

Supplemental Information

Pre-Registering Public Administration Studies: Avoiding the Poor Practice of a 'Best-Practice'

Appendix

List of 99 published studies that include all 113 experiments in the systematic review

- Agerberg, M. (2022). Messaging about corruption: The power of social norms. *Governance*, 35(3), 929-950.
- Aizenberg, E. (2023). Conflict and salience as drivers of corporate lobbying? An elite survey experiment. *Governance*, 36(2), 555-574.
- Aleksovska, M., & Schillemans, T. (2022). Dissecting multiple accountabilities: A problem of multiple forums or of conflicting demands?. *Public Administration*, 100(3), 711-736.
- Andersen, S. C., Bruntse, M., James, O., & Jilke, S. (2024). Does work quality differ between the public and private sectors? Evidence from two online field experiments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(1), 80-91.
- Backgaard, M., Döring, M., & Thomsen, M. K. (2023). It's not merely about the content: How rules are communicated matters to administrative burden. *Public Administration Review*, 1-21.
- Belle, N., & Cantarelli, P. (2024). Give, take, or match? Styles of reciprocity, job satisfaction, and work motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 84(4), 748-763.
- Benton, M. (2022). Communicating Reform: Testing an Apology for Police History as a Supplement to a Policy Communication. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 52(1), 46-60.
- Bertram, I., Bouwman, R., & Tummers, L. (2024). Getting what you expect: How civil servant stereotypes affect citizen satisfaction and perceived performance. *Public Administration*, 102(4), 1468-1491.
- Brummel, L., & de Blok, L. (2024). Do political and social accountability arrangements increase citizens' legitimacy perceptions? A vignette experiment in the Netherlands. *Public Management Review*, 1-25.
- Buntaine, M. T., Hunnicutt, P., & Komakech, P. (2021). The challenges of using citizen reporting to improve public services: A field experiment on solid waste services in Uganda. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 31(1), 108-127.
- Chen, B. M., & Libgober, B. (2024). Do Administrative Procedures Fix Cognitive Biases?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(1), 105-121.
- Damgaard, P. R., & James, O. (2024). Public service users' responses to performance information: Bayesian learning or motivated reasoning?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(4), 532-546.
- de Boer, N., Schott, C., & Loyens, K. (2024). Increasing Street-Level Bureaucrats' Well-Being in Times of Crisis: A Survey Experiment With Two Social Belonging Interventions. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 1-23.
- de Fine Licht, J., Agerberg, M., & Esaiasson, P. (2022). "It's Not Over When It's Over"—Post-Decision Arrangements and Empirical Legitimacy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 32(1), 183-199.
- Deslatte, A. (2020). To shop or shelter? Issue framing effects and social-distancing preferences in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Deslatte, A., Swann, W. L., & Feiock, R. C. (2021). Performance, satisfaction, or loss aversion? A meso-micro assessment of local commitments to sustainability programs. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(1), 201-217.

- Dinhof, K., Neo, S., Bertram, I., Bouwman, R., De Boer, N., Szydlowski, G., ... & Tummers, L. (2024). The threat of appearing lazy, inefficient, and slow? Stereotype threat in the public sector. *Public Management Review*, 26(7), 1941-1962.
- Döring, M. (2022). 'Explain, but make no excuses': service recovery after public service failures. *Public Management Review*, 24(5), 799-817.
- Döring, M., & Jilke, S. (2023). Cream-skimming at the frontline: The role of administrative literacy. *Public Administration*, 101(4), 1569-1586.
- Driscoll, A., Krehbiel, J., Nelson, M., & Samarth, T. (2023). Evaluating excuses: How the public judges noncompliance. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-16.
- Favero, N., & Kim, M. (2021). Everything is relative: How citizens form and use expectations in evaluating services. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(3), 561-577.
- Favero, N., & Pedersen, M. J. (2020). How to encourage "Togetherness by Keeping Apart" amid COVID-19? The ineffectiveness of prosocial and empathy appeals. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(2), 1-18.
- Favero, N., Pedersen, M. J., & Park, J. (2024). Which job attributes attract individuals high in public service motivation and self-efficacy to a public service job?. *Public Administration*, 102(4), 1283-1322.
- Fischer, C. (2022). Incentives can't buy me knowledge: the missing effects of appreciation and aligned performance appraisals on knowledge sharing of public employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 42(2), 368-389.
- Fischer, C., & Weißmüller, K. S. (2024). What Determines Civil Servants' Error Response? Evidence From a Conjoint Experiment. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 54(8), 747-770.
- Flink, C., & Xu, X. (2024). Cutback management strategies and citizen evaluation of government. *Public Administration*, 102(2), 715-732.
- Funk, K. D., Jensen, U. T., Molina Jr, A. L., & Stritch, J. M. (2023). Does leader gender matter for performance evaluations? Evidence from two experiments. *Public Management Review*, 25(5), 971-989.
- Gaozhao, D., Wright, J. E., & Gainey, M. K. (2024). Bureaucrat or artificial intelligence: people's preferences and perceptions of government service. *Public Management Review*, 26(6), 1498-1525.
- Gilad, S., Sulitzeanu-Kenan, R., & Levi-Faur, D. (2024). A taste for government employment also rests on its political flavor. *Public Administration Review*, 1-14.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., de Vries, F., & Bouwman, R. (2024). Regulators as guardians of trust? The contingent and modest positive effect of targeted transparency on citizen trust in regulated sectors. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(1), 136-149.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., John, P., Meijer, A., & Worthy, B. (2019). Do freedom of information laws increase transparency of government? A replication of a field experiment. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 1(2), 1-10.
- Halling, A., Christensen, J., Hansen, F. G., & Petersen, N. B. G. (2024). Deservingness at the frontline: How health-related responsibility cues affect sanctioning and prioritization of citizens. *Public Administration*, 1-21.
- Halling, A., & Petersen, N. B. G. (2024). Frontline employees' responses to citizens' communication of administrative burdens. *Public Administration Review*, 84(6), 1017-1037.
- Hansen, P. H., Pedersen, M. J., & Willems, J. (2024). Bureaucratic prioritizing among clients in the eyes of the public: Experimental evidence from three countries. *Public Administration Review*, 1-19.
- Heinzel, M., Reinsberg, B., & Swedlund, H. (2024). Transparency and citizen support for public agencies: The case of foreign aid. *Governance*, 1-22.

- Hopkins, V., Pickup, M., & Matthews, S. (2023). Ambiguous COVID-19 Messaging Increases Unsafe Socializing Intentions. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-14.
- Hume, S., John, P., Sanders, M., & Stockdale, E. (2020). Nudge in the time of Coronavirus: The compliance to behavioral messages during crisis. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 4(2), 1-12.
- Ivonchik, M. (2024). Knowing what you pay for: Does benefits information increase bond referenda support?. *Public Administration Review*, 1-15.
- Jilke, S., Lu, J., Xu, C., & Shinohara, S. (2019). Using large-scale social media experiments in public administration: Assessing charitable consequences of government funding of nonprofits. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 29(4), 627-639.
- Jo, S., & Meier, K. J. (2024). Public perceptions of the administrative values tradeoff: Bureaucratic and democratic ethos. *Public Administration*, 1-21.
- Johnson, D., & Neshkova, M. (2024). When do bureaucrats choose to unburden clients: A randomized experiment. *Public Administration*, 102(3), 1210-1232.
- Julienne, H., Lavin, C., Belton, C., Barjaková, M., Timmons, S., & Lunn, P. (2020). Behavioural pre-testing of COVID Tracker, Ireland's contact-tracing app. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Kalesnikaite, V., & Baker, K. (2024). Private organization's moral behaviour and citizen support for public-private partnerships: evidence from a survey experiment. *Public Management Review*, 1-25.
- Keppeler, F. (2024). No thanks, dear AI! Understanding the effects of disclosure and deployment of artificial intelligence in public sector recruitment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(1), 39-52.
- Keppeler, F., & Papenfuß, U. (2021). Employer branding and recruitment: Social media field experiments targeting future public employees. *Public Administration Review*, 81(4), 763-775.
- Keppeler, F., & Papenfuß, U. (2023). Employer value propositions for different target groups and organizational types in the public sector: Theory and evidence from field experiments. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(4), 701-726.
- Kroll, A., Mehta-Kroll, A., & Vogel, D. (2024). Mitigating Neighborhood Stigma: Examining Strategies of Relating and Reframing. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 54(6), 555-567.
- Landgrave, M., Weller, N., & Authement, J. (2023). Do Public Housing Agencies Discriminate Against Latinos? A Large-Scale Replication Study to Assess Discrimination. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-25.
- Larsen, M., Nyrup, J., & Petersen, M. B. (2020). Do survey estimates of the public's compliance with COVID-19 regulations suffer from social desirability bias?. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(2), 1-9.
- Larsson Taghizadeh, J. (2021). Caseload, time-pressure and discrimination: Are school principals who have less time for e-mail correspondence more likely to discriminate in their e-mail replies?. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 4(2), 1-21.
- Lasky-Fink, J., & Linos, E. (2024). Improving delivery of the social safety net: The role of stigma. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(2), 270-283.
- Lee, I. P., Jilke, S., & James, O. (2021). Do more options always benefit the users of public services? An experimental study of school choice, performance, and satisfaction. *Public Administration Review*, 81(1), 110-120.
- Lee, S., & Esteve, M. (2023). What drives the perceived legitimacy of collaborative governance? An experimental study. *Public Management Review*, 25(8), 1517-1538.
- Leight, J., & Safran, E. (2019). Increasing immunization compliance among schools and day care centers: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2(2), 1-15.

- Lenz, A. (2024). Managing crises as if no one is watching? Governance dilemmas from a public perspective. *Public Administration*, 102(4), 1397-1417.
- Li, W., Lee, H., Liu, Y., Tang, T., & Zheng, G. (2024). Reward exploitation or exploration? The effects of local government sustainability strategies and performance information on citizen evaluation. *Public Management Review*, 1-22.
- Liu, Y. (2024). Public trust and collaborative governance: an instrumental variable approach. *Public Management Review*, 26(2), 421-442.
- Martin, L., Delaney, L., & Doyle, O. (2023). The Distributive Effects of Administrative Burdens on Decision-Making. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-19.
- Meier, K. J., Davis, J., & Xu, X. (2023). Effectiveness, efficiency, and equity tradeoffs in public programs: A citizen experiment. *Public Administration Review*, 83(6), 1462-1477.
- Menger, A., & Stein, R. M. (2018). Enlisting the public in facilitating election administration: A field experiment. *Public Administration Review*, 78(6), 892-903.
- Migchelbrink, K., Raymaekers, P., Pattyn, V., & De Smedt, P. (2024). Public officials' motivated reasoning and their interpretation of policy information. *Public Management Review*, 1-27.
- Mikkelsen, M. F. (2021). Making sense of performance information on effectiveness, costs, and equality during the COVID-19 pandemic. The importance of reference points for citizens' performance information use. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 4(2).
- Nagtegaal, R., Tummers, L., Noordegraaf, M., & Bekkers, V. (2020). Designing to debias: Measuring and reducing public managers' anchoring bias. *Public Administration Review*, 80(4), 565-576.
- Newland, S. A., & Liu, J. C. E. (2021). Ethnic identity and local government responsiveness in Taiwan. *Governance*, 34(3), 875-892.
- Nicholson-Crotty, S., Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Webeck, S. (2019). Are public managers more risk averse? Framing effects and status quo bias across the sectors. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2(1), 1-14.
- Oberfield, Z. W., & Incantalupo, M. B. (2021). Racial discrimination and street-level managers: Performance, publicness, and group bias. *Public Administration Review*, 81(6), 1055-1070.
- Pedersen, M. J., Favero, N., & Park, J. (2023). Pay-for-performance, job attraction, and the prospects of bureaucratic representation in public organizations: evidence from a conjoint experiment. *Public Management Review*, 1-24.
- Penning de Vries, J., & Knies, E. (2023). "I expected more from you": the effect of expectation-disconfirmation on employees' satisfaction with supervisory support. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(2), 309-335.
- Pereira, C., Klevenhusen, A., & Barros, L. In court we trust? Political affinity and citizen's attitudes toward court's decisions. *Governance*, 1-22.
- Rimkutė, D., & van der Voet, J. (2023). When do bureaucrats respond to external demands? A theoretical framework and empirical test of bureaucratic responsiveness. *Public Administration Review*, 1-22.
- Samahita, M., & Lades, L. (2023). Compliance Spending Aversion: An Unintended Consequence of Charity Regulation. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-30.
- Schiff, D. S., Schiff, K. J., & Pierson, P. (2022). Assessing public value failure in government adoption of artificial intelligence. *Public Administration*, 100(3), 653-673.
- Schiff, K. J., Schiff, D. S., Adams, I. T., McCrain, J., & Mourtgos, S. M. (2023). Institutional factors driving citizen perceptions of AI in government: Evidence from a survey experiment on policing. *Public Administration Review*, 1-17.

- Sievert, M. (2021). A replication of “representative bureaucracy and the willingness to coproduce”. *Public Administration*, 99(3), 616-632.
- Sievert, M. (2023). The limited impact of reference groups' symbolic gender representation on willingness to coproduce. *Public Administration Review*, 83(3), 587-602.
- Sievert, M., & Bruder, J. (2023). Unpacking the effects of burdensome state actions on citizens' policy perceptions. *Public Administration*, 1-21.
- Sievert, M., Vogel, D., & Feeney, M. K. (2022). Formalization and administrative burden as obstacles to employee recruitment: Consequences for the public sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 42(1), 3-30.
- Stenderup, R., & Pedersen, M. J. (2024). Compliance burden versus program integrity protection: A survey experiment on citizen attitudes toward administrative documentation requirements in public service policy. *Public Administration Review*, 1-16.
- Szydlowski, G., de Boer, N., & Tummers, L. (2022). Compassion, bureaucrat bashing, and public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 82(4), 619-633.
- Szydlowski, G., & Charbonneau, E. (2024). Media, trust, and the influence of urban/rural context and education on public sector worker stereotypes. *Public Management Review*, 1-26.
- Thau, M., Mikkelsen, M. F., Hjortskov, M., & Pedersen, M. J. (2021). Question order bias revisited: a split-ballot experiment on satisfaction with public services among experienced and professional users. *Public Administration*, 99(1), 189-204.
- van der Does, R. (2023). Citizen involvement in public policy: Does it matter how much is at stake?. *Public Administration*, 101(3), 772-787.
- van der Voet, J., & Lerusse, A. (2024). Performance information and issue prioritization by political and managerial decision-makers: A discrete choice experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 34(4), 582-597.
- Van der Voet, J., & Rimkutė, D. (2023). A behavioral view on responsibility attribution in multi-level governance: Upward and downward responsibility attribution in response to performance below aspirations. *Public Administration*, 101(4), 1461-1480.
- Van der Voet, J., & van den Bekerom, P. (2024). Performance information, expectations and satisfaction with public service delivery in the context of co-production initiatives. *Public Management Review*, 1-22.
- van Roekel, H., & Schott, C. (2022). Activating employees' motivation to increase intentions to report wrongdoings: Evidence from a large-scale survey experiment. *Public Management Review*, 1-23.
- Van Teunenbroek, C., & Bekkers, R. (2020). Follow the crowd: Social information and crowdfunding donations in a large field experiment. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(1), 1-17.
- Vogel, D., & Willems, J. (2020). The effects of making public service employees aware of their prosocial and societal impact: A microintervention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(3), 485-503.
- Walsh, S., Porumbescu, G. A., & Hetling, A. (2024). Using technology to reduce learning costs and improve program comprehension: Lessons from a survey experiment on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. *Public Administration Review*, 1-13.
- Wang, Y., & Zhang, J. (2024). Promoting Citizens' willingness to participate in coproduction in public service through information frames. *Public administration*, 102(2), 479-499.
- Wright, J. E., Gaozhao, D., & Houston, B. (2022). Body-worn cameras and representation: What matters when evaluating police use of force?. *Public Administration Review*, 1-17.

Wright, J. E., Gaozhao, D., Dukes, K., & Templeton, D. S. (2023). The power of protest on policing: Black Lives Matter protest and civilian evaluation of the police. *Public Administration Review*, 83(1), 130-143.

Xu, C., & Li, H. (2022). Resource publicness matters in organizational perceptions. *Public Administration Review*, 82(2), 338-353.

Xu, C., & Liu, Y. (2021). Does mislabeling COVID-19 elicit the perception of threat and reduce blame?. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 4(2), 1-13.

Yanagi, I., Okada, I., Kubo, Y., & Kikuchi, H. (2023). Acceptance of COVID-19-related Government Restrictions: A Vignette Experiment on Effects of Procedural Fairness. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6, 1-25.

Yang, W., Qin, C., & Fan, B. (2023). Do institutional pressures increase reactive transparency of government? Evidence from a field experiment. *Public Management Review*, 25(11), 2073-2092.

Zhang, J., Wen, X., Mao, H., Xu, R., & Zhang, S. (2024). Does public officials' risk preference differ in self versus public decision-making? It depends on decision framing and bet size. *Public Administration*, 1-26.

Zhang, Y., & Wang, H. (2024). Symbolic Bureaucratic Representation and Client Cooperation: Experimental Insights From Four Daily Public Service Scenarios in China. *Public Administration*, 1-28.

Zhang, Y., & Wang, H. (2024). The origins and consequences of administrative burdens in mass immunization programs: Experimental evidence based on the monkeypox outbreak. *Governance*, 37(3), 947-967.

Table A1. PRISMA checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	p. 1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	p. 1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	pp. 1-2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	pp. 1-2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	n.a.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	pp. 4-6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	pp. 4-6
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	pp. 4-6
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	pp. 4-6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	n.a.
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	pp. 5-6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	n.a.
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	n.a.
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	n.a.
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	n.a.

Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	n.a.
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	p. 5
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	pp. 6-10
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	n.a.
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	n.a.
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	n.a.
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	n.a.
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	n.a.
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	pp. 10-11
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	pp. 10-12
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	pp. 10-12
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	n.a.