

Electronic Supplemental Materials (ESM)

Article title: The Effect of Everyday Safety Behavior on Intolerance of Uncertainty and Indecisiveness

Author names: Mona Hassan, Helmut Appel

Affiliation and e-mail address of the corresponding author: Helmut Appel, Institute of Clinical

Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Cologne, Germany; helmut.appel@uni-koeln.de

ESM 1 - Additional analyses regarding Study 1

ESM 1.1 Preregistered Exclusion Criteria and Number of Daily Surveys for Study 1

Table ESM 1.1-1

Preregistered Exclusion Criteria in Study 1

	Exclusion criteria	<i>N</i>
Complete exclusion	Did not finish baseline or final survey	26
	Recommended not using their data	5
	Did not answer the attention check correctly	3
Sensitivity analyses	Multivariate Outliers	3
	Did not believe decision was real	12

Table ESM 1.1-2

Number of Daily Surveys in Study 1

Number of daily surveys	<i>n_{increase}</i>	<i>n_{control}</i>	<i>n_{total}</i>	%
4	4	5	9	9.1
5	9	22	31	31.3
6	31	28	59	59.6

Note. Number of provided daily surveys not significantly associated with experimental condition, $\chi^2(2, N = 99) = 4.55, p = .103$.

ESM 1.2 Mediation Analyses

Table ESM 1.2-1

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on IU via IUSB in Study 1

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	0.49	0.13	.71	0.23, 0.75
DV: IU				
IUSB ^a	6.78	1.64	.39	3.17, 10.20
DV: IU (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-3.80	2.41	-.31	-8.59, 1.00
M: IUSB (b-path)	7.75	1.74	.44	4.29, 11.21
Indirect effect	3.82	1.28	.32	1.55, 6.51
Total effect	0.02	2.47	.00	-4.87, 4.92

Note. IU = Intolerance of uncertainty at final measurement; IUSB = IU-related safety behavior averaged across days 2-8; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; M = mediator; CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients); rows with significant coefficients (CI does not contain 0) in bold type; analysis conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017), 5,000 bootstraps. DV = dependent variable, IV = independent variable, M = mediator, CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients).

^anot considering Condition

Table ESM 1.2-2*Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on Indecisiveness via IUSB in Study 1*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	0.49	0.13	.71	0.23, 0.75
DV: Indecisiveness				
IUSB ^a	2.34	1.30	.17	-0.30, 4.72
DV: Indecisiveness (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-1.27	2.07	-.13	-5.38, 2.84
M: IUSB (b-path)	3.06	1.49	.22	0.10, 6.03
Indirect effect	1.51	0.78	.16	0.14, 3.19
Total effect	0.24	1.97	.02	-3.66, 4.14

Note. IUSB = IU-related safety behavior averaged across days 2-8; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; M = mediator; CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients); rows with significant coefficients (*CI* does not contain 0) in bold type; analysis conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017), 5,000 bootstraps.

^anot considering Condition

ESM 1.3 Robustness Check / Sensitivity Analysis

First, in line with preregistration, we identified multivariate outliers by determining each participant's Mahalanobis distance for all continuous variables and verifying whether it fell below a critical probability threshold ($< .001$). To assess the robustness of the results, we repeated analyses without multivariate outliers. We identified $n = 3$ multivariate outliers.

Next, in line with preregistration, we excluded $n = 12$ participants who did not believe the decision about the performance test was real (i.e., a test was actually carried out) and repeated analyses.

Excluding Multivariate Outliers. As in the main analysis, the ANOVA testing for a higher IU increase in the Increase condition compared to the control condition (H1) revealed a significant main effect of time, $F(1,94) = 4.42, p = .038, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .05$, but no significant main effect of condition, $F(1,94) = 0.03, p = .871$, or interaction, $F(1,94) = 0.01, p = .910$. Also in line with the main analysis,

testing greater indecisiveness in the Increase condition (H2) revealed no significant difference, $t(94) = -0.37, p = .485$.

Regarding the exploratory mediation analyses, the indirect effect of the experimental condition on IU via IUSB remained significant when excluding multivariate outliers (Table ESM 1.3-1). However, the indirect effect of the experimental condition on indecisiveness via IUSB did not remain significant when excluding multivariate outliers (Table ESM 1.3-2)

Table ESM 1.3-1

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on IU via IUSB Excluding Multivariate Outliers in Study 1

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	0.48	0.13	.69	0.21, 0.74
DV: IU				
IUSB ^a	6.50	1.81	.37	2.89, 9.96
DV: IU (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-4.08	2.47	-.34	-8.99, 0.82
M: IUSB (b-path)	7.53	1.79	.43	3.98, 11.08
Indirect effect	3.60	1.27	.30	1.38, 6.35
Total effect	-0.48	2.52	-.04	-5.48, 4.51

Note. IU = Intolerance of uncertainty at final measurement; IUSB = IU-related safety behavior

averaged across days 2-8; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; M = mediator; CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients); rows with significant coefficients (CI does not contain 0) in bold type; analysis conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017), 5,000 bootstraps.

^anot considering Condition

Table ESM 1.3-2

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental on Indecisiveness via IUSB Excluding Multivariate Outliers in Study 1

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	0.48	0.13	.69	0.21, 0.74
DV: Indecisiveness				
IUSB ^a	2.34	1.25	.17	-0.26, 4.68
DV: Indecisiveness (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-1.35	2.10	-.14	-4.03, 3.88
M: IUSB (b-path)	2.68	1.52	.19	-0.34, 2.82
Indirect effect	1.28	0.75	.13	-0.01, 0.30
Total effect	-0.07	1.99	-.01	-4.03, 3.88

Note. IUSB = IU-related safety behavior averaged across days 2-8; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; M = mediator; CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients); rows with significant coefficients (*CI* does not contain 0) in bold type; analysis conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017), 5,000 bootstraps.

^anot considering Condition

Excluding Participants who Questioned the Decision. In line with the main analysis, testing greater indecisiveness in the Increase condition (H2) revealed no significant difference, $t(85) = 0.55$, $p = .294$. Regarding the exploratory mediation analyses, the indirect effect of the experimental condition on indecisiveness via IUSB did not remain significant when excluding multivariate outliers (Table ESM 1.3-3)

Table ESM 1.3-2

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental on Indecisiveness via IUSB Excluding Participants who Questioned the Decision in Study 1

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	0.55	0.14	.78	0.27, 0.83
DV: Indecisiveness				
IUSB ^a	1.99	1.34	.18	-0.83, 4.41
DV: Indecisiveness (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	0.06	2.27	-.01	-4.45, 4.57
Mediator: IUSB (b-path)	1.97	1.62	.14	-1.25, 5.20
Indirect effect	1.08	0.86	.11	-0.52, 2.95
Total effect	1.14	2.09	.12	-3.02, 5.30

Note. IUSB = IU-related safety behavior averaged across days 2-8; DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; M = mediator; CI = 95% confidence intervals (referring to unstandardized coefficients); rows with significant coefficients (*CI* does not contain 0) in bold type; analysis conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017), 5,000 bootstraps.

^anot considering Condition

ESM 1.4 List of IUSB in Study 1

Table ESM 1.4

List of 16 Overcompensating Behaviors for Dealing with Uncertainty (IUSB) in Study 1

I only committed myself when I was 100% sure.
I found out as much as I could about the situation. (Internet, family, friends, professional services).
I sought advice from others.
I asked others for their opinion.
I let others reassure me.
I asked several people for the same information to be quite sure.
I compared myself with other people who have been in a similar situation before.
I went over everything I knew about the situation repeatedly.
I planned everything in detail.
I have thought about plan Bs or fallback strategies in case something doesn't go as planned.
I went over the situation repeatedly in my mind beforehand.
I went over the situation in my mind repeatedly afterwards.
I focused completely on the situation and blocked out everything else.
I kept a watchful eye on people close to me to prevent anything from happening to them
I took control of everything to reduce insecurity.
I preferred to do things myself rather than relying on others to carry them out.
