https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000330

Electronic Supplementary Material

complementing the manuscript

The Impact of Giving Feedback in Online Discussions:

Effects of Evaluative Reply Comments on the Authors of Evaluated User Comments

Journal of Media Psychology

Appendix

Stimulus comments

	Reference of evaluation	
Valence of the evaluation	**Directed at the content**	**Directed at the person**
Disapproving	it really sucks that you write here ... get out, you don't fit in here!	it really sucks that this comment is written here ... get rid of it, it doesn't fit in here!
Mixed	it's interesting that you write here … let's see if you fit in here?	it's interesting that this comment is written here … let's see if it fits in here?
Approving	it's really cool that you write here … keep it up, you fit in here!	it's really cool that this comment is written here … keep it up, that fits in here!

Results of the Pretest

Table EI

Assessment of the stimulus reply comments regarding valence in the pretest

	Valence of the evaluation of stimulus			
The reply comment…	**Disapproving** *M (SD)*	**Mixed** *M (SD)*	**Approving** *M (SD)*	
opposes/agrees	1.23 (0.81)	3.77 (1.17)	5.04 (1.29)	$F(2,94) = 206.757$, $p < .001$[a]
shows interest/ does not show interest	3.79 (1.32)	2.15 (1.09)	2.15 (1.17)	$F(2,94) = 42.443$, $p < .001$[b]
is positive/ is negative	5.75 (0.81)	2.85 (1.27)	1.73 (1.33)	$F(2,94) = 198.992$, $p < .001$[c]

Note.

All items measured on a semantic differential scale from 1 “strongly agree with item” to 6 “strongly agree with opposing item”.

$N = 48$. Repeated measures ANOVAs

[a]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $f = 2.10$, $\alpha = .05$, average correlation among repeated measures r = .27, power > .999.

[b]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $f = 0.95$, $\alpha = .05$, average correlation among repeated measures r = .29, power > .999.

[c]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $f = 2.06$, $\alpha = .05$, average correlation among repeated measures r = .20, power > .999.

Table EII

Assessment of the disapproving stimulus reply comments regarding reference of the evaluation in the pretest

	Reference of the evaluation of stimulus		
	Directed at the content	**Directed at the person**	
The reply comment…	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	
addresses the content of the comment/ addresses the person of the author	1.79 (1.14)	4.71 (1.57)	$t = -7.350$, $p < .001$[a]
refers to the comment content/ refers to the person of the author	5.25 (0.94)	2.58 (1.67)	$t = 6.822$, $p < .001$[b]

Note.

All items measured on a semantic differential scale from 1 "strongly agree with item" to 6 "strongly agree with opposing item".

$N = 48$. Independent *t*-tests.

[a]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 2.13$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power > .999.

[b]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 1.97$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power = .999.

Table EIII

Assessment of the mixed stimulus reply comments regarding reference of the evaluation in the pretest

	Reference of the evaluation of stimulus		
The reply comment…	**Directed at the content** *M (SD)*	**Directed at the person** *M (SD)*	
addresses the content of the comment/ addresses the person of the author	1.71 (1.30)	3.67 (1.69)	$t = -4.549$, $p < .001$[a]
refers to the comment content/ refers to the person of the author	4.88 (1.57)	2.96 (1.83)	$t = 3.896$, $p < .001$[b]

Note.

All items measured on a semantic differential scale from 1 "strongly agree with item" to 6 "strongly agree with opposing item".

$N = 48$. Independent *t*-tests.

[a]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 1.30$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power = .997.

[b]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 1.13$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power = .986.

Table EIV

Assessment of the approving stimulus reply comments regarding reference of the evaluation in the pretest

	Reference of the evaluation of stimulus		
The reply comment…	**Directed at the content** *M (SD)*	**Directed at the person** *M (SD)*	
addresses the content of the comment/ addresses the person of the author	1.88 (1.36)	3.65 (1.82)	$t = -3.786$, $p < .001$[a]
refers to the comment content/ refers to the person of the author	5.08 (1.50)	2.78 (1.76)	$t = 4.888$, $p < .001$[b]

Note.

All items measured on a semantic differential scale from 1 “strongly agree with item” to 6 “strongly agree with opposing item”.

$N = 48$. Independent *t*-tests.

[a]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 1.10$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power = .983.

[b]Results of the post-hoc power analysis: Effect size $d = 1.41$, $\alpha = .05$, sample sizes in each group $n = 24$, power = .999.

Table EV

Positive face threat by condition

	Reference of evaluation		
	Directed at the content	**Directed at the person**	**Total**
	(*n* = 183)	(*n* = 184)	(*N* = 367)
Valence of evaluation	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Disapproving (*n* = 115)	5.77 (1.04)	6.42 (0.60)	6.11 (0.89)
Mixed (*n* = 109)	3.69 (1.31)	4.60 (1.41)	4.14 (1.43)
Approving (*n* = 143)	1.98 (1.13)	2.34 (1.13)	2.15 (1.14)
Total (*N* = 367)	3.61 (1.95)	4.36 (2.03)	3.98 (2.03)

Table EVI

Negative face threat by condition

	Reference of evaluation		
	Directed at the content	**Directed at the person**	**Total**
	(*n* = 183)	(*n* = 184)	(*N* = 367)
Valence of evaluation	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Disapproving (*n* = 115)	3.14 (1.64)	3.45 (1.72)	3.31 (1.68)
Mixed (*n* = 109)	2.30 (1.26)	2.59 (1.42)	2.45 (1.34)
Approving (*n* = 143)	1.144 (0.81)	1.56 (0.78)	1.49 (0.79)
Total (*N* = 367)	2.20 (1.42)	2.49 (1.56)	2.34 (1.49)

Table EVII

Negative emotions by condition

	Reference of evaluation		
	Directed at the content	**Directed at the person**	**Total**
	(*n* = 183)	(*n* = 184)	(*N* = 367)
Valence of evaluation	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Disapproving (*n* = 115)	1.53 (0.56)	1.70 (0.83)	1.62 (0.72)
Mixed (*n* = 109)	1.42 (0.54)	1.38 (0.63)	1.40 (0.58)
Approving (*n* = 143)	1.26 (0.47)	1.37 (0.63)	1.31 (0.55)
Total (*N* = 367)	1.39 (0.53)	1.48 (0.72)	1.44 (0.63)

Table EVIII

Positive emotions by condition

	Reference of evaluation		
	Directed at the content	**Directed at the person**	**Total**
	(*n* = 183)	(*n* = 184)	(*N* = 367)
Valence of evaluation	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Disapproving (*n* = 115)	2.46 (0.72)	2.56 (0.68)	2.51 (0.69)
Mixed (*n* = 109)	2.77 (0.93)	2.59 (0.73)	2.68 (0.84)
Approving (*n* = 143)	2.71 (0.77)	2.88 (0.74)	2.79 (0.76)
Total (*N* = 367)	2.65 (0.81)	2.69 (0.73)	2.67 (0.77)

Table EIX

Willingness to participate further by condition

	Reference of evaluation		
Valence of evaluation	**Directed at the content** (n = 183) *M (SD)*	**Directed at the person** (n = 184) *M (SD)*	**Total** (N = 367) *M (SD)*
Disapproving (n = 115)	3.35 (1.33)	3.22 (1.35)	3.28 (1.33)
Mixed (n = 109)	3.48 (1.32)	3.75 (1.57)	3.61 (1.45)
Approving (n = 143)	3.77 (1.57)	3.99 (1.40)	3.88 (1.49)
Total (N = 367)	3.56 (1.43)	3.66 (1.46)	3.61 (1.45)