

Supplementary Information

Systematic metacognitive reflection helps people discover far-sighted decision strategies: a process-tracing experiment

Frederic Becker¹, Maria Wirzberger², Viktoria Pammer-Schindler³, Srinidhi Srinivas¹ and Falk Lieder¹

¹Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany. E-mail: frederic.becker@tuebingen.mpg.de.

²University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany.

³Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria.

Appendix

1. Analyzing the effect of reflection on active planning strategies

In this section, we examine the robustness of our results to the influence of the no-planning strategy. To do so, we reran the analysis of the effect of reflection on participants' expected score without all participants who used the no-planning strategy in at least one trial. This left 63 (48.8%) participants in the control condition and 71 (55.5%) participants in the reflection condition. In this subgroup, we still found a significant main effect of reflection on expected score in the performance phase ($\beta = 5.35, p = .02$). In addition, we still found that the average expected score in the first three trials moderated the effect of reflection on expected score ($\beta = -4.44, p = .004$) and score ($\beta = -4.99, p = .015$). This suggests, that also in the subgroup of active planners, reflection is especially helpful for those who plan poorly. Further, we could replicate the immediate positive effects of reflection prompts. Immediately after a reflection prompt, participants performed significantly more strategy changes ($\beta = 5.35, p = .02$), and they experienced significantly larger increases in expected score ($\beta = 0.91, p = .029$) than in transitions without reflection prompt.

In contrast to the analysis including participants who used the no-planning strategy, we did not find that reflection significantly increased the number of clicks ($\beta = 1.39, p = .198$) in the performance phase or immediately after a reflection prompt ($\beta = 1.26, p = .158$). This is mostly due to the fact, that active planners were already collecting a roughly appropriate amount of information. The fact, that they still improve with reflection, suggests that they learn to prioritize more useful information or to click in a more adaptive order. That is, they don't learn to plan more, but they do learn a better planning strategy.

In conclusion, these supplementary analyses show that benefits of metacognitive reflection are not limited to helping people overcome the no-planning strategy. Instead, reflection also helps people who are already planning to switch to more adaptive planning strategies.

2. Analyzing the moderation of self-evaluation on reflection

In this exploratory (not-preregistered) analysis, we examined whether the effectiveness of reflection is influenced by the ability to perform accurate self-evaluation. Participants of the reflection group were asked to metacognitively evaluate their own planning strategy. In detail, they responded to the question "How well do you think your current strategy is working?" on a Likert scale.

How well a participant's strategy worked on a given trial was jointly determined by two factors: the quality of the applied strategy and random variation in the available rewards. For example, consider a participant who used a maladaptive strategy but still received high rewards from lucky draws, or vice versa. We thus first examined to what degree participants' assessments reflected the quality of their

strategy, and to what degree it reflected the noise in their scores. To do so, we quantified the quality of the strategy by its expected score and the noisiness by the difference of the received score and the expected score. For each participant, we then regressed the self-evaluation scores they provided in response to the five reflection prompts with the mean expected score and the mean noise of the three trials preceding each reflection prompt. Finally, we defined the quality focus of a participant as the ratio of the two obtained coefficients: $F_{\text{quality}} = \beta_{\text{quality}} / (\beta_{\text{quality}} + \beta_{\text{noise}})$. By design, higher values of the quality focus score F_{quality} mean that the evaluation is more likely to reflect the actual strategy quality. We found that the average quality focus was 0.61 ($SD = 0.15$), meaning that participants' self-evaluations were more likely to describe the actual planning quality than the experienced noise.

In a subsequent regression analysis, we found that the quality focus moderated the effectiveness of reflection. The more participants focused their evaluation on their strategy's quality, the better they performed in the performance phase in terms of their expected score ($\beta = 9.25, p < .001$), score ($\beta = 7.84, p < .001$), and their number clicks ($\beta = 1.67, p = .004$).

Next, we also tested if the accuracy of participants' judgments of the quality of their strategy also moderated the effect of reflection. To control for the influence of noise on the self-evaluation scores, we first regressed the self-evaluation scores on the average value of the noise in that had afflicted the individual's score. The evaluation accuracy of a participant was then measured by the Pearson correlation between the resulting residuals and the mean expected scores. We found that the mean evaluation accuracy was 0.29 ($SD = 0.46$). In addition, we found that the more accurate the participants were in their self-evaluations, the higher were their expected score ($\beta = 5.47, p = .004$) and their score ($\beta = 4.29, p = .039$) in the performance phase.

In summary, the more participants focused their evaluation on the quality of their actual strategy and the more accurately they judged the quality of their strategy, the better they performed. One possible interpretation of this finding is that more accurate reflection leads to greater improvement in performance. This finding has potential implications for the design of reflection scripts. Concretely, it suggests that reflection scripts should guide participants to reflect on their own abilities rather than on external influences. However, we cannot rule out the alternative interpretation that the observed association is caused by a latent individual difference that improves self-evaluation and planning independently of each other. To discern between these two alternative explanations, follow-up experiments should measure the self-evaluation skills of the control group or actively manipulate the focus and quality of self-evaluation.

3. Complete model results

In this section, we provide the complete results of all of our regression analyses. Tables 1-2 report the results concerning the participants' performance, the number of clicks and the use of different strategy types. Tables 3-4 describe the moderation of the effect of reflection by the type of planning strategies participants used in the baseline trials.

Tables 5-7 list the results concerning whether and how much the participant's performance and number of clicks changed from one trial to the next. Table 6 describes the moderation of the effect of reflection by the participant's score on the previous trial. Table 7 describes the moderation of the effect of reflection by the type of the strategy the participant used on the previous trial. Lastly, Table 8 describes the moderation of the effect of reflection by how deeply the participant engaged with the reflection questions.

Lastly, tables 9-10 describe the moderation of the effect of reflection by the focus and accuracy of participants self-evaluation.

Table 1. Regression results concerning participants' performance and amount of planning in the learning phase.

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	7.35	<.001	8.51	.015	2.28	.001
	Baseline	15.17	<.001	12.52	<.001	3.51	<.001
	Trial Nr	2.32	<.001	1.3	.439	0.69	.002
	NFC	0.51	.88	0.61	.88	0.01	.981
	Reflection \times Baseline	-3.84	.001	-7.81	.001	-0.41	.416
	Reflection \times NFC	1.71	.619	1.3	.692	0.24	.616
3-7	Baseline \times NFC	-0.75	.497	-0.95	.647	0.19	.504
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	4.71	<.001	2.05	.475	1.14	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Baseline	-0.83	.006	0.85	.457	-0.22	.112
	Trial Nr \times NFC	0.08	.817	-3.23	.12	0.21	.278
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Baseline	-2.48	<.001	0.32	.845	-0.49	.033
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	0.25	.555	2.41	.147	0.24	.266
	Trial Nr \times Baseline \times NFC	-0.06	.788	0.74	.384	-0.24	.071

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). For the dependent variables expected score and score the predictor *Baseline* was given by the average expected score in the first three trials. For the dependent variable number of clicks the predictor *Baseline* was given by the average number of clicks in the first three trials.

Table 2. Regression results concerning participants' performance and amount of planning in the performance phase.

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	12.21	<.001	9.96	<.001	2.6	.002
	Baseline	11.87	<.001	10.28	<.001	2.1	<.001
	Trial Nr	3.07	<.001	2.8	.001	0.95	<.001
	NFC	0.36	.816	1.95	.816	-0.08	.87
	Reflection \times Baseline	-6.52	<.001	-6.89	<.001	-0.32	.606
	Reflection \times NFC	0.63	.737	-1.2	.737	0.08	.895
7-21	Baseline \times NFC	-0.25	.885	-0.9	.885	0.18	.617
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	-0.74	.021	0.28	.812	-0.39	.048
	Trial Nr \times Baseline	-1.29	<.001	-0.55	.344	-0.56	<.001
	Trial Nr \times NFC	0.25	.231	1.18	.231	0.05	.695
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Baseline	0.6	.015	-0.1	.904	0.3	.039
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	-0.15	.892	-0.31	.892	-0.55	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Baseline \times NFC	-0.08	.841	-0.17	.859	0.16	.056

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). For the dependent variables expected score and score the predictor *Baseline* was given by the average expected score in the first three trials. For the dependent variable number of clicks the predictor *Baseline* was given by the average number of clicks in the first three trials.

Table 3. Moderation of the effects of reflection and trial number on the performance and the amount of planning in the learning phase by the strategy type used in the baseline trials.

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	1.74	.204	-0.5	.822	0.98	.087
	Trial Nr	1.71	<.001	2.31	.052	0.51	.001
	NFC	-0.31	.717	-0.55	.717	-0.07	.866
	Other Baseline	-2.17	.12	-0.65	.757	-0.28	.607
	Near-Sighted Baseline	-5.92	<.001	-4.57	.028	-0.73	.154
	No-Planning Baseline	-16.2	<.001	-13.6	<.001	-3.16	<.001
	Reflection \times NFC	2.17	.298	1.85	.533	0.28	.624
	Reflection \times Other Baseline	-0.95	.667	-0.12	.964	1.23	.065
	Reflection \times Near-Sighted Baseline	0.98	.63	0.75	.761	0.64	.321
3-7	Reflection \times No-Planning Baseline	4.07	.004	9.24	<.001	2.19	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	1.94	<.001	2	.272	0.68	.002
	Trial Nr \times NFC	-0.04	.894	-2.38	.153	-0.05	.723
	Trial Nr \times Other Baseline	0.82	.177	-0.38	.81	0.29	.168
	Trial Nr \times Near-Sighted Baseline	1.79	<.001	0	.998	0.23	.246
	Trial Nr \times No-Planning Baseline	0.32	.438	-0.59	.64	-0.1	.531
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	0.13	.759	2.11	.274	0.35	.118
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Other Baseline	0.25	.965	0.6	.965	-0.4	.121
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Near-Sighted Baseline	0.86	.303	0.45	.81	-0.37	.138
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times No-Planning Baseline	1.82	<.001	-0.57	.76	-0.01	.961

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). The predictor Other Baseline was given by the frequency the participant used a strategy of an undefined strategy type in the first three trials. The predictor Near-Sighted Baseline is the number of times the participant used a Near-Sighted strategy in the first three trials. The predictor No-Planning Baseline is the number of times the participant used the No-Planning strategy in the first three trials.

Table 4. *Moderation of the effects of reflection and trial number on the performance and the amount of planning in the performance phase by the strategy type used in the baseline trials.*

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	3.94	.036	1.54	.491	1.61	.007
	Trial Nr	1.64	<.001	2.1	<.001	0.3	.003
	NFC	0.14	.906	0.91	.906	-0.13	.747
	Other Baseline	-2.02	.228	-1.19	.485	-0.24	.668
	Near-Sighted Baseline	-3.05	.043	-3.76	.034	-0.27	.612
	No-Planning Baseline	-13	<.001	-11.4	<.001	-2.45	<.001
	Reflection \times NFC	0.57	.909	-1.08	.909	0.11	.858
	Reflection \times Other Baseline	0.36	.946	1.02	.946	1.06	.125
	Reflection \times Near-Sighted Baseline	2.83	.142	4.63	.037	0.47	.485
7-21	Reflection \times No-Planning Baseline	4.93	.01	5.64	.01	1.56	.019
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	0.06	.801	0.38	.801	-0.03	.849
	Trial Nr \times NFC	0.17	.376	0.93	.376	0.22	.024
	Trial Nr \times Other Baseline	0.33	.2	0.12	.88	-0.04	.744
	Trial Nr \times Near-Sighted Baseline	0.25	.264	-0.66	.381	-0.11	.387
	Trial Nr \times No-Planning Baseline	1.56	<.001	0.44	.491	0.4	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	-0.14	.868	-0.19	.877	-0.6	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Other Baseline	-0.08	.752	-1.02	.497	0.16	.327
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Near-Sighted Baseline	-0.32	.236	1.28	.236	0.6	<.001
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times No-Planning Baseline	-0.94	<.001	-0.83	.379	-0.05	.737

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). The predictor Other Baseline was given by the frequency the participant used a strategy of an undefined strategy type in the first three trials. The predictor Near-Sighted Baseline is the number of times the participant used a Near-Sighted strategy in the first three trials. The predictor No-Planning Baseline is the number of times the participant used the No-Planning strategy in the first three trials.

Table 5. Regression results concerning whether and how much the participant's performance and amount of planning change by the participant's expected score in previous trial.

Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable									
	Change of						Magnitude of Change of			
	Strategy		Strategy Type		Clicks		Expected Score		Number of Clicks	
	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p
Reflection	0.98	<.001	0.69	.013	1.13	<.001	2.69	<.001	-0.1	.721
Prompt	-0.15	.858	-0.32	.858	0.07	.676	-0.07	.826	0.39	.423
NFC	-0.03	.816	-0.1	.816	0.16	.572	0.07	.88	0.04	.773
Previous Expected Score	0.11	.385	-0.69	<.001	1.57	<.001	-2.1	<.001	-0.03	.812
Prompt × NFC	0.1	.556	-0.26	.556	-0.1	.841	0.33	.175	0	.989
Prompt × Previous Expected Score	0.19	.42	0.35	.42	0.09	.829	0.07	.779	-0.05	.829
Reflection × NCS	0.13	.51	0.45	.198	0.18	.662	0.23	.557	-0.09	.662
Reflection × Prompt	0.63	.088	0.85	.074	0.67	.006	0.75	.278	1.31	.006
Reflection × Previous Expected Score	-0.5	.006	-0.31	.17	-0.77	<.001	-1.64	<.001	-0.15	.439
Reflection × Prompt × NFC	-0.09	.671	0.28	.567	-0.02	.909	-0.41	.261	0.17	.909
Reflection × Prompt × Previous Expected Score	-0.17	.451	-0.26	.451	-0.28	.257	-0.8	.045	-0.26	.436

Note: All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (×). The Previous Expected Score was given by the expected score of the strategy the participant used in the previous trial.

Table 6. Regression results concerning whether and how much the participant's performance and amount of planning changed and their moderation by the participant's score in previous trial.

Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable									
	Change of						Magnitude of Change of			
	Strategy		Strategy Type		Clicks		Expected Score		Number of Clicks	
	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p
Reflection	0.48	.154	0.04	.986	0.78	.011	0	.997	-0.8	.007
Prompt	-0.21	.556	-0.43	.556	0.02	.884	-0.07	.862	0.46	.288
NFC	-0.02	.88	-0.13	.88	0.31	.236	-0.1	.507	-0.03	.844
Previous Score	0	.997	-0.38	.02	0.28	<.001	-0.22	.322	0.76	<.001
Prompt \times NFC	0.09	.586	-0.26	.586	-0.09	.887	0.36	.171	0	.984
Prompt \times Previous Score	0.24	.251	0.4	.251	0.04	.752	0.16	.586	-0.08	.752
Reflection \times NCS	0.1	.592	0.43	.207	0.07	.795	0.15	.509	-0.07	.795
Reflection \times Prompt	0.84	.012	1.3	.006	0.67	.005	1.32	.027	1.53	.002
Reflection \times Previous Score	-0.06	.683	0.32	.143	-0.06	.56	0.33	.15	0.45	.043
Reflection \times Prompt \times NFC	-0.09	.691	0.27	.589	-0.05	.797	-0.45	.24	0.18	.797
Reflection \times Prompt \times Previous Score	-0.32	.15	-0.66	.042	-0.21	.237	-1.22	.001	-0.44	.237

Note: All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). The Previous Score was given by the score the participant obtained in the previous trial.

Table 7. Regression results concerning on whether and how much the participant's performance and amount of planning change by the type of the strategy used in the previous trial.

Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable									
	Change of						Magnitude of Change of			
	Strategy		Strategy Type		Clicks		Expected Score		Number of Clicks	
	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p
Reflection	0.17	.673	-0.06	.892	-0.06	.786	0.17	.537	-0.29	.481
Prompt	0.18	.547	0.29	.547	0.25	.257	0.12	.761	0.36	.257
NFC	-0.04	.743	-0.08	.743	0.11	.761	-0.05	.746	0.04	.761
Previous Other	0.95	.013	2.85	<.001	0.66	.203	0.59	.378	-0.24	.687
Previous Near-Sighted	1.32	.027	3.22	<.001	-2.15	<.001	4.59	<.001	-0.3	.751
Previous No-Planning	-0.61	.056	1.44	.001	-3.38	<.001	1.09	.002	0.08	.779
Prompt \times NFC	0.04	.812	-0.42	.277	-0.1	.864	0.36	.162	-0.01	.954
Prompt \times Previous Other	0.13	.962	-0.04	.962	-0.98	.105	-0.07	.953	0.23	.825
Prompt \times Previous Near-Sighted	-13.6	.926	-15.4	.926	0.21	.755	-4.59	.022	0.76	.755
Prompt \times Previous No-Planning	-0.26	.601	-0.53	.601	-0.17	.806	0.16	.783	-0.12	.806
Reflection \times NCS	0.11	.55	0.4	.28	0.2	.626	0.11	.605	-0.1	.626
Reflection \times Prompt	0.31	.469	0.64	.469	0.09	.693	-0.65	.187	0.81	.133
Reflection \times Previous Other	-0.14	.952	-0.04	.952	-0.8	.185	0.68	.804	-0.55	.447
Reflection \times Previous Near-Sighted	0.09	.906	0.2	.906	1.77	.029	1.88	.182	1.15	.357
Reflection \times Previous No-Planning	0.6	.289	0.74	.289	1.08	.004	0.54	.489	0.39	.398
Reflection \times Prompt \times NFC	-0.04	.853	0.45	.51	-0.01	.958	-0.46	.23	0.16	.958
Reflection \times Prompt \times Previous Other	-0.25	.711	-0.53	.711	1.18	.119	0.73	.612	0.88	.49
Reflection \times Prompt \times Previous Near-Sighted	13.8	.926	14.84	.926	0.23	.947	8.92	<.001	-0.14	.947
Reflection \times Prompt \times Previous No-Planning	0.47	.695	0.32	.695	0.93	.044	1.45	.095	0.25	.748

Note: All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times).

Table 8. Regression results on whether and how much the participant's performance and amount of planning changed in transitions with reflection prompts and whether these effects were moderated by Engagement.

Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable									
	Change of						Magnitude of Change of			
	Strategy		Strategy Type		Clicks		Expected Score		Number of Clicks	
	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p	β	p
Previous Expected Score	-0.23	.117	-0.81	<.001	0.86	<.001	-2.29	<.001	-0.51	.073
NFC	0.09	.828	0.34	.238	0.34	.066	0.33	.428	0.22	.388
High Engagement	0.18	.707	0.13	.707	0.2	.449	0.84	.198	0.58	.449
Previous Expected Score \times NFC	0	.99	0.07	.99	0.32	.055	0.82	.046	0.5	.074
Previous Expected Score \times High Engagement	0.04	.867	0.11	.867	-0.28	.523	-1.52	.043	-0.22	.67
Previous value \times High Engagement \times NFC	-0.38	.313	-0.29	.313	-0.29	.19	-2.75	<.001	-0.85	.149

Note: All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times).

Table 9. Moderation of the effects of reflection and trial number on the performance and the amount of planning in the performance phase by the self-evaluation focus.

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	15.63	<.001	12.93	<.001	3.58	<.001
	Baseline	11.87	<.001	10.27	<.001	2.08	<.001
	Trial Nr	3.06	<.001	2.8	.001	0.95	<.001
	NFC	0.08	.952	1.84	.952	-0.02	.972
7-21	Reflection \times Baseline	-8.03	<.001	-8.87	<.001	-1.18	.085
	Reflection \times NFC	-0.67	.907	-2.43	.877	-0.02	.978
	Reflection \times SEF	9.25	<.001	7.84	<.001	1.67	.004
	Baseline \times NFC	0.02	.984	-0.8	.984	0.11	.763
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	-0.62	.076	0.31	.794	-0.21	.31
	Trial Nr \times Baseline	-1.29	<.001	-0.55	.344	-0.56	<.001
	Trial Nr \times NFC	0.21	.29	1.17	.29	0.05	.697
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Baseline	0.7	.004	-0.07	.93	0.26	.073
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	-0.17	.967	-0.31	.967	-0.56	<.001
	Baseline \times Reflection \times SEF	-4.18	<.001	-4.25	<.001	-1.8	.009
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times SEF	0.36	.026	0.09	.938	0.25	.003
	Trial Nr \times Baseline \times NFC	-0.04	.896	-0.16	.896	0.16	.055

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). The predictor SEF denotes the self-evaluation focus.

Table 10. *Moderation of the effects of reflection and trial number on the performance and the amount of planning in the performance phase by the self-evaluation accuracy.*

Trial	Fixed Effect	Outcome Variable					
		Expected score		Score		Clicks	
		β	p	β	p	β	p
	Reflection	12.57	<.001	11.49	<.001	3.65	<.001
	Baseline	11.72	<.001	10.14	<.001	2.21	<.001
	Trial Nr	3.08	<.001	2.77	.001	0.95	<.001
	NFC	-0.16	.907	1.26	.907	-0.14	.79
	Reflection \times Baseline	-6.26	.002	-6.33	.003	-0.71	.29
	Reflection \times NFC	-1.29	.816	-2.63	.796	-0.48	.456
	Reflection \times SEA	5.47	.004	4.29	.039	0.63	.255
7-21	Baseline \times NFC	0.24	.983	-0.23	.983	0.24	.515
	Trial Nr \times Reflection	-0.83	.048	-1	.472	-0.47	.042
	Trial Nr \times Baseline	-1.28	<.001	-0.55	.337	-0.59	<.001
	Trial Nr \times NFC	0.19	.347	0.9	.274	0.05	.691
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times Baseline	0.86	.002	0.9	.425	0.29	.069
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times NFC	-0.26	.491	-1.09	.491	-0.71	<.001
	Baseline \times Reflection \times SEA	-3.57	.003	-2.96	.025	-0.47	.231
	Trial Nr \times Reflection \times SEA	0.38	.024	1.99	.002	0.21	.022
	Trial Nr \times Baseline \times NFC	-0.02	.874	0.09	.874	0.16	.074

Note. All p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons. Significant predictors are marked in bold. Interaction effects are denoted with a cross (\times). The predictor SEA denotes the self-evaluation accuracy.