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ABSTRACT

Jensen, Rachel, M.A., Spring 2024
Communication Studies

To revise or not to revise: how feedback type, interpersonal liking, and messenger credibility influence revision

Chairperson: Dr. Christina G. Yoshimura

Revisions inevitably occur during project creation and curation; many of which are influenced by received feedback. Previous research has highlighted the role goals, perceptions of self, and task complexity play in revision, but little research has examined how feedback type and an individual’s feelings toward their feedback giver influence revision. A quasi-experimental design examined how feedback type (additive, subtractive, or none), interpersonal liking for a feedback-giver, and perceived credibility of a feedback-giver affected students’ (n = 155) willingness to revise, self-reports of revision, and calculated actual revision score. Results indicated that participants in a feedback-receiving condition reported higher levels of willingness to revise and having had revised than those who received no feedback, but that individuals in the subtractive feedback condition revised their work significantly less than those in the additive and no feedback conditions. Results also indicated that interpersonal liking and perceived credibility were significant predictors of willingness to revise and self-reported revision, but not actual revision.
In organizational contexts, individuals often seek feedback from others (Fickelstein & Fishbach, 2012). In general, peers provide accurate feedback to each other (He & Gao, 2023; Hovardas et al., 2014), and feedback has been shown to improve project creation and curation (King, 2016). However, despite the fact that individuals both seek and receive accurate feedback from their peers, there are many cases in which individuals resist implementing the feedback they receive into their work (Baer & Brown, 2012; Toivonen et al., 2023).

Revisions are an important part of project curation because they often improve the quality of the work (Shintani et al., 2014). Because of the inevitability of revisions in creating projects, it is important to understand the variables related to feedback that influence individuals to revise. In the workplace, individuals receive feedback from staff members of varying hierarchical levels in the organization, such as their boss, peers, or subordinates, with whom they have varying levels of relational closeness. When receiving feedback, prior research suggests that factors such as feedback type and psychological ownership complicate the application of feedback-based revisions (Brown & Baer, 2012; Grimes, 2018; Toivonen et al., 2023). Interestingly, very little is known about relational factors related to accepting and rejecting feedback from peers. The purpose of this paper is to examine the conditions under which individuals revise projects from which they receive peer feedback. Specifically, this paper is curious about how characteristics of an individual’s relationship with the feedback-giver, interpersonal liking and credibility, influence revision.
Background

Feedback

Scholars from various social scientific fields have sought to understand the impact of feedback on both individuals and performance output, as well as the conditions under which individuals make feedback-based revisions. In examining feedback interventions (FIs) on performance, a meta-analysis found that while FIs on average improve performance, one third have negative implications for performance levels (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). In particular, FIs related to the individual performing (or “self”), rather than the task, make individuals feel threats to their self-esteem, which in turn leads to worse performance (King, 2016; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Furthermore, research examining goal revision suggests that the type of feedback people receive influences how and whether or not they revise (Tolli & Schmidt, 2008).

Feedback type

Feedback type may influence both how individuals perceive the utility of feedback they receive and the subsequent decision of whether or not to implement the feedback. Certain types of feedback include provision of social support to one another. For example, individuals positively rate feedback from peers that provides useful information, which subsequently improves their well-being and performance on given tasks (Zhang et al., 2022). In addition, receiving feedback that has low face threat makes individuals feel as though the feedback-giver cares about them and their well-being, which is associated with improved well-being (Burleson, 2009; Haden et al., 2019). While it may be easy to interpret these findings as evidence that feedback inherently benefits individuals, this conclusion would be incorrect. Not all feedback types are helpful, supportive, or warranted. In fact, one study found that students who prefer to
receive feedback privately engage less in classroom settings, as a means of avoiding public corrective feedback (Tindage & Myers, 2020). Furthermore, Hadden and Frisby (2019) found that linguistic politeness in instructors’ feedback to students plays an important role in whether or not the feedback is perceived as a face threat to students. Specifically, the type of language used in the feedback influenced the amount of face threat students felt.

Brown and Baer’s (2012) definition of feedback types have two categories, additive and subtractive. Additive feedback refers to “contributions that aim at refining an individual’s ideas by building upon or extending them” whereas subtractive feedback refers to “contributions that aim at refining a person’s ideas by eliminating certain aspects of them” (p. 61). Studies in the U.S. show that individuals prefer self-enhancing and self-improving feedback as opposed to self-effacing feedback (Gaertner et al., 2012). While both additive and subtractive feedback may provide improvement opportunities, because of the preference for self-enhancing feedback, individuals may prefer receiving feedback that is additive rather than subtractive. Because additive feedback extends the ideas individuals have, it may be seen as a more enhancing form of feedback than subtractive feedback, which eliminates ideas. In fact, if individuals feel strong levels of psychological ownership over their ideas, they may see subtractive feedback as self-effacing. Furthermore, individuals tend to like and be more persuaded by those they view as having a positive attitude (Zorn et al., 2022). Additive feedback enhances extant ideas and so may be seen as a positive attitude, whereas subtractive feedback strikes out some of an individual’s ideas and may be seen as a negative attitude. Therefore, if an individual receives additive feedback and sees the feedback-giver as having a positive attitude, they may be more likely to revise their ideas than if they received subtractive feedback. For the purposes of this
study, feedback type will be limited to either additive feedback or subtractive feedback, about which the following research question is proposed:

**RQ1: How does feedback type, or no feedback, influence a) perceived willingness to revise b) reports of revision and c) actual revision?**

*Psychological ownership*

In addition to examining the role feedback type plays in the revision process, another important variable to understand in the revision process is psychological ownership. Psychological ownership refers to “the state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership or a piece of that target is “theirs’”” (Pierce et al., 2003, p. 86). When aspects of an individual’s identity are connected to their ideas, feedback encouraging revision feels threatening to their sense of self. For example, a qualitative study examining organizational founders’ responses to feedback suggests that feedback given to the founders may trigger a resistance toward revision, particularly if it is a creative idea over which they feel high levels of psychological ownership (Grimes, 2018). This may be because when an individual’s idea is related to their sense of self, they experience a “love at first sight” effect, where they become more attached to the idea (Lazar et al., 2022, p. 2). The levels of psychological ownership individuals feel over their work can influence whether or not they revise or are willing to revise their projects, as well as emotions following the implementation of feedback. Individuals who feel a strong sense of psychological ownership over their ideas but decide to implement feedback may feel resistance during the revision process (Baer & Brown, 2012; Toivonen et al., 2023).

Many researchers have sought to examine the relationship between psychological ownership and performance; however, the results are largely mixed. For example, some studies
have found significant (Brown et al., 2014) and marginal (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) relationships between psychological ownership and performance, whereas another found the effects of psychological ownership on job performance to be insignificant (Mayhew et al., 2007). More recent work has sought to understand the impacts of psychological ownership on performance through additional lenses, such as territoriality. In two studies, Chen et al. (2023) suggest that psychological ownership can either make individuals feel a need to territorially defend or expand their work. They found when individuals feel psychological ownership over their work and become territorially defensive, they decrease information exchange behaviors with others, which in turn negatively impacts their job performance. Conversely, when individuals feel psychological ownership over their work but become territorially expansive, their information exchanges increase, which positively impacts their performance. Importantly, this study found communicating ideas and information with others seems to improve performance. Communicating ideas allows for individuals to receive new insights and feedback from others, which increases engagement in creative processes (Binnewies et al., 2006). However, it is unclear whether or not the improved performance comes from revising ideas after information exchanges or other related factors. Additionally, if the information exchange is a significant variable related to revision, it is also unknown what specific communicative exchanges are happening to induce the implementation of the feedback. Specifically, the type of feedback shared within communicative exchanges could be a particularly salient variable in understanding the implementation (or decision to not implement) of feedback.

Furthermore, researchers suggest that people also remain committed to their ideas when they have expressed them outwardly. For example, researchers found that after making a bet on a racehorse, participants became more confident in their chosen racehorse (Brownstein et al.,
2004; Knox & Inkster, 1968). Because the participants placed an initial bet on one horse, they had a stake in its success, and thus experienced increased confidence in the horse’s winning ability throughout the races. In order for individuals to commit to an idea, they first either come up with the idea or come across the idea. When curating an initial idea or receiving initial information, individuals grow fond of and attached to their idea and subsequently remain committed to it (Lazar et al., 2022). This, in turn, influences whether or not they make changes to their idea based on feedback or new information received (Bond et al., 2007; Brownstein, 2003). Thus, if an individual is attached and committed to their idea and receives feedback counseling them in a differing direction, they may decide to not implement the feedback because it goes against their sense of ownership for their initial idea. At the same time, in project curation, individuals may seek to improve their ideas by whatever means necessary in order to succeed. Thus, the following research question is proposed:

**RQ2: How does psychological ownership influence a) perceived willingness to revise b) reports of revision and c) actual revision?**

**Relational Characteristics**

Finally, the impact of feedback received from others may also depend on the relationship between the feedback giver and receiver. While feedback may, objectively, be helpful or unhelpful, the relational context between the feedback giver and receiver may be an important determinant in the reception and application of the feedback. Specifically, this paper seeks to understand how variables such as interpersonal liking and perceived credibility influence whether or not participants revise their work.

*Interpersonal liking*
People like and prefer individuals whom they perceive as more similar to themselves (Singh et al., 2016; Zorn et al., 2022). Messenger similarity and liking plays a significant role on how persuasive individuals perceive messages (Berscheid, 1966; Jiang et al., 2010; Woodside & Davenport, 1974) and whether or not they change their mind based on the message (Brock, 1965). People see feedback-givers more positively when they are given positive, rather than negative, feedback (Kingsley et al., 2018). Therefore, when curating projects, recognizing the relationship between the feedback-giver and feedback-receiver may be important in understanding whether or not the project creator is incentivized to revise.

Individuals who perceive verbal aggression from an individual to whom they speak report feeling lower levels of interpersonal liking for that individual (Myers & Johnson, 2003). If a feedback-giver acts in a verbally aggressive manner, the receiver may feel lower levels of interpersonal liking for them, and thus may not revise according to their feedback. If an individual receives feedback from someone whom they feel lower levels of interpersonal liking because of perceived verbal aggression, it may influence whether or not they apply that individuals’ feedback, even if the feedback has valuable information regarding their work.

*RQ3: How does level of interpersonal liking for a feedback giver influence a) perceived willingness to revise b) reports of revision and c) actual revision?*

**Credibility**

In order for feedback to increase recipient understanding and be perceived as useful, the feedback-giver must be perceived as credible. People rate feedback-givers as more credible when they give detailed feedback, have more experience, and use persuasion (Cionea et al., 2021; Wilson & Sherrell, 1993; Wu & Shafer, 1987). In a meta-analysis of 114 studies, Wilson and
Sherrell (1993) found that, on average, 16 percent of the difference in the persuasiveness of a message was attributed to the expertise of the persuading individual. Thus, perceptions of credibility in a feedback-giver may influence whether or not individuals are persuaded to revise their project ideas after receiving feedback.

*RQ4: How do perceptions of a feedback giver’s credibility influence a) perceived willingness to revise b) reports of revision and c) actual revision?*

**Methods**

**Participants**

Participants were undergraduate students from twelve general education courses at a mid-sized university in the United States who received extra credit for participation. Each of the twelve classes were randomly assigned to one of three feedback type conditions (additive, subtractive, or no feedback). The original sample size consisted of 197 participants, however, 42 were removed for failure to complete the survey, submitting incorrect documents, and receiving inapplicable feedback that could not be used to calculate a revision score. This left a final sample size of 155 participants, which consisted of 39.4% women, 56.8% men, .6% nonbinary and 3.2% other/prefer not to say with an average age of 19.27 years ($SD = 2.69$). 92.5% of participants identified as white, 2.1% as Black or African American, 2.1% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2.1% as Asian, .7% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and .7% other.

**Procedure**

Before arriving to class, students were informed of a potential extra credit opportunity to stimulate peer feedback for an upcoming speech for class (or for the no feedback condition, they were informed of an opportunity to say their speech ideas aloud). Participation was optional, but
only students who had submitted a required assignment indicating they had thoroughly thought through their project idea were eligible to participate. After filling out the consent form (see Appendix A), students provided a detailed description of their upcoming speech and completed a scale assessing their level of psychological ownership over their speech idea. After completing the questionnaire, students were assigned to one other individual in the class. Half of the students were given five minutes to present their speech idea to a classmate, after which their paired classmate would give them feedback (or just listen and give no feedback in the control condition).

In the additive condition, students were told to only give feedback that was additive, because feedback is most effective and receptive when it doesn’t detract from what an individual has. In the subtractive condition, participants were told that for the sake of time and efficiency, to only provide subtractive feedback, so that the students could understand what didn’t work in their speech and remove it. To ensure feedback was either additive or subtractive, feedback-givers were asked to provide two specific points of feedback which the person sharing the idea would report in a later questionnaire. In the no feedback condition, students were told to not give any feedback, because the purpose of the exercise was to say a speech idea out loud, which can help with confidence in presenting on speech day (See Appendix B for scripts used for each measure).

After sharing their speech idea and receiving feedback (only additive and subtractive conditions), students filled out a questionnaire where they described the two changes the feedback-giver recommended they make (e.g. what they were told to take out/add in). All participants rated their perceptions of the feedback-giver’s credibility, their willingness to revise their speech idea, and how much they liked the feedback-giver. After completing the activity,
students in all conditions were asked to write a detailed description of their speech again, self-report how much they felt they revised their speech idea, and report demographic information (age, ethnicity, gender, and major). The students who first shared their speech idea were then shifted one spot, so the students who had not yet shared their speech idea could share it with a new individual to whom they had not given feedback. The same procedure was repeated for students who hadn’t shared the first time around.

**Measures**

*Psychological ownership*

After writing their speech idea for the first time, participants responded to a four-item measure assessing psychological ownership adapted from Baer and Brown (2012), Pierce et al. (2004), and Van Dyne and Pierce (2004). Using a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), students responded to the prompts: “I feel a high degree of personal ownership over this speech idea;” “This is my speech idea;” “I feel like this is my speech idea;” “I sense that this speech idea is mine” (α = .923).

*Interpersonal liking*

To assess the extent to which participants liked the person from whom they were receiving feedback, this study used Veksler & Eden’s (2017) six-item interpersonal liking scale (IL-6). The scale from 1 (*not at all true*) to 9 (*definitely true*) included items such as “I think that this person and I may have a lot in common;” “There are aspects of this person’s personality that I admire;” “I think that this person exhibits good judgment;” “I think that future interactions with this person would be pleasurable;” “I have enjoyed interacting with this person in the past;” and “I would like to get to know this person better” (α = .866).
Credibility

Participants rated their perceptions of their feedback-giver’s credibility using a five-item, seven-point, semantic differential scale developed by Gaziano and McGrath (1986), modified by Meyer (1988), and validated by Roberts (2010). The scale included items rating the credibility of the messenger: is fair or unfair, is unbiased or biased, tells the whole story or does not tell the whole story, is accurate or inaccurate, and can be trusted or cannot be trusted ($\alpha = .785$).

Feedback type

To ensure that the feedback given aligned with the condition to which students were assigned, the researchers independently coded the two feedback points reported in the survey as either additive or subtractive. There were three discrepancies out of 128 feedback points for the additive condition and two discrepancies out of 116 for the additive condition, which resulted in 98% simple intercoder reliability. Any differences in feedback codes were discussed and resolved through consensus by the researchers.

Revision

In the additive and subtractive conditions, after receiving two specific points of feedback students self-reported their willingness to revise from a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) in response to the prompts: “I am willing to apply the feedback I have been given to my speech idea;” “I will revise my speech idea based on this feedback;” “I will implement this feedback into my speech.” In the no feedback condition, participants rated the points: “I am willing to revise my speech idea;” “I will revise my speech idea;” and “I will change some aspect of my speech” on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) ($\alpha = .848$).
After writing their finalized speech idea, students in all conditions self-reported how much they believed they revised their speech idea on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) by responding to three prompts: “I revised my speech idea;” “My speech idea has some differences now from when I started this activity;” “I have made edits to my speech idea.” (α = .821)

To assess whether or not students in the additive and subtractive conditions implemented the feedback, the researcher and one research assistant evaluated the original speech idea, the two feedback points, and the finalized speech idea for each student. The coders independently determined whether or not a student had revised their speech from the beginning to the end with a rating of 0 (if no feedback points were implemented), 1 (if one feedback point was implemented), or 2 (if both feedback points were implemented). In the additive feedback condition, the coders had one discrepancy between the revision score given for 23 participants (96% simple intercoder reliability), which they resolved by reviewing the case and coming to consensus. In the subtractive feedback condition, coders had three discrepancies between the given revision score for 35 participants (91% simple intercoder reliability), which they again resolved via review and consensus. To standardize a revision score between 0-2 across all conditions, in the no feedback condition the Levenshtein distance score was calculated to quantify the character differences between students’ first and second outlines. Once each participant was assigned a numerical score for character difference, researchers found the average character difference for individuals who did revise their work in the no feedback condition (M = 512.76). Participants received a 0 if there were no character differences, a 1 if their character difference was between 1 and the mean, and a 2 if their character difference was greater than the mean.
Results

For full results of the regression analyses, please see Tables 1-6. To analyze the research questions, researchers performed three linear hierarchical regressions. These regressions aimed at evaluating the individual predictive value of each variable. However, it is also important to assess the variance accounted for by each variable, to assess whether significant associations have a meaningful effect size. In the context of willingness to revise, interpersonal liking explained 9.4% of the variance (p < .001), perceptions of the feedback giver's credibility explained 9.6% of the variance (p < .001), and participation in the additive feedback condition accounted for 12.3% of the variance (p < .001). For self-reported revision, interpersonal liking explained 9.9% of the variance (p < .001), perceptions of feedback giver’s credibility explained 10.2% of the variance (p < .001), and being in the additive feedback condition explained 3.9% of the variance (p < .01). Regarding the extent to which participants actually revised their work, being in the subtractive condition was the only significant predictor and explained 7.1% of the variance (p < .001). Based on these findings, the impact of the overall models’ prediction of revision suggest that these variables together seem to account for only a small amount of variance. To accurately predict revision, there are many other variables that may need to be considered.

Each linear hierarchical regression addressed a different revision outcome variable, either self-reported willingness to revise, self-reported revision, or actual revision. The predictor variables of the regressions were the feedback condition (additive, subtractive, or no feedback), interpersonal liking, perceived credibility, and psychological ownership. Each variable of interest was entered as its own block in the regression to assess the unique predictive ability of each
variable on the three revision outcomes. For full results of the regression analyses, please see Tables 1-6.

To answer the first research question to evaluate the influence of feedback condition on perceived willingness to revise, reports of revision, and actual revision, researchers ran three linear regressions. To compare the conditions, two dummy variables were created. The first dummy variable indicates the presence of subtractive feedback, where it is coded as 1 if the condition is present and 0 otherwise. Similarly, the second dummy variable indicates the presence of additive feedback, with a value of 1 indicating its presence and 0 indicating its absence. Results indicated the presence of subtractive feedback ($\beta = .33, SE = .24, t = 4.12, p < .001$) and additive feedback ($\beta = .42, SE = .23, t = 5.24, p < .001$) had a significant effect on self-reported willingness to revise, as well as self-reports of revision (subtractive: $\beta = .18, SE = .31, t = 2.18, p < .05$; additive: $\beta = .24, SE = .29, t = 2.78, p < .01$). The results revealed a significant and negative effect of subtractive feedback type on actual revision ($\beta = -.26, SE = .15, t = -2.78, p < .01$), but additive feedback did not have a significant influence on actual revision. Thus, the feedback conditions significantly influenced participants’ self-reported willingness to revise and their reports of revision; however, only subtractive feedback had a significant, and negative, effect on actual revision.

To answer the second research question, which sought to understand how psychological ownership influences willingness to revise, self-reported revision, and actual revision, researchers conducted three linear regressions. The results indicated that psychological ownership did not significantly influence any of the three revision variables.

The third research question looked at how interpersonal liking influences self-reported willingness to revise, self-reported revision, and actual revision. Researchers conducted three
linear regressions, which indicated a significant effect of interpersonal liking on perceived willingness to revise ($\beta = .23, SE = .08, t = 3.18, p < .01$), as well as self-reports of revision ($\beta = .22, SE = .1, t = 2.86, p < .01$), but an insignificant effect on actual revision.

In the fourth research question, researchers sought to understand how perceived credibility influences self-reported willingness to revise, self-reported revision, and actual revision. Results indicate a significant effect of perceived credibility on self-reported willingness to revise ($\beta = .17, SE = .12, t = 2.16, p < .05$), and self-reports of revision ($\beta = .25, SE = .15, t = 3.06, p < .01$); however, the results did not indicate a significant effect of perceived credibility on actual revision.
Table 1
Individual Coefficients of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Willingness to Revise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56 (1, 149)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.18 (1, 149)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.16 (1, 149)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.12 (1, 149)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>5.24 (1, 149)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
<sub>a</sub> 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition.  
<sub>b</sub> 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.  
*p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

Table 2
Model Summary for Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Willingness to Revise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change (df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.67 (1, 153)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>15.87 (1, 152)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>18.05 (1, 151)</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.36 (1, 150)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>27.46 (1, 149)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
<sub>a</sub> 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition.  
<sub>b</sub> 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.
Table 3
Individual Coefficients of Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized $\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.56 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.86 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.06 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback$_a$</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.18 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback$_b$</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.78 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
$_a$ 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition.  
$_b$ 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.

$p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$

Table 4
Model Summary for Predictor Variables on Self-Reported Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change (df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.03 (1, 153)</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>17.042 (1, 152)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>19.69 (1, 151)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback$_a$</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.74 (1, 150)</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback$_b$</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>7.72 (1, 149)</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
$_a$ 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition.  
$_b$ 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.
### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized $\beta$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t(\text{df})$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.43 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.60 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback$_a$</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-2.78 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback$_b$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35 (1, 149)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition. b 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.

*p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>$F$ Change (\text{df})</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ownership</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03 (1, 153)</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal liking</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.41 (1, 152)</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.54 (1, 151)</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtractive feedback$_a$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>11.95 (1, 150)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive feedback$_b$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12 (1, 149)</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a 0 = all other conditions, 1 = subtractive condition. b 0 = all other conditions, 1 = additive condition.
Discussion

This study explored how feedback condition, psychological ownership, the interpersonal liking a feedback receiver has for a feedback giver, and perception of a feedback giver’s credibility influenced individuals’ willingness to revise their work, their self-reported revision, and how much they actually revised their work. This study examined how feedback conditions influenced three revision different variables. Hierarchical regressions indicated that individuals who received feedback (additive and subtractive conditions) reported being more willing to revise their work and self-reported revising more than individuals in the no feedback condition. However, when examining how much participants actually revised their work, a regression suggested that participants in the subtractive condition revised their work significantly less than individuals in the additive and no feedback condition. The discrepancy in actual revision between the subtractive condition and other conditions highlights the implications subtractive feedback may have on individuals’ actions. Perhaps participants felt social pressure to report being willing to revise and having had revised, but when it came to actually revising, they chose to leave it as it was. Because subtractive feedback suggests the removal of parts of an individuals’ work, it may be negatively appraised by the receiver. Research suggests negative feedback may lead to disengagement (Fonteyne et al., 2018) and/or resistance (Kaufman & Schunn, 2011). Further, negative feedback may be perceived by individuals as unfair, unhelpful, or a sign that the feedback giver lacks proper qualifications to provide viable insights (Fong et al., 2018; Kaufman & Schunn, 2011). Although this study did not ask participants to rate the valence of the feedback they received, it may be that such feelings and emotions toward their feedback influenced their decision to implement (or not implement) their feedback.
Interestingly, participants were very consistent between what they said they were willing to do (willingness to revise) and what they said they did (self-reported revision); however, the actual revision score differed from the self-reports in most instances. Participants were asked for self-reported revision whether they had revised their speech, not whether they implemented the feedback. Perhaps in the additive and subtractive condition, they did edit their speech, but not by implementing the feedback they received. Furthermore, the assignment the experiment was based on had a specific time frame in which students were required to speak (seven to eight minutes), with point penalties for speaking over or under the allotted time. Because this experiment took place one week before their performances and they were required to have a finished outline completed to participate, they may have had their speech within the time limits and not felt incentivized to make any edits that could place them over or under the speaking limit. People may be more or less amenable to feedback and significant revisions based on how far along they are in their work.

In general, participants tended to revise their work very little. For example, in the no feedback condition, participants had on average about a 5% difference between their first and second drafts they submitted. Based on the results, it appears that whether or not an individual receives feedback does not have a significant impact on revision. Future research would benefit from examining other factors that could influence substantial revisions. For example, if a person had a negative performance, that might influence them to make significant edits to their work more than receiving feedback from a peer, even one perceived to be credible.

The researchers also sought to examine the role psychological ownership plays in the three revision variables. Interestingly, despite previous evidence suggesting psychological ownership’s influence on revision (Baer & Brown, 2012; Bond et al., 2007; Brownstein, 2003;
Chen et al., 2023; Grimes, 2018; Toivonen et al., 2023) psychological ownership was not a significant predictor for any of the revision variables. The psychological ownership scale (Baer & Brown, 2012; Pierce et al., 2004; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) generally used language asking to what extent the participants felt their ideas were theirs, but did not assess their care for the idea. Perhaps students reported high levels of psychological ownership, but had little passion for their idea. Participants may have seen the prompts “I feel like this speech idea is mine” and strongly agreed since they came up with the idea, but not felt a high sense of passion for the topic. Asking questions about the extent to which they feel passionate about the idea might be a better predictor of revision than asking the extent to which they feel the idea is theirs. One study suggests passion for work enhances team creativity (Xiao et al., 2019). Thus, in this instance, the amount of emotional investment or passion individuals have for their work may be a better predictor of revision variables than psychological ownership.

Furthermore, this study assessed the influence of interpersonal perceptions an individual had for their feedback-giver on the three revision variables in regards to interpersonal liking and perceived credibility. The results suggested that both interpersonal liking and perceived credibility were significant predictors of willingness to revise and self-reported revision. Interpersonal liking and perceived credibility both influence how persuasive individuals view feedback-givers (Myers & Johnson, 2003; Wilson & Sherrell, 1993). Thus, if participants rated high levels of interpersonal liking and perceived credibility, it makes sense that the feedback they received might be more persuasive to them, thus influencing their self-reports of willingness to revise and revision.

In contrast to the self-report variables, however, the results also suggested interpersonal liking and perceived credibility were not significant predictors of actual revision. The disparity
between the self-reported revision variables and the actual revision outcome may be attributed to factors such as social desirability bias, privacy issues, time constraints, or a number of other variables. Although the individual who gave them feedback didn’t see their survey, participants were seated next to other classmates, which may have influenced the honesty with which they answered the interpersonal liking and perceived credibility questions. Additionally, students were only allotted ten minutes to make edits to their work before reentering it into the survey. This may not have been an adequate amount of time for the students to make edits and implement the feedback they were given.

**Limitations and future research**

Inevitably, there were some limitations to this study. First, while the revision score between additive and subtractive conditions was standardized based on evidence of feedback implementation, the no feedback condition was coded using Levenshtein distance to give a feedback score. It may be that the revision scores in the no feedback condition were inflated compared to the additive and subtractive conditions. For example, in the additive and subtractive conditions, if someone added a new sentence that was not related to any feedback they received, they received a score of zero on their actual revision. This was done in the interest of examining the implementation of the specific feedback they received. However, in the no feedback condition, any addition of characters automatically entitled participants to receive at least a one in revision score. It may be that the revision score was unable to be accurately standardized across all conditions, thus influencing the outcomes of the regressions which utilized the revision score.

A second limitation relates to the delivery of feedback. This study did not ask for any other information that participants received from their feedback giver except for the two specific
pieces of feedback (in the additive and subtractive conditions). It may be, however, that how feedback is delivered also influences whether or not it is implemented. The measure for interpersonal liking sought to capture the participants’ feelings about their feedback giver, but the study did not assess how the participants perceived the delivery, and other information they received aside from the additive and subtractive feedback. However, the way in which information is communicated may play a large role in its implementation (Hadden & Frisby, 2019). For example, a participant who received feedback without compliments may be less willing to implement their feedback than an individual who received compliments on their work and then the feedback. Future studies would benefit from examining how compliments, tone, perceptions of social support, and other verbal and nonverbal indicators influence the implementation of feedback.

Future research would also benefit from examining whether or not individuals revise based on the medium through which feedback is communicated. In this study, feedback was communicated in-person and also provided on a piece of paper. However, different mediums through which feedback is communicated, such as email, video call, in person, on a document, etc., could make implementation more or less incentivizing due to practicality and utility.

Receptivity and adaptation to feedback are important skills in various life contexts, yet there are many circumstances in which individuals are hesitant to seek and implement feedback from others. Research on what variables predict and influence revision benefit individuals in uncovering beneficial factors and methods through which work can be improved, and also is pertinent to creating cohesion and refining work in organizational contexts. This study sheds light on the role interpersonal liking, perceived credibility, and feedback type play in individuals’ willingness to revise, self-reported revision, and actual revision. Future studies would benefit
from examining additional interpersonal contexts between feedback givers and receivers, and how they help or hinder revision.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent

Hello,

You are being invited to participate in a research project conducted at the University of Montana. The study is examining the impact of <feedback | saying an idea out loud> on project revision. This in-class activity should take about 40 minutes to complete. Please remember that your participation in this survey is voluntary. This means that you have the option to not respond to any question that you choose, and can stop participating at any time. If you would like to stop your participation, please raise your hand to inform me. We will be collecting your NetID, however, we will not share your NetID outside of the research team and the data collected will only ever be presented in aggregate form. That means your identity and information will remain completely confidential. Upon completion of the study, you will receive extra credit from your instructor. Participation in this activity may allow you to improve your public speaking skills and the quality of your project.

Participation or nonparticipation will not impact your relationship with the University of Montana. Submission of the survey will be interpreted as your informed consent to participate and that you confirm you are at least 18 years of age. If you have any questions about the research, please contact the researcher, Rachel Jensen at rachel2.jensen@umconnect.umt.edu or faculty research advisor, Christina Yoshimura at christina.yoshimura@umontana.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the UM Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (406) 243-6672. You may print or save a copy of this page for your records.
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this research project.

Appendix B

Additive Condition Script

Good < morning | afternoon >. For class today, you will have an opportunity to participate in an extra credit activity worth 10 points. The activity will allow you an opportunity to share and receive feedback about your speech idea with one of your fellow classmates. To participate, you need to have submitted the Draft Outline assignment on Moodle. If you are interested in participating, please move to the front seats of the class. If you would prefer to not participate and not receive the extra credit, please move to the back. For those of you who are willing to participate, please share your name with me one by one so I can generate a random assignment to another individual.

You will be using a Qualtrics survey throughout the duration of the activity today. Some of the questions you will come across may be confusing, so I will explain them now. For some questions, you will be given prompts regarding the extent to which you agree with something. On those questions, you will select one. On other questions, you may be asked to slide a bar to indicate your beliefs. If you have questions along the way, please raise your hand.

TALK ABOUT IMPORTANCE

To receive extra credit, you will need to fill the survey out as we go along. Once you open the link, it is very important that you do not close out of it. I will instruct you on where to find the survey in a moment. Please do not proceed beyond opening it once you have found the link. On Moodle, your instructor has shared a link to a Qualtrics survey. Please find the link now and open it.
Now that you have found and opened the Qualtrics survey, please read over the informed consent and decide if you would like to participate in this activity. Once you have answered yes or no to the informed consent portion, please wait to continue until given further instructions. If you change your mind and decide you would not like to participate, please let me know.

As mentioned earlier, in order to participate, you must have completed the speech draft outline. After answering the informed consent portion, please click the next arrow on the survey. ENTER NAME Once you have done that, please open your draft outline you submitted and copy the entire document, including the references page. Once you have copied your outline, please return to the Qualtrics survey and paste it in the text box. After you paste your outline, please wait before continuing on the survey.

Now that you have all successfully added your draft outline, please proceed to the next page, where you will be asked some questions about your draft outline. Once you have answered the questions, please click the next arrow.

You should now be on a screen that prompts you to wait before moving on. Please do not close out of the survey, but you can put your laptop to the side for now. You will now be randomly assigned to another individual.

Now that you are sitting across from the individual to whom you have been randomly assigned, we will ask those closest to the front of the room to please share your speech idea with your partner. Spend about five minutes sharing the details of your speech idea. If you would like, you can even practice giving your entire speech. If you’re not quite ready to fully practice your speech, please tell them ideas about your speech, such as information about your sources, stories you will tell, etc. For those who will be listening to the speech ideas this round, please write
down two specific things you think they could add to their speech to make it better on a piece of paper. ONLY TWO WE DON’T WANT INFO OVERLOAD. For this activity, it is important that your feedback focuses on the content of the speech, not the delivery. People tend to be most receptive to feedback that adds to what they already have, so we want the feedback you provide to add to what they already have, not take away. For example, if you think of another source they would benefit from having that you are familiar with, let them know. Please do not tell them to take anything out of their speech. Is everyone clear on their role?

Now that you are clear on the instructions, please share your speech idea. Feedback-givers, please refrain from giving feedback until the five minutes are up, TAKE TWO SPECIFIC NOTES.

Five minutes are now up. Feedback-givers, please spend the next few minutes sharing your two feedback ideas with them. Remember, please only let them know what they could ADD to their speech, not what you believe they should take out or anything about their delivery. Once you are done, please indicate by giving a thumbs-up.

Feedback-givers, please give your paper with the two specific feedback points to the individual who just shared their idea with you. For those of you who just shared your speech idea, please return to the Qualtrics survey and press the next button. Feedback-givers, you do not need to return to the survey at this point. In the text box, please write down the two specific points of feedback you received on the Qualtrics survey, formatted as point 1 and point 2. Once you are done, please wait for my instructions before pressing the next button. Hold onto the paper you received with your feedback points.
Now that you have been given feedback and written it down, those who just GAVE feedback, please move one seat to the left. While they are moving, those of you who just shared your speech idea, please move onto the next page of the survey and answer the following questions. You may continue clicking through the survey until you appear upon a note that says STOP.

Please do not close out of your Qualtrics. We will repeat the same procedure as last time, except for those of you who just shared your speech idea, you will now be giving feedback to a new person. If you did not share your speech idea last time, you will share it now. For those of you who are now feedback-givers, please listen and write down two specific points of feedback for the individual sharing their idea. Remember, the feedback should only be about what they could ADD to their speech, not about their delivery or what they should take away. Please share your speech idea now for the next five minutes.

Now that five minutes are up, feedback givers, please share the two specific points of feedback. When you have explained the feedback, please give a thumbs-up.

Feedback-givers, please give the paper with the two feedback points to the individual who just shared their speech idea. For those of you who just shared your speech idea, please go back to the survey and write down the two feedback points you received. You may continue through the survey until you hit a page that says to STOP.

Now, I want to spend the next X minutes allowing you all to make revisions to your draft outline. Please sit silently and work on your outline. Please do not close out of the survey.

Please click the next arrow on the Qualtrics quiz. You will see, it is asking for another copy of your draft outline. Now that you have possibly made some edits to your outline, please
copy the entirety of the outline again, including references, and paste it into the text box on the survey.

Please click the next arrow, where you will be asked to indicate the extent to which you revised your speech idea.

Once you have answered those questions, please move onto the final block and answer those questions.

Thank you so much for your participation! Your teacher will award extra credit for your work. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me. Good luck with your speeches!

**Subtractive Condition Script**

Good *< morning | afternoon >*. For class today, you will have an opportunity to participate in an extra credit activity worth X points. The activity will allow you an opportunity to share and receive feedback about your speech idea with one of your fellow classmates. To participate, you need to have submitted the Draft Outline assignment on Moodle. If you are interested in participating, please move to the front seats of the class. If you would prefer to not participate and receive the extra credit, please move to the back. For those of you who are willing to participate, please share your name with me one by one so I can generate a random assignment to another individual.

You will be using a Qualtrics survey throughout the duration of the activity today. Some of the questions you will come across may be confusing, so I will explain them now. For some questions, you will be given prompts regarding the extent to which you agree with something. On those questions, you will select one. On other questions, you may be asked to slide a bar to indicate your beliefs, like this. If you have questions along the way, please raise your hand.
To receive extra credit, you will need to fill the survey out as we go along. Once you open the link, it is very important that you do not close out of it. I will instruct you on where to find the survey in a moment. Please do not proceed beyond opening it once you have found the link. On Moodle, your instructor has shared a link to a Qualtrics survey. Please find the link now and open it.

Now that you have found and opened the Qualtrics survey, please read over the informed consent and decide if you would like to participate in this activity. Once you have answered yes or no to the informed consent portion, please wait to continue until given further instructions. If you change your mind and decide you would not like to participate, please let me know.

As mentioned earlier, in order to participate, you must have completed the speech draft outline. After answering the informed consent portion, please click the next arrow on the survey. Once you have done that, please open your draft outline you submitted and copy the entire document, including the references page. Once you have copied your outline, please return to the Qualtrics survey and paste it in the text box. After you paste your outline, please wait before continuing on the survey.

Now that you have all successfully added your draft outline, please proceed to the next page, where you will be asked some questions about your draft outline. Once you have answered the questions, please click the next arrow.

You should now be on a screen that prompts you to wait before moving on. Please do not close out of the survey, but you can put your laptop to the side for now. You will now be randomly assigned to another individual.
Now that you are sitting across from the individual to whom you have been randomly assigned, we will ask those closest to the front of the room to please share your speech idea with your partner. Spend about five minutes sharing the details of your speech idea. If you would like, you can even practice giving your entire speech. If you’re not quite ready to fully practice your speech, please tell them ideas about your speech, such as information about your sources, stories you will tell, etc. For those who will be listening to the speech ideas this round, please write down two specific things you think they could take out of speech to make it better on a piece of paper. For this activity, it is important that your feedback focuses on the content of the speech, not the delivery. For the sake of time and efficiency, we ask that you please only tell them what they would benefit from taking out, as there may not be time to look up and add in new information. For example, if you think one of their sources might not be reputable, let them know they would benefit from it being taken out. Please do not tell them to add anything to their speech. Is everyone clear on their role?

Now that you are clear on the instructions, please share your speech idea. Feedback-givers, please refrain from giving feedback until the five minutes are up, but feel free to take notes.

Five minutes are now up. Feedback-givers, please spend the next few minutes sharing your two feedback ideas with them. Remember, please only let them know what they could TAKE OUT of their speech, not what you believe they should add or anything about their delivery. Once you are done, please indicate by giving a thumbs-up.

Feedback-givers, please give your paper with the two specific feedback points to the individual who just shared their idea with you. For those of you who just shared your speech idea, please return to the Qualtrics survey and press the next button. Feedback-givers, you do not
need to return to the survey at this point. In the text box, please write down the two specific points of feedback you received on the Qualtrics survey, formatted as point 1 and point 2. Once you are done, please wait for my instructions before pressing the next button. Hold onto the paper you received with your feedback points.

Now that you have been given feedback and written it down, those who just GAVE feedback, please move one seat to the left. While they are moving, those of you who just shared your speech idea, please move onto the next page of the survey and answer the following questions. You may continue clicking through the survey until you appear upon a note that says STOP.

Please do not close out of your Qualtrics. We will repeat the same procedure as last time, except for those of you who just shared your speech idea, you will now be giving feedback to a new person. If you did not share your speech idea last time, you will share it now. For those of you who are now feedback-givers, please listen and write down two specific points of feedback for the individual sharing their idea. Remember, the feedback should only be about what they could TAKE OUT of their speech, not about their delivery or what they should add. Please share your speech idea now for the next five minutes.

Now that five minutes are up, feedback givers, please share the two specific points of feedback. When you have explained the feedback, please give a thumbs-up.

Feedback-givers, please give the paper with the two feedback points to the individual who just shared their speech idea. For those of you who just shared your speech idea, please go back to the survey and write down the two feedback points you received. You may continue through the survey until you hit a page that says to STOP.
Now, I want to spend the next X minutes allowing you all to make revisions to your draft outline. Please sit silently and work on your outline. Please do not close out of the survey.

Please click the next arrow on the Qualtrics quiz. You will see, it is asking for another copy of your draft outline. Now that you have possibly made some edits to your outline, please copy the entirety of the outline again, including references, and paste it into the text box on the survey.

Please click the next arrow, where you will be asked to indicate the extent to which you revised your speech idea.

Once you have answered those questions, please move onto the final block and answer those questions.

Thank you so much for your participation! Your teacher will award extra credit for your work. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me. Good luck with your speeches!

No Feedback Condition Script

Good < morning | afternoon >. For class today, you will have an opportunity to participate in an extra credit activity worth X points. The activity will allow you an opportunity to share your speech idea with one of your fellow classmates. To participate, you need to have submitted the Draft Outline assignment on Moodle. If you are interested in participating, please move to the front seats of the class. If you would prefer to not participate and receive the extra credit, please move to the back. For those of you who are willing to participate, please share your name with me one by one so I can generate a random assignment to another individual.
You will be using a Qualtrics survey throughout the duration of the activity today. Some of the questions you will come across may be confusing, so I will explain them now. For some questions, you will be given prompts regarding the extent to which you agree with something. On those questions, you will select one. On other questions, you may be asked to slide a bar to indicate your beliefs, like this. If you have questions along the way, please raise your hand.

To receive extra credit, you will need to fill the survey out as we go along. Once you open the link, it is very important that you do not close out of it. I will instruct you on where to find the survey in a moment. Please do not proceed beyond opening it once you have found the link. On Moodle, your instructor has shared a link to a Qualtrics survey. Please find the link now and open it.

Now that you have found and opened the Qualtrics survey, please read over the informed consent and decide if you would like to participate in this activity. Once you have answered yes or no to the informed consent portion, please wait to continue until given further instructions. If you change your mind and decide you would not like to participate, please let me know.

As mentioned earlier, in order to participate, you must have completed the speech draft outline. After answering the informed consent portion, please click the next arrow on the survey. Once you have done that, please open your draft outline you submitted and copy the entire document, including the references page. Once you have copied your outline, please return to the Qualtrics survey and paste it in the text box. After you paste your outline, please wait before continuing on the survey.
Now that you have all successfully added your draft outline, please proceed to the next page, where you will be asked some questions about your draft outline. Once you have answered the questions, please click the next arrow.

You should now be on a screen that prompts you to wait before moving on. Please do not close out of the survey, but you can put your laptop to the side for now. You will now be randomly assigned to another individual.

Now that you are sitting across from the individual to whom you have been randomly assigned, we will ask those closest to the front of the room to please share your speech idea with your partner. Spend about five minutes sharing the details of your speech idea. If you would like, you can even practice giving your entire speech. If you’re not quite ready to fully practice your speech, please tell them ideas about your speech, such as information about your sources, stories you will tell, etc. For those who will be listening to the speech ideas this round, please do not interrupt or provide feedback at the end. For this activity, we just want you to share your idea out loud, as that can help clarify ideas in your mind and make you more confident on speech day. Again, please do not provide any feedback.

Now that you are clear on the instructions, please share your speech idea.

Five minutes are now up. For those of you who just shared your speech idea, please return to the Qualtrics survey and press the next button. Continue with the survey until you hit the next STOP section. Listeners, you do not need to return to the survey at this point, but do not close out of it. Those who just listened please move one seat to the left while the others fill out their survey.
Please do not close out of your Qualtrics. We will repeat the same procedure as last time, except for those of you who just shared your speech idea, you will now be listening to a new person. If you did not share your speech idea last time, you will share it now. For those of you who are now listening, please listen to not give feedback. Please share your speech idea now for the next five minutes.

Now that five minutes are up, for those of you who just shared your speech idea, please go back to the survey and continue through the survey until you hit a page that says to STOP.

Now, I want to spend the next X minutes allowing you all to make revisions to your draft outline. Please sit silently and work on your outline. Please do not close out of the survey.

Please click the next arrow on the Qualtrics quiz. You will see, it is asking for another copy of your draft outline. Now that you have possibly made some edits to your outline, please copy the entirety of the outline again, including references, and paste it into the text box on the survey.

Please click the next arrow, where you will be asked to indicate the extent to which you revised your speech idea.

Once you have answered those questions, please move onto the final block and answer those questions.

Thank you so much for your participation! Your teacher will award extra credit for your work. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me. Good luck with your speeches!