

Supplemental Digital Appendix 2
Descriptive Information for Each Included Study (n = 24), Scoping Review on Influence of Indirect Prior Performance Information (PPI) on Ratings of Current (Target) Performance

First author, year ^{ref}	Research setting/ topic	Indirect PPI				Control group (no PPI)	Raters			Target performance			
		Label	Description	Positive	Negative		Number	Description	Familiarity with task	Description	Level	Rating tool	Main findings
Baltes, 2000 ⁴³	Job interviewer performance	Performance cue effect	Rating of interviewer by panel of experts	Yes	Yes	Yes	169	Undergraduate psychology students	Moderate	Videotape of interviewer interviewing a person for a receptionist position	Variable	22-item 9-point behavior scale	Assimilation effect
Duerksen, 1972 ⁴⁴	Musical performance	Explicit preparations on evaluations	Reputation of performer (professional vs. graduate applicant)	Yes	Yes	Yes	517	University students (both music and non-music majors)	Moderate/ good	Tape recording of piano piece from famous pianist	Good	7-domain rating scale	Assimilation effect for both music and non-music major evaluators
Fenner, 1993 ⁴⁵	Employee evaluation using CPM	Knowledge of prior performance	Personnel file with evaluation from prior supervisor	Yes	Yes	No	44	Undergraduate students	Poor	Performance data (words per minute/text context) of four simulated employees; data selected by rater	Good/ poor	Global rating, performance variability, confidence in global rating	Assimilation effect
Findlay, 2004 ⁴⁶	Figure skating performance	Reputation bias	Reputation of figure skater	Yes	Yes	No	12	Qualified figure skating judges	Excellent	Videotape of Ontario/Quebec figure skater competitive performances	Variable	Skate Canada score sheet	Assimilation effect occurring during the evaluation phase
Foster, 1980 ³⁰	Student evaluation	Label-induced/ stereotypical/ expectancy bias	Evaluation of “normal” or “disturbed” by a clinical team	No	Yes	No	36	Teachers and trainees	Excellent	Videotape of boy engaging in motor tasks, playing, and reading	Average	Academic, development, activity, personal/social skills	Assimilation effect for both experienced teacher and trainee evaluators
Foti, 1993 ²⁴	Instructor lecture performance	Prior impressions	Written paragraph on instructor’s past performance	Yes	Yes	Yes	145	Introductory psychology students	Good	Videotape of instructor lecture	Average	Global evaluation, Recognition accuracy	Assimilation effect that increased as processing demands increase

First author, year ^{ref}	Research setting/ topic	Indirect PPI				Control group (no PPI)	Raters			Target performance			
		Label	Description	Positive	Negative		Number	Description	Familiarity with task	Description	Level	Rating tool	Main findings
Hanges, 1991 ³¹	New employee evaluation	Prior information bias	Written statement from previous supervisor	Yes	Yes	No	89	Undergraduate students	Poor	Written vignettes describing behavior	Variable	Global performance rating	• Assimilation effect • Negativity bias
Heslin, 2005 ²²	Employee negotiating skills	Performance anchor	Written text from supervisor	No	Yes	Yes	83	MBA students	Good	Videotape of employee performance	Good	12-item behavioral observation scale	• Assimilation effect for entity theorists • No effect for incremental theorists
Huber, 1989 ³²	Accounting clerk performance	Prior performance ratings, contextual variables, anchoring effect	Written sentence describing past performance	Yes	Yes	No	64	Accountants	Excellent	Authentic performances derived from the employee's record	Variable	Authentic weighted performance standard scale	• Assimilation effect with general standards • No effect with specific standards
Kaplan, 1995 ³³	Employee evaluation	Work history	Written information of past performance	Yes	Yes	No	57	Senior auditors	Excellent	Written auditing trail with one missing step	Poor	Likelihood of rating below expectations and to report step missed	Assimilation effect
Miles, 2001 ³⁴	Surgical residency interviews	Bias	Real life performance information	Yes	Yes	Yes	46	Department of surgery faculty	Excellent	Live surgical residency interview	Variable	Global rating and 9 personal characteristics	Assimilation effect at residency sites emphasizing knowledge/ judgment
Nieminen, 2013 ¹⁴	Manager performance	Past performance information	Written narrative of past performance	Yes	Yes	Yes	355	Undergraduate psychology students	Poor	Videotape of manager dealing with problem subordinate	Average	Performance scale and global assessment	Assimilation effect
Perry, 1974 ³⁵	Instructor lecture performance	Prior expectations	Teacher rating scores from the internet	Yes	Yes	No	153	Undergraduate psychology students	Very good	Live lecture	Not indicated	University of Manitoba teacher rating tool	Assimilation effect
Perry, 1979 ³⁶	Instructor lecture performance	Reputation/ expectancy effects	Written comments from prior students	Yes	Yes	No	198	Undergraduate psychology students	Very good	Videotaped lecture	Variable	Rating of overall teaching ability	Assimilation effect only for the high expressive lecturer

First author, year ^{ref}	Research setting/ topic	Indirect PPI				Control group (no PPI)	Raters			Target performance			
		Label	Description	Positive	Negative		Number	Description	Familiarity with task	Description	Level	Rating tool	Main findings
Radocy, 1976 ³⁷	Musical performance	Bias conditions	Provided alleged facts	Yes	Yes	Yes	450	Undergraduate music majors	Very good	Tape-recorded music pieces	Very good	7-point rating scale of several criteria	Assimilation effect
Reilly, 1998 ²⁰	Lecture performance Sales call performance	Context effects	Written performance ratings from prior students	Yes	No	Yes	200	“Subjects”	Very good and poor	Videotaped lecture: familiar (hunger) and unfamiliar (sales call) performances	Average	9-dimension 7-point performance evaluation scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assimilation effect with unfamiliar topic/ untrained evaluator.• Contrast effect with unfamiliar topic/ trained evaluator.• No effect with familiar topic.
Salvemini, 1993 ²³	Sales call performance	Bias	Written ratings of prior performance	Yes	Yes	Yes	108	Student volunteers	Moderate	Videotapes (actors performing in customer sales)	Average	Magnitude estimation scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assimilation effect even with training.• No effect when incentives for accuracy were added.
Siegall, 1992 ³⁸	Employee performance	Rater expectations	Written information from previous manager	Yes	Yes	Yes	159	Undergraduate Students	Poor	Written 6-month job performance	Average	7-point rating scale	No effect
Sisco, 2007 ³⁹	Instructor lecture performance	Prior performance	Written information from other students	Yes	Yes	Yes	162	Undergraduate psychology students	Very good	Videotaped lectures of applicant to psychology department	Average	9-dimension performance rating scale	Contrast effect
Smither, 1998 ^{17(study 1)}	Instructor lecture performance	Prior performance information	Average ratings from prior students	Yes	Yes	No	51	Undergraduate Students	Very good	Videotaped lecture	Average	9-dimension performance rating scale	Assimilation effect
Smither, 1998 ^{17(study 3)}	Instructor lecture performance	Prior performance information	Written information of performance	Yes	Yes	No	109	Undergraduate Students	Very good	Videotaped lecture	Average	9-dimension performance rating scale	Assimilation effect that was strongest in high-discrepancy groups

First author, year ^{ref}	Research setting/ topic	Indirect PPI				Control group (no PPI)	Raters			Target performance			
		Label	Description	Positive	Negative		Number	Description	Familiarity with task	Description	Level	Rating tool	Main findings
Thelwell, 2013 ⁴⁰	Sports coach performance	Reputation bias	Written trainer reputation	Yes	Yes	Yes	326	Undergraduate sports/exercise science students	Good	Videotape of coach teaching drills	Average	24-item 5-point coach competency scale	Assimilation effect
Towler, 2006 ⁴¹	Instructor lecture performance	Reputation	Written trainer reputation	Yes	Yes	Yes	75	Undergraduate psychology students	Good	Videotape of experienced female trainer	Not indicated	Lecture rating tool of multiple dimensions	Assimilation effect
Uggerslev, 2002 ⁴²	Employee performance	Indirect performance information	Voicemail/email from co-worker	Yes	Yes	Yes	220	Undergraduate Students	Poor	Videotaped server waiting table	Variable	3-item 7-point scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assimilation effect with positive target.• No effect with negative target.

Abbreviations: CPM, computerized performance monitoring; MBA, master of business administration.
^aKey data for each study are included here. Additional data extracted, as described in the Method, are available from the corresponding author upon request.