). There was no significant effect on the extent to which they expected their advisor to be invested in working with participants in future, $F_s < 1.40, p_s > .240$.

Affect and Enjoyment. We analyzed affective states measured at the beginning and end of the study. A 2×2 repeated measures ANOVA found no significant effect on negative affect (nervous, anxious; $\alpha_{t1} = .92, \alpha_{t2} = .94$), $F_s < .93, p_s > .338$ and revealed a significant effect of the

expertise manipulation on excitement, $F(1, 156) = 7.64, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .05$. Specifically, in the low-positivity conditions, excitement decreased when working with higher-expertise advisors ($\Delta -0.31$) compared with when working with lower-expertise advisors ($\Delta 0.46$), $F(1, 80) = 5.82, p = .024, \eta_p^2 = .06$. In the high-positivity conditions, there was no difference in excitement. We note that participants' change in excitement from Time 1 to Time 2 was correlated with perceived advisor effectiveness ($r = .19, p = .009$), potentially driving the result on excitement. We then analyzed participants' overall enjoyment with the singing task. A 2×2 ANOVA revealed a marginally significant effect for positivity, $F(1, 157) = 3.71, p = .056, \eta_p^2 = .02$. The other main effect and the interaction did not emerge, $F_s < .48, p_s > .490$. Specifically, participants with the higher-positivity advisor ($M = 5.24, SD = 1.32$) enjoyed the task more than those with the lower-positivity advisor ($M = 4.85, SD = 1.29$).

Supplemental Materials E1. Instructions, manipulations, and main measures

Study 1

Instructions:

“Predicting Advisor Choice: Now please indicate your preferences for future relationships in career development. An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Imagine that you are about to select an advisor for your career. We are interested in how you would choose an advisor to help you advance in your career. Please select which advisor you would choose below, based on their traits. You can rank them by clicking the number on the left and dragging to the position you want it to be (1 = top choice; 6 = last choice).”

Rank options:

Advisor's expertise: your advisor is a great expert in what you do

Advising experience: your advisor had many successful advisees in past

Personality fit: you and your advisor get along and enjoy the time together

Positivity: your advisor has expressed he or she is excited to work with you

Honest feedback and criticism: your advisor gives you honest feedback about your performance

Other _____

Study 1B

Instructions:

“Predicting Advisor Choice: Now please indicate your preferences for future relationships in career development. An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Imagine that you are about to select an advisor for your career. We are interested in how you would choose an advisor to help you advance in your career. Please indicate the extent to which you would like to choose an advisor who possesses each of the five traits (1 = not at all; 7 = very much).”

Items:

Advisor's expertise: your advisor is a great expert in what you do

Advising experience: your advisor had many successful advisees in past

Personality fit: you and your advisor get along and enjoy the time together

Positivity: your advisor has expressed he or she is excited to work with you

Honest feedback and criticism: your advisor gives you honest feedback about your performance

Other _____

Study 2

Instruction:

“Predicting Coach Choice: Now imagine you are a contestant at The Voice. Please indicate your preferences for future relationships with the The Voice coaches. How do you think you would choose a coach to work with? We are interested in how you would choose an advisor to help you advance in your singing career. Please select which advisor you would choose below, based on their traits. You can rank them by clicking the number on the left and dragging to the position you want it to be (1 = top choice; 6 = last choice).”

Rank options:

Expertise: a coach has a great expertise in a type of music you play
Advising experience: a coach has many successful artists who won the show as mentees in past
Personality fit: you and a coach get along and enjoy the time together
Positivity: a coach has expressed he or she is excited to work with you
Honest feedback and criticism: a coach gives you honest feedback about your performance

Study 2A

Instruction:

“We are interested in your plan of how to proceed in the Voice competition, if you get the chance. For the following questions, imagine you became a contestant on the Voice. You have given your initial audition performance and all four of the coaches have turned around, wanting to work with you. How do you think you should choose a coach to work with? We are interested in what makes a coach a good advisor who can guide an artist to win the show. Please rank the 6 traits below in order of importance in making someone a good advisor (1 = most important, 6 = least important).”

Rank options:

Expertise: a coach has a great expertise in a type of music you play
Mentoring experience: a coach has many successful artists who won the show as mentees in past
Personality fit: you and a coach get along and enjoy the time together
Positive feedback: a coach gives positive feedback and compliments about your performance
Honest feedback: a coach gives honest feedback and criticism about your performance
Other (specify here): _____

Study 4A

Participants (A note on recruitment in Studies 4A and 4B): We aimed to recruit 200 participants via MTurk. However, in Studies 4A and 4B, 60 and 55 participants, respectively, spent less than 5 seconds reading about the advisors or failing the attention check, and thus, we recruited an additional 80 participants for each study to meet our preregistered number of 200 participants.

Instruction (both conditions):

“An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Advisors can come in many different forms. In this study, we will ask you to imagine that you are about to select a musical advisor. Imagine that you are an aspiring Country singer who will be on the live audition show of The Voice. In this show, a set of judges will listen to you sing and then turn around if they are interested in being your coach. If you have more than 1 coach turnaround, you get to choose who you would like to work with. Please imagine your thoughts and feelings as you perform and wait to see which coaches will be interested in working with you. You are happy to see that two of the judges have turned around - indicating that they would both like to work with you. Now you get to hear from them before deciding who you would like to work with. When you hear from these judges, please think about what you think are the important qualities or attributes to have in someone who advises you.”

Instruction (high-spread condition):

“Coach 1 says to you, “Wow! Great job - you have a great voice! That was a great rendition of the song. Both of us would love to work with you and you have great potential.”

Additional Info: Coach 1 is a Grammy winning artist in R/B and Soul. Coach 1 was born in Atlanta, Georgia and was signed to Motown Records when only 14-years-old.

Coach 2 says to you, “Nice work. I think you have a solid voice. With some tweaks, you can improve.”

Additional Info: Coach 2 is a Grammy winning artist in Country. Coach 2 was born in Ada, Oklahoma and had their lead-off single spend five weeks at number one on the Billboard Hot Country Songs chart.”

Instruction (low-spread condition):

“Coach 1 says to you, "Wow! Great job - you have a great voice! That was a great rendition of the song. Both of us would love to work with you and you have great potential."

Additional Info: Coach 1 is a Grammy winning artist in Folk rock. Coach 1 was born in Duluth, Minnesota and was signed to Asylum Records when only 14-years-old.

Coach 2 says to you, "Nice work. I think you have a solid voice. With some tweaks, you can improve."

Additional Info: Coach 2 is a Grammy winning artist in Country. Coach 2 was born in Ada, Oklahoma and had their lead-off single spend five weeks at number one on the Billboard Hot Country Songs chart.”

Predicted choice:

“Who would you choose to be your advisor ("coach")?”

Expertise:

“Does Coach 1 seem to have a high level of expertise in music, generally?”

“Does Coach 1 seem to have a high level of expertise in your musical genre ("Country"), specifically?”

Positivity:

“How positive do you think Coach 1 was?”

“How excited do you think Coach 1 is to work with you?”

Study 4B

Instruction (both conditions):

“Imagine that you are looking to choose a financial advisor. You can see their returns on investment (ROI). An ROI measures the gain or loss generated on an investment relative to the amount of money invested. ROI is usually expressed as a percentage where a higher percentage is a greater return on your investment. In this study, we will ask you to consider the attributes that would be important to you in a financial advisor.

Imagine that you have now met with two potential financial advisors. Please click forward to learn more about these advisors and your interactions. While reading, please think about what you think are the important qualities or attributes to have in someone who advises you.”

Instruction (high spread condition):

“Advisor 1 You have a very pleasant conversation with Advisor 1. Advisor 1 is super warm toward you, smiling and nodding throughout, and expresses enthusiasm at the option to work together.

Additional Info: Advisor 1 is a Certified Financial Planner, and did his undergraduate degree in finance at the University of Virginia. On average, his ROI for his clients is 7%.

Advisor 2 You have a decently pleasant conversation with Advisor 2. Advisor 2 is more neutral in his expression, leaning back in his chair, and says that he would be happy to work together.

Additional Info: Advisor 2 is a Certified Financial Planner, and did his undergraduate degree in finance at the University of Michigan. On average, his ROI for his clients is 15%.”

Instruction (low spread condition):

“Advisor 1 You have a very pleasant conversation with Advisor 1. Advisor 1 is super warm toward you, smiling and nodding throughout, and expresses enthusiasm at the option to work together.

Additional Info: Advisor 1 is a Certified Financial Planner, and did his undergraduate degree in finance at the University of Virginia. On average, his ROI for his clients is 7%.

Advisor 2 You have a decently pleasant conversation with Advisor 2. Advisor 2 is more neutral in his expression, leaning back in his chair, and says that he would be happy to work together.

Additional Info: Advisor 2 is a Certified Financial Planner, and did his undergraduate degree in finance at the University of Michigan. On average, his ROI for his clients is 9%.”

Predicted choice:

“Who would you choose to be your financial advisor?”

Expertise:

“Does Advisor 1 seem to have a high level of expertise in finance, generally?”

“Does Advisor 1 seem to have a high level of expertise in guaranteeing clients a high return on investment, specifically?”

Positivity:

“How positive do you think Advisor 1 was?”

“How excited do you think Advisor 1 is to work with you?”

Study 5

Instruction (choice condition):

“Social skills are invaluable in the workplace and in day-to-day life. Your success at connecting with and communicating with others is vital to important life outcomes. Individuals with better communication skills are more likely to negotiate for higher salaries and have successful relationships at work and at home. We are interested in measuring social skills and how individuals express themselves online. Today, you will complete a variety of tasks. Starting on the next page you will be asked to respond to various questions measuring your social and interpersonal skills. Please take your time to carefully respond to these questions and be as detailed as possible (minimum 100 characters).

Tell us about a time where you persuaded someone to take your side on an issue. What was the issue? How specifically did you persuade someone to take your point of view?

How do you make friends? What do you do to try to make a new friend?

When a friend or coworker is feeling down, what do you do?

A coworker has just returned to work after the loss of their parent. What do you say to this person upon seeing them for the first time?

Thank you for the response on your social skills. Social skills are one of those domains in which we believe ourselves to be better than we actually are. Experts say that professional social-skills coaching can improve our career to a great extent. From the next page onward, you will read about an actual group that provides advice on your social skills. The group consists of a number of career coaches and psychologists that serve as advisors. Once you read about the group, you will be asked to choose an advisor whom you actually want advice from. We are interested in your choice, and you will work with the chosen advisor.

Please move on to the next page to begin.

Please ensure that pop-up boxes are enabled as we are using a Chat Platform where you will be asked to communicate with one of the advisors.

An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Advisors can come in many different forms.

Career coaches and psychologists often pose the previous questions in order to assess and advise an individual on their social skills. Feedback can easily be given to make us more persuasive and socially skilled. These people can pick apart what you have said and give you specific strategies to use in the future to increase your social skills.

Please wait while we match you with the facilitators for the next part of the study.

We are interested in what makes a person a good career coach or advisor. We are using a Chat Platform to provide you with real-time feedback. This study is being run by a professor at a business school and a career coaching group. We are running this study only in the afternoons (EST) to provide our participants with detailed feedback in real time. We are giving your responses to the social skills assessments questions to an advisor to provide you with immediate feedback. There are multiple advisors on call right now and we will do our best to match you with your desired advisor. We have provided some information about their advising philosophies below. Please select your ideal advisor below, based on their philosophies (1 = top choice; 4 = last choice). You can rank them by clicking the number on the left and dragging to the position you want it to be. We will match you based on your selected advisor traits and they will give you feedback on your interpersonal skills ASAP.”

Instruction (prediction condition):

“In order to assess social skills, career coaches and advisors often have advisees answer various questions about how they would act in certain situations to get an understanding of the types of behaviors where an individual could improve. On the next page you will read the types of questions that career advisors might ask advisees in order to assess their social skills. When you read these questions, think for a moment about what you might say to these questions. Advisees answer the following types of questions to assess their social skills:

Tell us about a time where you persuaded someone to take your side on an issue. What was the issue? How specifically did you persuade someone to take your point of view?

How do you make friends? What do you do to try to make a new friend?

When a friend or coworker is feeling down, what do you do?

A coworker has just returned to work after the loss of their parent. What do you say to this person upon seeing them for the first time?

Social skills tend to be one of those domains in which we believe ourselves to be better than we actually are. Experts say that professional social skills coaching can improve our career to a great extent.

From the next page, you will read about a group that provides advice on your social skills. The group consists of a number of career coaches and psychologists that serve as advisors. Once you read about the group, you will be asked to choose an advisor whom you hypothetically want advice from. We are interested in your preferences, but you will not work with the chosen advisor. Please move on to the next page to begin.

An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Advisors can come in many different forms.

Career coaches and psychologists often pose the previous questions in order to assess and advise an individual on their social skills. Feedback can easily be given to make us more persuasive and socially skilled. These people can pick apart what you have said and give you specific strategies to use in the future to increase your social skills.

Now please indicate your preferences for future relationships in career development. We are interested in what makes a person a good career coach or advisor. Imagine being paired with an advisor in the future who will assist you in refining your interpersonal skills. These advisors all have expertise in the area of interpersonal

communications and development. However, different advisors have different philosophies. We are interested in how people should choose a career coach or advisor. Please rank the advisor philosophies below in order of importance in how you should choose an advisor. You can rank them by clicking the number on the left and dragging to the position you want it to be (1 = most important; 4 = least important).”

Rank options:

Honest Feedback: I try to give my advisees honest and critical feedback, with an emphasis on pointing out their weaknesses

Positive Feedback: I always find a positive thing to say to encourage my advisees, with an emphasis on pointing out their strengths

Experience: I have years of experience helping advisees form better relationships

Expertise: I apply my expertise in interpersonal behaviors to my advisee’s specific situation, in order to help them achieve the most successful outcome

Study 6 Pre-test A

Instruction (all conditions):

“An advisor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. Advisors can come in many different forms. In this study, we would like you to imagine that you have come to have your singing assessed by a potential advisor. You have sung the song, "Don't Stop Believin'" and are waiting to hear back from a potential advisor. Please imagine your thoughts and feelings as you have finished your performance and wait to hear from your potential advisor.”

Instruction (high-positivity manipulation):

“After your singing, your potential advisor says to you, "Great job. You have a great voice! That was a great rendition of the song. Everyone would love to work with you and you have great potential.””

Instruction (low-positivity manipulation):

“After your singing, your potential advisor says to you, "Good job. You have a good voice. That was a decent rendition of the song. With some tweaks you can improve.””

Instruction (high-expertise manipulation):

“Your potential advisor continues...

"First of all, do not try to sing too loud. It is harder to hit the right pitch when you try to sing in a bigger voice.

That’s why it is easier to hum some times. More specifically, to get the right pitch, two things to remember is 1) to have enough air flow and 2) to have enough space in your mouth. First, you are a wind instrument as a singer, which is why you need enough air to sing well on pitch. Every time you get a chance to breathe during singing, make sure you inhale enough (just like when you sigh). Second, you want to make sure you have enough space in your mouth without your face feeling closed. You want to stretch your mouth as if you are yawning.

This song involves a number of high notes, including the part with the lyrics “somewhere in the night.” Those parts of the song are usually harder to hit the correct note. For the high notes, you need to act as if you are singing the high note BEFORE it comes. As the pitch goes higher, the part of your body necessary to hit the pitch goes higher as well, just think of your body as an instrument. So it is important to open space in your mouth and face. Lift the back of your mouth as if you are yawning to create the space to create echo. Open up the space before you hit the high note. Also you can do that mentally, you should pretend you are singing in the high note BEFORE you hit the high note. So you do not have to rush to go to high note so suddenly. Then once you get to the note, thrust your energy down when you actually get to the note. Finally, you do not have to scrunch your face or “squeeze” the face muscle to get to the note. That motion does not help you.””

Instruction (low-expertise manipulation):

"Your potential advisor continues...

"Usually, it is important to listen to your own singing, or playing any type of instrument, recorded. Often we do not see how we perform exactly, and that is why listening to your own recording helps what you do well and what you do badly. You can see which part you struggle of getting the right note or getting the right tempo. Then repeat working on the part you can improve specifically and repeat the process of recording and practicing the weak part. It is also often help to move a part of your body to the rhythm to keep you in the correct tempo. Snap your fingers or tap your foot (especially when your hands are occupied to the instrument) to "feel the beat." It makes it easier to keep the tempo right.

This song involves a number of tempo changes, including the part with the lyrics "somewhere in the night." Those parts of the song are usually harder to hit the correct tempo. For the changes in tempo, you need to act as if you are singing the tempo change BEFORE it comes. As the tempo goes faster, just think of your body as an instrument and move your body in line with the tempo."

Positivity:

"How positive do you think your advisor was?"

"How excited do you think the advisor is to work with you?"

Expertise:

"Does the advisor seem to have a high level of expertise?"

Study 6 Pre-test B

Instruction (high-expertise manipulation):

"Imagine your potential advisor says to you...

"First of all, do not try to sing too loud. It is harder to hit the right pitch when you try to sing in a bigger voice.

That's why it is easier to hum sometimes. More specifically, to get the right pitch, two things to remember is 1) to have enough air flow and 2) to have enough space in your mouth. First, you are a wind instrument as a singer, which is why you need enough air to sing well on pitch. Every time you get a chance to breathe during singing, make sure you inhale enough (just like when you sigh). Second, you want to make sure you have enough space in your mouth without your face feeling closed. You want to stretch your mouth as if you are yawning."

Your potential advisor continues...

"This song involves a number of high notes, including the part with the lyrics "somewhere in the night." Those parts of the song are usually harder to hit the correct note. For the high notes, you need to act as if you are singing the high note BEFORE it comes. As the pitch goes higher, the part of your body necessary to hit the pitch goes higher as well, just think of your body as an instrument. So it is important to open space in your mouth and face. Lift the back of your mouth as if you are yawning to create the space to create echo. Open up the space before you hit the high note. Also you can do that mentally, you should pretend you are singing in the high note BEFORE you hit the high note. So you do not have to rush to go to high note so suddenly. Then once you get to the note, thrust your energy down when you actually get to the note. Finally, you do not have to scrunch your face or "squeeze" the face muscle to get to the note. That motion does not help you."

Instruction (low-expertise manipulation):

"Imagine your potential advisor says to you...

"First, it is important to listen to your own singing, or playing any type of instrument, recorded. Often, we do not see how we perform exactly, that is just hard to do. So that is why listening to your own recording helps what you do badly and what you should improve. You can see which part you struggle of getting the right note or getting the right tempo. You should then repeat working on the part you can improve specifically and repeat the process of recording and practicing the weak part. It is also often help to move a part of your body to the rhythm to keep you in

the correct tempo. You should either snap your fingers or tap your foot (especially when your hands are occupied to the instrument) to “feel the beat.” It would help you keep the tempo right throughout a song.”

Your potential advisor continues...

"This song involves a number of tempo changes, including the part with the lyrics “somewhere in the night.” Those parts of the song can be hard to hit the correct tempo. For the changes in tempo, you need to act as if you are singing the tempo change before it comes. As the tempo goes faster, just think of your body as an instrument and move your body in line with the tempo.””

Positivity:

“How positive do you think your advisor was?”

“How excited do you think the advisor is to work with you?”

Expertise:

“Does the advisor seem to have a high level of expertise in music, generally?”

“Does the advisor seem to have a high level of expertise in singing, specifically?”

Study 6

Instruction for the first singing task:

“You will be singing the popular karaoke song, Don't Stop Believin' by Journey. You can listen to this song now if you are not familiar with it. You have a hard copy of the song lyrics beside you in a folder--please look over the lyrics to familiarize yourself with the song. You will be singing the Glee version of the song--you will be able to hear the track over your headphones and sing along. Although this version has "male" and "female" parts, we would like you to sing all parts of the song. Don't worry--just sing along to the best of your abilities. Feel free to stand up if that makes you more comfortable. The words on the karaoke track will "light up" when you need to sing them. Just follow along! Note that you will be only asked to sing the first three verses of this song. Please click to the next page to begin. Press "play" right now to begin! There will be a musical interlude before you have to start singing.”

General instruction for feedback (all conditions):

“Next you will be receiving some feedback on singing performance that includes detailed advice to help improve your performance in Round 2. Please read this feedback carefully. Please click to the next page to begin receiving feedback. Note that there may be a slight delay as we collect the feedback from the advisor.”

Instruction for feedback (high-positivity manipulation):

“From your advisor: "Great job. You have a great voice! That was a great rendition of the song. Everyone certainly myself included would love to work with you and you have great potential.””

Instruction for feedback (low-positivity manipulation):

“From your advisor: "Good job. You have a good voice. That was a decent rendition of the song. With some tweaks you can improve.””

Instruction for feedback (high-expertise manipulation):

“From your advisor (continued): "First of all, do not try to sing too loud. It is harder to hit the right pitch when you try to sing in a bigger voice. That's why it is easier to hum sometimes. More specifically, to get the right pitch, two things to remember is 1) to have enough air flow and 2) to have enough space in your mouth. First, you are a wind instrument as a singer, which is why you need enough air to sing well on pitch. Every time you get a chance to breathe during singing, make sure you inhale enough (just like when you sigh). Second, you want to make sure you have enough space in your mouth without your face feeling closed. You want to stretch your mouth as if you are yawning.”

Your advisor continues...

"This song involves a number of high notes, including the part with the lyrics "somewhere in the night." Those parts of the song are usually harder to hit the correct note. For the high notes, you need to act as if you are singing the high note BEFORE it comes. As the pitch goes higher, the part of your body necessary to hit the pitch goes higher as well, just think of your body as an instrument. So it is important to open space in your mouth and face. Lift the back of your mouth as if you are yawning to create the space to create echo. Open up the space before you hit the high note. Also you can do that mentally, you should pretend you are singing in the high note BEFORE you hit the high note. So you do not have to rush to go to high note so suddenly. Then once you get to the note, thrust your energy down when you actually get to the note. Finally, you do not have to scrunch your face or "squeeze" the face muscle to get to the note. That motion does not help you."

Instruction for feedback (low-expertise manipulation):

"From your advisor (continued): "Going forward - first, it is important to listen to your own singing, or playing any type of instrument, recorded. Often, we do not see how we perform exactly, that is just hard to do. So that is why listening to your own recording helps reveal where you are doing poorly and what you should do to improve. You can see which parts you struggle with getting the right note or getting the right tempo. You should then repeat working on the part you can improve specifically and repeat the process of recording and practicing the weak part. It is also often helpful to move a part of your body to the rhythm to keep you in the correct tempo. You should either snap your fingers or tap your foot (especially when your hands are occupied to the instrument) to "feel the beat." It would help you keep the tempo right throughout a song."

Your advisor continues...

"This song involves a number of tempo changes, including the part with the lyrics "somewhere in the night." Those parts of the song can be hard to hit the correct tempo. For the changes in tempo, you need to act as if you are singing the tempo change before it comes. As the tempogoes faster, just think of your body as an instrument and move your body in line with the tempo."

Instruction for the second singing task:

"Now we will move onto Round 2 of the singing. You will repeat the song "Don't Stop Believin". Get ready and then you will start again on the next page..."

Positivity:

"How positive do you think the advisor was in general?"

Expertise:

"Would you say that the advisor has high levels of expertise (in music generally)?"

"Would you say that the advisor has high levels of expertise (in singing specifically)?"

Supplemental Materials E2. Other items and variables collected in Studies 1 – 6

Study 1

SDS (Social Desirability Scale):

“It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work”

“I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way.”

“On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.”

“There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.”

“No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener.”

“There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.”

“I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.”

“I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.”

“I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.”

“I have never been irked when people expressed ideas different from my own.”

“There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.”

“I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.”

“I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings”

Other items:

“What do you think the researchers are testing in this study?”

Study 2

Previous exposure:

“Have you heard about the show, The Voice?”

“Have you ever watched the show?”

“How often do you watch the show?”

“Each season of The Voice begins with the "Blind Auditions," where coaches form their team of artists whom they mentor through the remainder of the season. The coaches sit with their backs towards the stage during artist auditions. Coaches who want an artist to join their team press their button, which turns their chair towards the artist and illuminates the words "I want you" at the bottom of the chair. If more than one coach expresses interest in an artist, the artist selects his or her coach from those who turned around. Have you watched any of the blind auditions of The Voice?”

SDS (same as Study 1)

Other items:

“Please describe what you think would make someone a good coach on The Voice.”

“Now imagine an artist, Jennifer Walker, appears on the Blind Audition. She is a young, 18-year-old artist from San Diego, where she plays in a local Indie band. She sings "Fix You," by the band Coldplay for the audition. Her performance was well-received, and all four coaches of the season turned around to express their interest in working with her. Now, Jennifer must choose whether to work with Adam Levine, CeeLo Green, Christina Aguilera, or Blake Shelton. This is a very important decision for her, and the choice may affect her chance of winning the show. Which coach do you think Jennifer should choose?”

Study 2E

Perceived importance:

“How important do you think it is for your career as a musician to appear on the show, The Voice?”

“How important do you think it is to meet a good coach to win the competition, The Voice?”

“How important do think think it is to meet a good coach to have a successful career as a musician?”

Other items:

“What is the single most important thing that you are looking for in coaches?”

“How long have you played music?”

“Would you identify yourself as a working musician?”

“What genre of music do you most identify with?”

Study 3

Other variables in the artist level:

Age, gender, ethnicity, whether solo or group artist, song title, season number, episode number, order appeared in the season, order appeared in the episode, the number of coaches turned around, genre information (this genre information was used to create the expertise variable)

Other variables in the coach levels:

Age, order the coaches turned around (the order variable is not included because the time variable is included instead), LIWC total word counts, LIWC affect percentages (the LIWC outcome variables were used to create the verbal positivity measure), genre information (this genre information was used to create the expertise variable)

Other variables in the dyad level:

Gender fit, ethnicity fit, frequency of positive behavior (the frequency variable is not included because the continuous behavioral positivity measure is included instead)

Study 4A

Advisor evaluations:

“How much do you like Coach 1?”

“How happy did Coach 1's comments make you feel?”

“How fun would it be to work with Coach 1?”

“Does Coach 1 seem committed to your improvement?”

“To what degree do you think that Coach 1 would facilitate your singing career?”

“To what degree would you feel obligated to choose Coach 1?”

Other items:

“What is the current status of your singing career?”

“How often do you practice singing per week? (Please enter in hours)”

“In which musical genre do you usually sing?”

“What do you think the researchers are testing in this study?”

Study 4B

Advisor evaluations:

“How much do you like Advisor 1?”

“How happy did the interaction with Advisor 1 make you feel?”

“How excited do you think Advisor 1 is to work with you?”

“How fun would it be to work with Advisor 1?”

“Does Advisor 1 seem committed to your financial goals?”

“To what degree do you think that Advisor 1 would facilitate your personal investment goals?”

“To what degree would you feel obligated to choose Advisor 1?”

Other items:

“Does a higher ROI mean a more successful personal investment?”

“To what degree do you have active personal investment goals?”
“Do you have a financial advisor right now?”
“Which factors affected your choice of Advisor A versus Advisor B?”
“What do you think the researchers are testing in this study?”

Study 5

Experience:

“Do you currently have a mentor in your workplace (i.e., is someone mentoring you)?”
“Do you currently serve as a mentor to someone in your workplace (i.e., you are mentoring someone else)?”

Other items:

“You ranked _____ first. In a few sentences below, please tell us why this was most appealing to you.”
“You ranked _____ last. In a few sentences below, please tell us why this was least appealing to you.”
“Is there anything that you would like to tell us about your experience in this study? Did you notice anything unusual? Any feedback would be helpful to the research team.”

Study 6 Pre-test A-B

Advisor evaluations:

“How satisfied are you with the advisor who provided you with feedback?”
“How much do you like the advisor who provided feedback?”
“How helpful do you think this feedback would be in improving your singing?”
“How intelligent, in general, does the advisor seem?”
“Does the advisor seem committed to your improvement?”
“How willing would you be to receive future feedback from this advisor?”
“How much would you want to receive feedback from a different advisor?”
“How accurate does the feedback provided by the advisor seem?”

Feedback perception:

“How difficult was the feedback to understand?”
“How much effort did you exert to read the feedback?”
“How difficult would the feedback be to implement in your performance?”
“Please indicate your general responses to the advisor's feedback below.”

Experience:

“Do you currently have a mentor in your workplace (i.e., is someone mentoring you)?”
“Do you currently serve as a mentor to someone in your workplace (i.e., you are mentoring someone else)?”

Other items:

“What is the current status of your singing career?”
“How often do you practice singing per week? (Please enter in hours)”
“In which musical genre do you usually sing?”
“Is there anything that you would like to tell us about your experience in this study? Did you notice anything unusual? Any feedback would be helpful to the research team.”

Study 6

Pre-task (beliefs about singing skills):

“How confident are you in your singing abilities?”
“How skilled do you think you are in singing?”
“Compared to your peers completing this same study at [the university name], where would you place your singing skill levels?”

Pre-task (affective states):

“How nervous are you for the singing task?”

“How anxious are you for the singing task?”

“How excited are you for the singing task?”

Post-task and pre-feedback (beliefs about singing skills):

“How confident are you in your singing abilities?”

“How skilled do you think you are in singing?”

“How confident are you that you performed well on the singing task?”

Post-task and pre-feedback (planning):

“Based on the feedback that you have just received, what do you plan to do differently in the next round? Please let us know what you plan to do differently in a sentence or two.”

Post-task and post-feedback (beliefs about singing skills):

“How confident are you in your singing abilities?”

“How skilled do you think you are in singing?”

“Compared to your peers completing this same study at [the university name], where would you place your singing skill levels?”

“How confident are you that you performed well on the singing task?”

“To what extent do you think your singing skills improved in the task?”

Post-task and post-feedback (advisor evaluations):

“How satisfied are you with the advisor who provided you feedback?”

“How much do you like the advisor who provided you feedback?”

“How accurate was the feedback provided by the advisor?”

“To what extent do you feel like your performance improved because of your advisor’s feedback?”

“How helpful was the feedback you received in improving your singing?”

“How invested in your success do you think the advisor was?”

“How willing are you to receive further feedback from the same advisor?”

“How much do you want to receive feedback from a different advisor?”

Post-task and post-feedback (affective states):

“How nervous were you during the singing task?”

“How anxious were you during the singing task?”

“How happy were you during the singing task?”

“How excited were you during the singing task?”

Post-task and post-feedback (overall enjoyment):

“How much did you enjoy the singing task?”

Post-task and post-feedback (advisor rank):

“An advisor/ mentor is usually a more experienced and more knowledgeable person, who helps to guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable person in the field. We are interested in what makes a person a good advisor/ mentor. Please rank the traits below in order of importance in making someone a good advisor/ mentor. You can rank them by clicking the number on the right and dragging to the position you want it to be (1 = most important; 6 = least important).

Advisor’s expertise: your advisor is a great expert in what you do

Advising experience: your advisor had many successful advisees in past

Personality fit: you and your advisor get along and enjoy the time together

Positive feedback: your advisor gives you positive feedback and compliments

Honest feedback and criticism: your advisor gives you honest feedback about your performance”

Post-task and post-feedback (experience:

“Do you currently have a mentor (i.e., is someone mentoring you)?”

“Do you currently serve as a mentor to someone in your workplace/ program/ organization (i.e., you are mentoring someone else)?”

Other variables in performance coding:

Pitch, tempo, enthusiasm, overall quality for the “somewhere in the night” sequence, overall quality of Time1 and Time 2, overall change in quality from Time 1 to Time 2, overall change in enthusiasm from Time 1 to Time 2

Other items:

“What is the current status of your singing career?”

“How often do you practice singing per week? (Please enter in hours)”

“In which musical genre do you usually sing?”

“How important do you think to be a good singer?”

“Prior to this study, how familiar were you with the song “Don’t Stop Believin’?””

“To the extent that you improved during your second performance, which factors do you think most facilitated your improvement?”

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us about your experience in this study? Did you notice anything unusual? Any feedback would be helpful to the research team.”