**Deviations from the Pre-Registration Study 1**

In the pre-registration, we noted that participants would be induced to approach and avoidance motivation through outcome framing in the first question. Additionally, the sentence “Think about the goal you want to achieve/avoid” was added in subsequent questions according to condition in an attempt to strengthen the effects of the experimental manipulation. Furthermore, the pre-registration described “perceived distance to the goal”, indicating that we were measuring the temporal distance participants perceived to their goal. Contrary to this, the study measured perceived distance to the day of the examination, and not to the grades that participants wanted to achieve, because it is more logical to assume that the motivational states might influence how they perceive that which they can plan for (the day of the examination) as opposed to achieving their goal. In the pre-registration, it was noted that data gathering would stop after 240 participants. Practically, it was difficult to keep this strictly at 240 participants. More important, this decision was not influenced by any intermediate analyses of data and thus does not constitute the practice of “optional stopping”, Also, the actual amount in each condition was around 100, corresponding with the a priori power analysis. In the pre-registration, it was noted that participants who answered wrongly on the comprehension check would be excluded. We deviated from the pre-registration by not using the comprehension check as an exclusion criterion, but instead opted for a non-registered manipulation check by analyzing the grades that participants in the two conditions reported when they were asked to focus on what they wanted to approach or what they wanted to avoid. No participants were excluded on the basis of this un-registered manipulation check.

**Deviations from the Pre-Registration Study 2**

In the pre-registration, it was noted that data gathering would stop after 400 participants. Practically, it was difficult to keep this strictly at 400 participants, particularly because there was a much larger turn-out of participants than expected. More important, this decision was not influenced by any intermediate analyses of data and thus does not constitute the practice of “optional stopping”. As an addition to our pre-registered exclusion criterion that participants who answered wrongly according to the comprehension check would be excluded, we also excluded participants with incomplete responses.