

Electronic Supplement 3. Detailed Results.

Table 1. *Open Science-Related Attitudes, Behaviors, and Intentions*

		Item Statistics							
		Whole Sample		Predocs		Postdocs		(Jun.) Profs	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Open and transparent research processes	Attitude	4.51	0.62	4.48	0.51	4.47	0.72	4.57	0.68
	Intention	4.31	0.67	4.22	0.52	4.47	0.62	4.29	0.85
	Behavior	4.03	0.72	4.25	0.64	3.88	0.60	3.95	0.86
Publication of anonymized primary data with publications.	Attitude	3.85	0.87	4.04	0.98	3.65	0.86	3.90	0.85
	Intention	3.88	0.95	3.82	0.85	3.94	1.03	3.90	1.02
	Behavior	2.86	1.26	2.84	1.26	2.94	1.48	2.80	1.11
Publication of codes with publications.	Attitude	3.81	0.99	4.04	0.98	3.80	0.86	3.65	1.18
	Intention	3.76	1.02	3.95	0.72	3.94	1.03	3.40	1.23
	Behavior	2.65	1.27	2.82	1.55	2.73	1.16	2.45	1.10
Publication of materials with publications.	Attitude	3.97	1.02	4.13	1.14	4.00	0.71	3.85	1.18
	Intention	3.79	0.93	3.86	0.85	3.82	0.88	3.70	1.08
	Behavior	2.87	1.28	2.72	1.56	2.94	1.14	2.95	1.15
Publication of preprints	Attitude	3.21	1.27	3.39	1.34	3.19	1.22	3.15	1.39
	Intention	3.31	1.25	3.41	1.14	3.18	1.24	3.32	1.42
	Behavior	2.46	1.44	2.29	1.62	2.35	1.22	2.71	1.45
Publication of preregistrations	Attitude	3.98	1.06	4.35	1.07	3.76	1.09	3.95	1.13
	Intention	3.96	0.98	4.10	0.94	3.65	1.06	4.11	0.94
	Behavior	2.73	1.47	2.80	1.67	2.38	1.54	2.95	1.19
Registered Report as publication format	Attitude	3.87	0.95	4.39	1.23	4.08	0.76	3.76	1.15
	Intention	3.62	1.09	3.84	0.90	3.44	1.03	3.53	1.33
	Behavior	1.76	1.03	1.39	0.61	1.62	0.89	2.20	1.28
Publication of additional material	Attitude	3.49	1.04	3.43	0.90	3.65	1.06	3.43	1.21
	Intention	3.32	1.07	3.32	1.04	3.29	1.05	3.33	1.15
	Behavior	1.73	1.34	2.14	1.25	2.94	1.25	3.19	1.33
Publication of complete anonymized primary project data.	Attitude	3.17	0.94	3.17	0.78	3.38	0.89	3.00	1.15
	Intention	3.16	1.17	3.05	0.94	3.18	1.19	3.26	1.41
	Behavior	1.72	0.98	1.26	0.56	1.73	0.88	2.15	1.18

Note. Predocs ($n = 23$), Postdocs ($n = 17$), (Jun.) Profs ($n = 21$)

Table 2*Open Science-Related General Attitudes (in descending order within domains)*

	Item Statistics					
	Whole Sample		Low OS Behavior		High OS Behavior	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Global Attitudes</i>						
Science should be open and transparent.	4.68	0.50	4.64	0.54	4.74	0.45
An open and transparent research process is good for science.	4.68	0.50	4.67	0.53	4.79	0.42
An open and transparent research process is not superfluous.*	4.66	0.51	4.65	0.54	4.68	0.48
An open and transparent research process should be the norm.	4.34	0.73	4.22	0.75	4.53	0.70
An open and transparent research process increasing trust in study results.	4.14	0.96	3.89	1.09	4.47	0.51
An open and transparent research process increasing trust in scientists.	3.85	1.02	3.68	1.06	4.11	0.81
An open and transparent research process will be the norm.	3.35	0.95	3.35	0.95	3.44	0.86
<i>Specific Attitudes</i>						
Journals providing registered reports as publications format.	4.14	0.95	3.91	0.95	4.67	0.82
Grant institutions making data publication with publications obligatory.	3.47	1.14	3.19	1.08	3.89	1.20
Journals making data publication with publications obligatory.	3.38	1.13	3.12	1.10	3.74	1.19
Consideration of Open Science for selection on scientific positions.	3.24	1.27	2.81	1.25	3.84	1.07
Journals' preference for preregistered vs. not preregistered submissions.	3.16	1.17	2.88	1.17	4.67	0.82
Journals making code publication with publications obligatory.	3.16	1.09	2.94	1.15	3.42	0.96
Grant institutions making data publication of projects obligatory.	3.02	1.07	2.83	1.02	3.26	1.15

Note. OS = Open Science Behavior; High vs. Low Open Science Behavior was defined based on two behavior variables: general OS behavior and preregistrations; if both responses were greater than 3, participants were included into the High OS Behavior group ($n = 19$), if they were not, participants were included into the Low OS behavior group ($n = 37$); * = assessed reversed coded: "An open and transparent research process is generally superfluous."

Table 3*Potential Explanations (in descending order) for an Open Science-Related Intention-Behavior Gap*

	Items Statistics					
	Whole Sample		Low OS Behavior		High OS Behavior	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
No time.	3.59	1.01	3.78	0.80	3.16	1.26
Worry that time is better invested in writing papers.	3.45	1.11	3.78	0.87	2.68	1.16
Doing so only if all other scientists are forced to do so as well.	3.00	1.30	3.19	1.35	2.61	1.24
Lack of training opportunities.	2.97	1.34	3.00	1.43	2.68	1.16
Bad cost-benefit ratio.	2.83	0.99	3.18	0.88	2.21	0.92
Not a concrete idea.	2.65	1.04	2.59	0.93	2.53	1.12
Anxiety that analytic mistakes will be detected.	2.64	1.05	2.73	1.04	2.37	0.96
No benefit.	2.47	1.01	2.57	0.99	2.16	0.96
Worry to have a competitive disadvantage.	2.25	1.18	2.30	1.27	1.95	0.85
Bad for my career.	1.90	0.96	1.97	1.03	1.79	0.85

Note. OS = Open Science Behavior; High vs. Low Open Science Behavior was defined based on two behavior variables: general OS behavior and preregistrations; if both responses were greater than 3, participants were included into the High OS Behavior group ($n = 19$), if they were not, participants were included into the Low OS behavior group ($n = 37$). The response formats ranged from 1 = *does not apply at all* to 5 = *applies completely*.