Supplementary information

Regression Analysis including influential case

Table S1. Regression analysis predicting total hazards identified from personality factors, anchor condition (low or high), time and words used on task *including influential case*.

Model	Variable	B	95% CI		SE	Beta	t	*p*	F	R-squared	R-squared change
1	Constant	-10.212	(-24.606,	4.183)	7.208		-1.417	.161	4.271	.283**	
	Extraversion	0.032	(-0.164,	0.229)	0.098	0.038	0.328	.744			
	Agreeableness	0.079	(-0.108,	0.265)	0.094	0.093	0.842	.403			
	Conscientiousness	0.270	(0.054,	0.486)	0.108	0.277	2.492	.015			
	Neuroticism	0.146	(-0.061,	0.353)	0.104	0.165	1.413	.163			
	Openness	0.157	(-0.039,	0.352)	0.098	0.175	1.602	.114			
	Anchor Condition$_{(0 = low, 1 = high)}$	4.784	(2.479,	7.090)	1.155	0.444	4.144	<.001			
2	Constant	-7.672	(-20.011,	4.667)	6.175		-1.242	.219	7.661	.493***	.210***
	Extraversion	0.075	(-0.095,	0.244)	0.085	0.089	0.879	.383			
	Agreeableness	0.049	(-0.111,	0.209)	0.080	0.058	0.608	.545			
	Conscientiousness	0.124	(-0.070,	0.318)	0.097	0.127	1.274	.207			
	Neuroticism	0.184	(0.006,	0.361)	0.089	0.207	2.067	.043			
	Openness	0.077	(-0.095,	0.249)	0.086	0.086	0.897	.373			
	Anchor Condition$_{(0 = low, 1 = high)}$	2.971	(0.866,	5.076)	1.053	0.276	2.821	.006			
	Time on Task	0.014	(-0.076,	0.105)	0.0045	0.035	0.316	.753			
	Word Count	0.021	(0.011,	0.030)	0.005	0.494	4.392	<.001			

Note ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

This analysis includes an influential case, as identified by a high Mahalanobis score and DFBETA for neuroticism. The pattern of significant results is identical to the reported analysis without the influential case for Model 1. In Model 2 neuroticism is significant in this analysis but not in the analysis without this influential case reported in the paper ($p = .424$). The other significant findings in Model 2 follow the same pattern in both analyses, i.e. significant effects of Anchor Condition and Word Count.