

Supplementary Material: No Evidence That Lateral Preferences Predict Individual Differences in the
Tendency to Update Mental Representations: A Replication-Extension Study

Marton L. Gyimesi, Johannes K. Vilsmeier, Martin Voracek, and Ulrich S. Tran*

* Correspondence: Dr. Ulrich Tran: ulrich.tran@univie.ac.at.

Status-Quo Scenario and Experimental Conditions

Participants in both conditions read a paragraph describing a scenario which stated that the electrical company of the reader had been deemed a monopoly and was to be broken up by the government, which would in turn assign the participant to one of three electrical companies including the original company as well. The original English texts are provided in Westfall et al. (2014). In the current study, each participant read the following German paragraph:

“Stellen Sie sich vor, die Regierung kommt zur Ansicht, dass Ihr derzeitiger Stromanbieter eine Monopolstellung am Markt einnimmt, die aufgebrochen werden muss. Der Plan der Regierung sieht nun vor, dass bisherige Kunden dieses Stromanbieters, die sich dazu bereit erklären, einem von drei Stromanbietern nach dem Zufallsprinzip zugeteilt werden sollen (einer der drei Anbieter ist Ihr derzeitiger Stromanbieter).”

Then, the reader was informed about their prior experience with their current electric company, which, depending on the experimental condition had been either positive or negative. The positive experience condition stated that the reader had always been happy with his or her electrical company in the past, it read as follows:

LATERAL PREFERENCES AND THE STATUS QUO

“Sie waren mit Ihrem derzeitigen Stromanbieter bisher stets zufrieden. Die Stromkosten erscheinen Ihnen angemessen, die Rechnungen sind leicht verständlich.”

The negative experience condition stated that the participant had never been happy with his or her electrical company in the past:

“Sie waren mit Ihrem derzeitigen Stromanbieter bislang nie zufrieden. Die Stromkosten erscheinen Ihnen unangemessen hoch, die Rechnungen sind schwer verständlich zu lesen und beim einzigen Mal, als Sie mit dem Kundendienst zu tun hatten, war Ihre Erfahrung schrecklich.”

The participants then had the choice of either staying with their current electrical company (i.e., status quo) or accepting the randomly assigned company (i.e., non-status quo):

“Wenn Sie nun die Wahl hätten, für welche der folgenden Optionen würden Sie sich entscheiden (bitte eine ankreuzen):

- Sie bleiben bei Ihrem aktuellen Stromanbieter
- Sie akzeptieren den von der Regierung zufällig zugeteilten Stromanbieter.”

Table S1.*Frequency of inconsistent and consistent-footers by classification scheme and valence condition*

Classification	Experience	Footedness	Choice	Inconsistent-footers		Consistent-footers	
				<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Median split	Positive	Skilled	Status quo	187	87.4	266	86.1
			Non-status quo	27	12.6	43	13.9
		Movement	Status quo	166	85.1	262	88.5
			Non-status quo	29	14.9	34	11.5
	Negative	Skilled	Status quo	33	16.1	62	17.9
			Non-status quo	172	83.9	285	82.1

LATERAL PREFERENCES AND THE STATUS QUO

		Movement	Status quo	28	15.6	59	18.2	
			Non-status quo	151	84.4	266	81.8	
Empirical cutoffs	Positive	Skilled	Status quo	131	85.1	364	86.9	
			Non-status quo	23	14.9	55	13.1	
		Movement	Status quo	125	87.4	370	86.0	
			Non-status quo	18	12.6	60	14.0	
		Negative	Skilled	Status quo	20	14.1	85	18.6
				Non-status quo	122	85.9	371	81.4
		Movement	Status quo	23	15.8	82	18.1	

Non-status quo

123

84.2

370

81.9

Sensitivity Analysis

We conducted additional analyses on the relationship between handedness, as categorized using the cutoffs proposed by Tran et al. (2014), excluding left-handed participants. For the frequency distribution of choice behavior by handedness category please refer to Table S2. The results did not change meaningfully from the analyses with left-handers included. For the positive condition, $\chi^2(1, 540) = 0.073, p = 0.786, OR = 0.89, 95\% CI = [0.38-2.07]$, and for the negative condition, $\chi^2(1, 574) = 0.002, p = 0.961, OR = 1.02, 95\% CI = [0.49-2.09]$.

Table S2.

Frequencies of inconsistent and consistent-handers by valence condition for right- and mixed-handers only.

Classification	Valence	Choice	Inconsistent-			
			handers		Consistent-handers	
			<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Empirical cutoffs	Positive	Status quo	43	86.0	428	87.3
		Non-status quo	7	14.0	62	12.7
	Negative	Status quo	10	18.2	93	17.9
		Non-status quo	45	81.8	426	82.1