

## **Electronic Supplement 1.**

### **Detailed methods of our study**

#### **Participants**

Participants were suited for inclusion if they reported to be currently working in a german-speaking country (i.e., Germany, Austria, Switzerland) in an area related to sport psychology. They were recruited using mailing lists of official accounts of the German Association of Sport Psychology (asp) and the sport psychology panel of the German Psychological Society (DGPs) as well as flyers at the annual conference of the asp in June 2022, postings on social media (e.g. Instagram, Twitter), and through personal communication. Reminders were sent twice. In total, 361 persons opened the survey by clicking on the link. A portion of 99 persons started answering the questionnaire but discontinued (27 after answering the first page of questions, 8 after the second, and one each for the following three pages) and were, therefore, not included in the analyses. Finally, 61 researchers with an age range from 25 to 67 years ( $M = 38.21$ ,  $SD = 10.94$ ) completed the questionnaire, stemming – per self-reported affiliation – from a broad range of subdisciplines within sport science and psychology. Of these 61 researchers, 39 researchers identified themselves as female (64%), 20 as male (33%), whereas two researchers (3%) did not provide any information on their gender. The majority (53 researchers, 87%) reported to be working in Germany, and the minority in Austria (2 researchers, 3%) and Switzerland (6 researchers, 10%). At the pre-doctoral level, 23 researchers (38%) took part, 17 researchers (28%) at the post-doctoral level, and 21 (34%) at the level of (junior) professors. A total of 40 researchers (66%) were employed on a temporarily limited contract, while 21 (34%) held a permanent position.

#### **Design and Materials**

##### **Design**

Participants completed an online survey run on the platform of [soscisurvey.com](https://www.soscisurvey.com), with data stored on institutional servers at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology. Data were collected between June and August 2022. The completion of the questionnaire took about 20 minutes. Prior to participation, informed consent was obtained. Also, participants were informed about the privacy policy, that data will be transferred and saved at an institutional server as well as that anonymized data and code will be made publicly accessible. The study followed a cross-sectional, correlative study design and all its procedures adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki. Participation was voluntary and could be discontinued at every time point without any disadvantages.

## Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed including demographic aspects (6 items) as well as the assessment of five domains involving the key elements of TPB: i.) attitudes towards OS practices (9 items), ii.) intentions to adhere to OS standards in the future (9 items), iii.) behavior regarding OS practices (10 items), iv.) potential explanations of an intention-behavior-gap (if existent, 10 items), and v.) more general attitudes towards OS (14 items). Questions were mainly adopted from the investigation regarding data management guidelines of the German Psychological Society (DGPS; Abele-Brehm et al., 2018) and had to be answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*). All materials, including the final questionnaire, a codebook, anonymized data, and code, can be retrieved from [osf.io/w3bj6/](https://osf.io/w3bj6/).

## Data Analysis

With this study, we aimed at describing the current state of affairs regarding OS in the German-speaking Sport Psychological community. We would like to emphasize that the presented analyses are solely exploratory and, given the small sample size, the presented results are only descriptive in nature. The conclusions drawn are, therefore, necessarily preliminary and selective. They are selective for two reasons: (1) due to the potential selectivity within the assessed sample and (2) due to our selectivity in focusing on those aspects that we deemed important and, therefore, worth mentioning. Furthermore, we planned to use the data to gain a closer look on putative differences between status groups. Based on the available sample size, a post-hoc power analysis (G\*Power; Faul et al., 2007) revealed that, to detect medium effect sizes of  $d = 0.5$  between status groups, power was only ranging from .44 to .49 and was even smaller for the detection of small effects of  $d = .20$  (i.e., range of .15 to .16). As these values are far from the typically recommended power of .80, the obtained data will only be presented descriptively. Means and standard deviations will be reported as well as the absolute and relative number of responses falling into the provided response categories.