

**On the interplay of motivational characteristics and academic achievement:
The role of Need for Cognition**

Supplementary Material

Anja Strobel^{1§}, Alexander Strobel^{2§}, Franzis Preckel³, & Ricarda Steinmayr⁴

¹ Department of Psychology, Chemnitz University of Technology, Chemnitz, Germany

² Faculty of Psychology, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany

³ Department of Psychology, University of Trier, Trier, Germany

⁴ Department of Psychology, Technical University Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany

Author Note

Anja Strobel: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0313-0615>

Alexander Strobel: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9426-5397>

Franzis Preckel: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5768-8702>

Ricarda Steinmayr: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0294-1045>

§ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anja Strobel, Department of Psychology, Chemnitz University of Technology, 09120 Chemnitz, Germany. E-mail: anja.strobel@psychologie.tu-chemnitz.de

Supplementary Methods

We used *RStudio* (version 2023.6.1.524, Posit Team, 2023) with R (version 4.3.1; R Core Team, 2023) and the R-packages *lavaan* (version 0.6.-15; Rosseel, 2012), *naniar* (version 1.0.0; Tierney & Cook, 2023), *papaja* (version 0.1.0.9997; Aust & Barth, 2018), *psych* (version 2.3.6; Revelle, 2023), and *pwr* (version 1.3-0; Champely, 2020). We also employed the packages *haven* (version 2.5.3; Wickham et al., 2023) and *xlsx* (version 0.6.5; Dragulescu & Arendt, 2020) for reading/writing data, *here* (version 1.0.1; Müller, 2020) for file handling, and *shape* (version 1.4.6; Soetaert, 2021) for figure creation.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1 informs about the reliabilities of the variables of interest in the present study. Tables S2-5 provide the intercorrelations of the variables involved in the correlation analyses for grades in the subjects German, Math, Physics, and Chemistry. Results for specific grades can be found in the Supplementary Tables S2-5 with regard to intercorrelations (analogous to Table 1 in the main text) and S6-9 with regard to detailed statistics on these intercorrelations (analogous to Table 2 in the main text).

Table S1*Reliabilities of the variables of interest*

	T1		T2		Retest
	α	ω	α	ω	r_{tt}
Grades					
Overall					.79
German					.59
Math					.60
Physics					.69
Chemistry					.76
<i>Ability Self-Concept</i>					
Overall	.84	.84	.84	.85	.83
German	.93	.94	.92	.91	.90
Math	.95	.95	.95	.94	.85
Physics	.95	.95	.96	.97	.77
Chemistry	.96	.96	.96	.97	.81
<i>Interest</i>					
Overall	.88	.89	.87	.89	.81
German	.92	.92	.91	.91	.79
Math	.94	.93	.94	.94	.80
Physics	.94	.95	.94	.94	.81
Chemistry	.95	.94	.94	.94	.80
<i>Motivational Traits</i>					
Hope for Success	.86	.87	.87	.87	.72
Fear of Failure	.88	.88	.90	.91	.75
Need for Cognition	.88	.88	.90	.89	.88

Note. $N = 277$ except for Grades ($N = 276$); T1 and T2 = measurement occasions, interval: 53-59 weeks, α = Cronbach's alpha and ω = MacDonald's omega are not available for Grades, r_{tt} = retest reliability (Spearman rank correlations)

Table S2

Robust correlations of the variables in the analyses on German grades

	T1 intercorrelations					Self-feedback and cross-domain coupling					
	ASC1	INT1	HFS1	FOF1	NFC1	Δ GRD	Δ ASC	Δ INT	Δ HFS	Δ FOF	Δ NFC
GRD1	.53	.46	.27	-.19	.33	-.58	.17	.04	.03	-.13	.13
ASC1	—	.68	.17	-.15	.22	.32	-.48	.31	-.14	.12	-.07
INT1		—	.15	-.11	.23	-.05	.03	-.55	.07	-.03	-.03
HFS1			—	-.39	.82	-.20	-.07	-.02	-.98	.26	-.22
FOF1				—	-.52	-.05	-.11	-.04	.04	-.27	-.21
NFC1					—	.32	.13	-.05	.94	-.27	-.19
Correlated change											
Δ GRD						—	.13	.18	.06	-.05	.20
Δ ASC							—	.44	-.01	.02	.08
Δ INT								—	.08	.04	.14
Δ HFS									—	-.15	.49
Δ FOF										—	-.14

Note. $N = 276$ - 277 ; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$; GRD = German grades, ASC = Ability Self-

Concept German, INT = Interest in German, HFS = Hope for Success, FOF = Fear of Failure, NFC =

Need for Cognition, suffix 1 indicates the respective score at measurement occasion 1, Δ denotes the respective change score

Table S3

Robust correlations of the variables in the analyses on Math grades

	T1 intercorrelations					Self-feedback and cross-domain coupling					
	ASC1	INT1	HFS1	FOF1	NFC1	Δ GRD	Δ ASC	Δ INT	Δ HFS	Δ FOF	Δ NFC
GRD1	.70	.58	.31	-.22	.35	-.56	.04	.00	-.09	.02	.20
ASC1	—	.81	.32	-.22	.32	.07	-.63	.22	.18	-.03	-.02
INT1		—	.35	-.21	.36	.08	.22	-.59	.06	-.04	-.06
HFS1			—	-.39	.82	-.12	-.03	-.05	-1.02	.27	-.21
FOF1				—	-.52	-.10	-.06	.04	.06	-.27	-.21
NFC1					—	.17	.02	.16	.94	-.29	-.21
Correlated change											
Δ GRD						—	.53	.45	.07	.04	.17
Δ ASC							—	.65	.05	-.05	.12
Δ INT								—	.14	.01	.22
Δ HFS									—	-.15	.51
Δ FOF										—	-.15

Note. $N = 276$ - 277 ; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$; GRD = Math grades, ASC = Ability Self-Concept Math, INT = Interest in Math, HFS = Hope for Success, FOF = Fear of Failure, NFC = Need for Cognition, suffix 1 indicates the respective score at measurement occasion 1, Δ denotes the respective change score

Table S4

Robust correlations of the variables in the analyses on Physics grades

	T1 intercorrelations					Self-feedback and cross-domain coupling					
	ASC1	INT1	HFS1	FOF1	NFC1	Δ GRD	Δ ASC	Δ INT	Δ HFS	Δ FOF	Δ NFC
GRD1	.57	.46	.27	-.17	.31	-.62	.14	.11	.03	-.02	.09
ASC1	—	.83	.25	-.13	.30	.05	-.63	.17	.05	.14	.08
INT1		—	.25	-.10	.30	-.04	.31	-.51	.09	-.19	-.09
HFS1			—	-.39	.82	.00	.15	.08	-.98	.26	-.22
FOF1				—	-.52	.07	-.08	.03	.04	-.26	-.21
NFC1					—	.31	-.10	.09	.89	-.27	-.19
Correlated change											
Δ GRD						—	.25	.21	.10	-.10	.12
Δ ASC							—	.72	.15	-.12	.07
Δ INT								—	.18	-.10	.12
Δ HFS									—	-.15	.49
Δ FOF										—	-.15

Note. $N = 276-277$; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$; GRD = Physics grades, ASC = Ability Self-

Concept Physics, INT = Interest in Physics, HFS = Hope for Success, FOF = Fear of Failure, NFC =

Need for Cognition, suffix 1 indicates the respective score at measurement occasion 1, Δ denotes the respective change score

Table S5

Robust correlations of the variables in the analyses on Chemistry grades

	T1 intercorrelations					Self-feedback and cross-domain coupling					
	ASC1	INT1	HFS1	FOF1	NFC1	Δ GRD	Δ ASC	Δ INT	Δ HFS	Δ FOF	Δ NFC
GRD1	.55	.49	.34	-.24	.36	-.67	.05	.05	.11	-.06	.11
ASC1	—	.84	.28	-.16	.25	.10	-.67	.16	-.07	.05	-.04
INT1		—	.24	-.08	.26	.01	.39	-.50	.07	-.05	.05
HFS1			—	-.39	.82	-.08	.10	.05	-.99	.26	-.22
FOF1				—	-.52	.04	-.04	.02	.05	-.27	-.21
NFC1					—	.23	-.03	.03	.91	-.27	-.21
Correlated change											
Δ GRD						—	.26	.24	.02	-.11	.01
Δ ASC							—	.74	.13	-.01	.16
Δ INT								—	.08	.01	.17
Δ HFS									—	-.15	.48
Δ FOF										—	-.14

Note. $N = 276-277$; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$; GRD = Chemistry grades, ASC = Ability Self-Concept Chemistry, INT = Interest in Chemistry, HFS = Hope for Success, FOF = Fear of Failure, NFC = Need for Cognition, suffix 1 indicates the respective score at measurement occasion 1, Δ denotes the respective change score

Table S6

Results of latent change score modeling of the interplay of German grades, German ability self-concept, interest in German, and motivational traits

Criterion	T1 Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>CI.LB</i>	<i>CI.UB</i>	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>
Δ Grade	Grade*	-0.43	0.05	-0.53	-0.33	-.58	< .001
	Ability Self-Concept	0.24	0.06	0.12	0.36	.32	< .001
	Interest	-0.03	0.05	-0.12	0.06	-.05	.512
	Hope for Success	-0.23	0.12	-0.45	0.00	-.20	.047
	Fear of Failure	-0.06	0.07	-0.19	0.07	-.05	.359
	Need for Cognition	0.23	0.08	0.07	0.38	.32	.005
Δ Ability Self-Concept	Grade	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.13	.17	.013
	Ability Self-Concept*	-0.21	0.04	-0.28	-0.14	-.48	< .001
	Interest	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.06	.03	.683
	Hope for Success	-0.05	0.06	-0.16	0.07	-.07	.450
	Fear of Failure	-0.07	0.04	-0.14	0.01	-.11	.075
	Need for Cognition	0.05	0.04	-0.03	0.13	.13	.202
Δ Interest	Grade	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.12	.04	.468
	Ability Self-Concept	0.24	0.07	0.10	0.38	.31	.001
	Interest*	-0.36	0.06	-0.46	-0.25	-.55	< .001
	Hope for Success	-0.03	0.12	-0.27	0.21	-.02	.813
	Fear of Failure	-0.05	0.07	-0.18	0.08	-.04	.458
	Need for Cognition	-0.03	0.08	-0.18	0.12	-.05	.668
Δ Hope for Success	Grade	0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.07	.03	.551
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.07	0.03	-0.14	0.00	-.14	.037
	Interest	0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.08	.07	.198
	Hope for Success*	-0.77	0.07	-0.92	-0.63	-.98	< .001
	Fear of Failure	0.03	0.05	-0.07	0.13	.04	.552
	Need for Cognition	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.56	.94	< .001
Δ Fear of Failure	Grade	-0.07	0.03	-0.14	0.00	-.13	.041
	Ability Self-Concept	0.07	0.04	-0.02	0.15	.12	.141
	Interest	-0.01	0.04	-0.09	0.06	-.03	.721
	Hope for Success	0.21	0.08	0.06	0.36	.26	.006
	Fear of Failure*	-0.21	0.07	-0.34	-0.08	-.27	.002
	Need for Cognition	-0.14	0.06	-0.25	-0.02	-.27	.017
Δ Need for Cognition	Grade	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.12	.13	.024
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.03	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-.07	.421
	Interest	-0.01	0.03	-0.08	0.05	-.03	.715
	Hope for Success	-0.16	0.08	-0.32	-0.01	-.22	.038
	Fear of Failure	-0.15	0.06	-0.27	-0.04	-.21	.008
	Need for Cognition*	-0.09	0.06	-0.20	0.02	-.19	.120

Note. $N = 276$ - 277 ; coefficients indicate cross-domain coupling and self-feedback (*); coefficients are unstandardized slopes B with their standard errors SE and 95% confidence intervals ($CI.LB$ = lower bound, $CI.UB$ = upper bound), β is the standardized slope and p the respective p -value; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$

Table S7

Results of latent change score modeling of the interplay of Math grades, Math ability self-concept, interest in Math, and motivational traits

Criterion	T1 Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>CI.LB</i>	<i>CI.UB</i>	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>
Δ Grade	Grade*	-0.52	0.07	-0.66	-0.37	-.56	< .001
	Ability Self-Concept	0.07	0.10	-0.12	0.26	.07	.492
	Interest	0.07	0.08	-0.08	0.22	.08	.353
	Hope for Success	-0.22	0.17	-0.56	0.12	-.12	.207
	Fear of Failure	-0.17	0.12	-0.40	0.06	-.10	.138
	Need for Cognition	0.20	0.12	-0.04	0.44	.17	.099
Δ Ability Self-Concept	Grade	0.02	0.04	-0.06	0.10	.04	.581
	Ability Self-Concept*	-0.33	0.06	-0.45	-0.20	-.63	< .001
	Interest	0.11	0.04	0.02	0.19	.22	.013
	Hope for Success	-0.04	0.11	-0.25	0.18	-.03	.742
	Fear of Failure	-0.06	0.07	-0.20	0.08	-.06	.389
	Need for Cognition	0.01	0.07	-0.12	0.15	.02	.844
Δ Interest	Grade	0.00	0.06	-0.11	0.11	.00	.974
	Ability Self-Concept	0.15	0.07	0.00	0.29	.22	.043
	Interest*	-0.37	0.06	-0.49	-0.25	-.59	< .001
	Hope for Success	-0.07	0.15	-0.35	0.22	-.05	.655
	Fear of Failure	0.05	0.10	-0.14	0.24	.04	.610
	Need for Cognition	0.14	0.10	-0.06	0.35	.16	.166
Δ Hope for Success	Grade	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.02	-.09	.217
	Ability Self-Concept	0.07	0.04	-0.01	0.14	.18	.082
	Interest	0.02	0.03	-0.03	0.08	.06	.442
	Hope for Success*	-0.81	0.07	-0.95	-0.67	-1.02	< .001
	Fear of Failure	0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.14	.06	.351
	Need for Cognition	0.46	0.05	0.37	0.55	.94	< .001
Δ Fear of Failure	Grade	0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.07	.02	.852
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.01	0.05	-0.11	0.09	-.03	.825
	Interest	-0.01	0.04	-0.09	0.06	-.04	.716
	Hope for Success	0.22	0.08	0.07	0.38	.27	.005
	Fear of Failure*	-0.21	0.07	-0.35	-0.08	-.27	.002
	Need for Cognition	-0.15	0.06	-0.26	-0.03	-.29	.011
Δ Need for Cognition	Grade	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.13	.20	.010
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.01	0.05	-0.10	0.08	-.02	.851
	Interest	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.05	-.06	.579
	Hope for Success	-0.16	0.08	-0.31	0.00	-.21	.044
	Fear of Failure	-0.15	0.06	-0.26	-0.04	-.21	.008
	Need for Cognition*	-0.10	0.05	-0.21	0.01	-.21	.067

Note. $N = 276$ - 277 ; coefficients indicate cross-domain coupling and self-feedback (*); coefficients are unstandardized slopes B with their standard errors SE and 95% confidence intervals ($CI.LB$ = lower bound, $CI.UB$ = upper bound), β is the standardized slope and p the respective p -value; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$

Table S8

Results of latent change score modeling of the interplay of Physics grades, Physics ability self-concept, interest in Physics, and motivational traits

Criterion	T1 Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>CU.LB</i>	<i>CI.UB</i>	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>
Δ Grade	Grade*	-0.45	0.05	-0.54	-0.35	-.62	< .001
	Ability Self-Concept	0.04	0.07	-0.10	0.18	.05	.580
	Interest	-0.03	0.06	-0.14	0.08	-.04	.607
	Hope for Success	0.01	0.14	-0.27	0.28	.00	.965
	Fear of Failure	0.10	0.08	-0.06	0.26	.07	.232
	Need for Cognition	0.28	0.09	0.11	0.44	.31	.001
Δ Ability Self-Concept	Grade	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.19	.14	.049
	Ability Self-Concept*	-0.45	0.09	-0.62	-0.28	-.63	< .001
	Interest	0.19	0.07	0.06	0.33	.31	.005
	Hope for Success	0.21	0.15	-0.09	0.50	.15	.166
	Fear of Failure	-0.10	0.09	-0.27	0.07	-.08	.245
	Need for Cognition	-0.08	0.10	-0.28	0.11	-.10	.397
Δ Interest	Grade	0.08	0.05	-0.02	0.17	.11	.113
	Ability Self-Concept	0.11	0.08	-0.04	0.27	.17	.146
	Interest*	-0.31	0.06	-0.43	-0.19	-.51	< .001
	Hope for Success	0.10	0.15	-0.19	0.39	.08	.480
	Fear of Failure	0.04	0.09	-0.13	0.21	.03	.664
	Need for Cognition	0.08	0.10	-0.12	0.27	.09	.450
Δ Hope for Success	Grade	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.06	.03	.557
	Ability Self-Concept	0.02	0.04	-0.06	0.10	.05	.615
	Interest	0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.09	.09	.232
	Hope for Success*	-0.78	0.07	-0.92	-0.64	-.98	< .001
	Fear of Failure	0.03	0.05	-0.07	0.13	.04	.549
	Need for Cognition	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.53	.89	< .001
Δ Fear of Failure	Grade	-0.01	0.03	-0.08	0.06	-.02	.768
	Ability Self-Concept	0.06	0.05	-0.03	0.15	.14	.211
	Interest	-0.07	0.04	-0.15	0.01	-.19	.074
	Hope for Success	0.21	0.08	0.06	0.37	.26	.006
	Fear of Failure*	-0.21	0.07	-0.34	-0.08	-.26	.002
	Need for Cognition	-0.14	0.06	-0.25	-0.03	-.27	.012
Δ Need for Cognition	Grade	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.09	.09	.192
	Ability Self-Concept	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.12	.08	.460
	Interest	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	0.04	-.09	.389
	Hope for Success	-0.16	0.08	-0.32	-0.01	-.22	.036
	Fear of Failure	-0.15	0.06	-0.26	-0.04	-.21	.007
	Need for Cognition*	-0.09	0.06	-0.20	0.02	-.19	.107

Note. $N = 276-277$; coefficients indicate cross-domain coupling and self-feedback (*); coefficients are unstandardized slopes B with their standard errors SE and 95% confidence intervals ($CI.LB$ = lower bound, $CI.UB$ = upper bound), β is the standardized slope and p the respective p -value; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$

Table S9

Results of latent change score modeling of the interplay of Chemistry grades, Chemistry ability self-concept, interest in Chemistry, and motivational traits

Criterion	T1 Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>CU.LB</i>	<i>CI.UB</i>	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>
Δ Grade	Grade*	-0.43	0.04	-0.51	-0.36	-.67	< .001
	Ability Self-Concept	0.06	0.05	-0.04	0.16	.10	.235
	Interest	0.01	0.05	-0.08	0.10	.01	.889
	Hope for Success	-0.09	0.10	-0.28	0.11	-.08	.368
	Fear of Failure	0.04	0.07	-0.09	0.17	.04	.536
	Need for Cognition	0.17	0.06	0.04	0.30	.23	.009
Δ Ability Self-Concept	Grade	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.13	.05	.485
	Ability Self-Concept*	-0.44	0.08	-0.59	-0.29	-.67	< .001
	Interest	0.23	0.06	0.11	0.35	.39	< .001
	Hope for Success	0.14	0.12	-0.09	0.37	.10	.241
	Fear of Failure	-0.05	0.09	-0.21	0.12	-.04	.593
	Need for Cognition	-0.03	0.08	-0.19	0.13	-.03	.730
Δ Interest	Grade	0.04	0.05	-0.06	0.14	.05	.445
	Ability Self-Concept	0.11	0.09	-0.07	0.30	.16	.225
	Interest*	-0.32	0.08	-0.48	-0.17	-.50	< .001
	Hope for Success	0.07	0.14	-0.20	0.33	.05	.626
	Fear of Failure	0.03	0.10	-0.16	0.22	.02	.734
	Need for Cognition	0.03	0.09	-0.15	0.21	.03	.773
Δ Hope for Success	Grade	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.09	.11	.033
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	0.04	-.07	.457
	Interest	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.08	.07	.397
	Hope for Success*	-0.78	0.07	-0.93	-0.63	-.99	< .001
	Fear of Failure	0.04	0.05	-0.06	0.14	.05	.475
	Need for Cognition	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	.91	< .001
Δ Fear of Failure	Grade	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	0.04	-.06	.428
	Ability Self-Concept	0.02	0.05	-0.08	0.12	.05	.702
	Interest	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.07	-.05	.678
	Hope for Success	0.22	0.08	0.06	0.37	.26	.005
	Fear of Failure*	-0.21	0.07	-0.34	-0.08	-.27	.001
	Need for Cognition	-0.14	0.06	-0.25	-0.03	-.27	.011
Δ Need for Cognition	Grade	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.10	.11	.090
	Ability Self-Concept	-0.01	0.05	-0.10	0.08	-.04	.753
	Interest	0.02	0.04	-0.06	0.09	.05	.637
	Hope for Success	-0.17	0.08	-0.32	-0.01	-.22	.033
	Fear of Failure	-0.15	0.06	-0.27	-0.04	-.21	.008
	Need for Cognition*	-0.10	0.06	-0.21	0.02	-.21	.091

Note. $N = 276$ - 277 ; coefficients indicate cross-domain coupling and self-feedback (*); coefficients are unstandardized slopes B with their standard errors SE and 95% confidence intervals ($CI.LB$ = lower bound, $CI.UB$ = upper bound), β is the standardized slope and p the respective p -value; bold-faced coefficients $p < .05$

References

- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2018). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Champely, S. (2020). *Pwr: Basic functions for power analysis*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=pwr>
- Dragulescu, A., & Arendt, C. (2020). *xlsx: Read, write, format Excel 2007 and Excel 97/2000/XP/2003 files*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xlsx>.
- Müller, K. (2020). *Here: A simpler way to find your files*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here>
- Posit Team. (2023). *RStudio: Integrated development environment for R*. Boston, MA: Posit Software, PBC. Retrieved from <http://www.posit.co/>
- R Core Team. (2023). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Revelle, W. (2023). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/>
- Soetaert, K. (2021). *Shape: Functions for plotting graphical shapes, colors*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shape>
- Tierney, N., & Cook, D. (2023). Expanding tidy data principles to facilitate missing data exploration, visualization and assessment of imputations. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 105(7), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v105.i07>
- Wickham, H., Miller, E., & Smith, D. (2023). *haven: Import and export 'SPSS', 'Stata' and 'SAS' files*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=haven>