

ESM 2 - Additional analyses regarding Study 2

ESM 2.1 Preregistered Exclusion Criteria and Number of Daily Surveys for Study 2

Table ESM 2.1-1

Preregistered Exclusion Criteria in Study 2

Exclusion criteria		<i>N</i>
Complete exclusion	Did not finish baseline survey or failed baseline attention checks	33
	Did not finish finaly survey	34
	Provided < 3 daily surveys	2
	Recommended not using their data	3
	Failed final survey attention check	10
	Had already taken part in similar study (or n/a)	12
Sensitivity analyses	Multivariate Outliers	0
	Did not believe decision was real	27

Table ESM 2.1-2

Number of Daily Surveys in Study 2

Number of daily surveys	<i>n_{increase}</i>	<i>n_{decrease}</i>	<i>n_{total}</i>	%
3	1	2	3	2.0
4	3	1	4	2.7
5	11	6	17	11.6
6	63	60	123	83.7

Note. Number of provided daily surveys not significantly associated with experimental condition, $\chi^2(3, N = 147) = 2.34, p = .506$.

ESM 2.2 Mediation Analyses

Table ESM 2.2-1

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on IU via IUSB in Study 2

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	1.44	0.10	1.52	1.24, 1.64
DV: IU				
IUSB ^a	4.47	1.17	.32	2.15, 6.68
DV: IU (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-6.85	3.21	-.51	-13.20, -0.51
M: IUSB (b-path)	7.25	1.71	.51	4.29, 11.21
Indirect effect	10.42	2.84	.78	4.97, 16.17
Total effect	3.57	2.19	.27	-0.76, 7.90

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 2.2-2*Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on Indecisiveness via IUSB in Study 2*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	1.44	0.10	1.52	1.24, 1.64
DV: Indecisiveness				
IUSB ^a	4.47	1.19	.17	2.05, 6.73
DV: Indecisiveness (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-1.57	2.47	-.16	-6.46, 3.32
Mediator: IUSB (b-path)	2.10	1.31	.20	-0.50, 4.69
Indirect effect	3.01	2.29	.31	-1.27, 7.61
Total effect	1.44	1.61	.15	-1.73, 4.62

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 2.3 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 ($< .001$). No multivariate outliers were present in the dataset. Next, in line with preregistration, we excluded $n = 27$ participants who did not believe the decision about the performance test was real (i.e., a test was actually carried out) and repeated analyses. This only applied to analyses involving the indecisiveness measure, which was based on the decision about the alleged performance tests (i.e., analyses associated with H2).

In line with the main analysis, testing greater indecisiveness in the Increase condition (H2) revealed no significant difference, $t(118) = 0.55, p = .292$. Regarding the exploratory mediation

analyses, an indirect effect of the experimental condition on indecisiveness via IUSB was not observed when excluding these cases, which replicated the main analyses (Table ESM 2.3-3)

Table ESM 2.3-1

Mediation Model of the Effect of the Experimental Condition on Indecisiveness via IUSB Excluding Participants who Questioned the Decision in Study 2

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>CI (LL, UL)</i>
DV: IUSB				
Condition (a-path)	1.55	0.11	1.60	1.34, 1.77
DV: Indecisiveness				
IUSB ^a	4.24	1.28	.32	1.67, 6.73
DV: Indecisiveness (mediation model)				
IV: Condition (direct effect)	-4.17	2.96	-.42	-10.03, 1.70
Mediator: IUSB (b-path)	3.33	1.52	.33	0.32, 6.34
Indirect effect	5.17	2.75	.52	-0.35, 10.53
Total effect	1.00	1.82	.10	-2.60, 4.60

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