Reproducing original results

**Experiment 1**

Participants in the time-pressure condition took less time to report the outcome of the dice roll (*M* = 10.80 s, *SD* = 4.42 s) than those in the self-paced condition (*M* = 23.20 s, *SD* = 11.26 s), *t*(70) = -6.02, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.42, 95% CI [0.89, 1.95], indicating a successful time-pressure manipulation.

Participants in the time-pressure condition did report significantly higher dice roll outcomes (*M* = 4.56, *SD* = 1.48 ) than participants in the self-paced condition (*M* = 3.87 ,*SD* = 1.61 ), Z *= 2.03, p* = .043, *d* = 0.44*,* 95% CI [-0.03, 0.91]. Cheating was evaluated by comparing the observed distribution in each condition with the expected distribution of a fair roll. There was evidence for cheating in the time-pressure condition, *X²*(5, *N* = 34) = 17.88 , *p* = .003, and in the self-paced condition, *X²*(5, *N* = 38) = 13.47, *p* = .019 as well.

**Experiment 2**

Participants in the time-pressure condition took less time to report the outcome of the dice roll (*M* = 4.56 s, *SD* = 1.71 s) than those in the self-paced condition (*M* = 10.30 s, *SD* = 6.74 s), *t*(70) = -5.13, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.21, 95% CI [0.70, 1.73], indicating a successful time-pressure manipulation.

Participants in the time-pressure condition reported significantly higher dice roll outcomes (*M* = 4.38, *SD* = 1.50) than participants in the self-paced condition (*M* = 3.42, *SD* = 1.84), *Z* = 2.17, *p* = .030, *d* = 0.58*,* 95% CI [0.10, 1.06]. Cheating was evaluated by comparing the observed distribution in each condition with the expected distribution of a fair roll. There was evidence for cheating in the time-pressure condition, *X²*(5, *N* = 39) = 17.77, *p* = .003, but not in the self-paced condition, *X²*(5, *N* = 33) = 1.73, *p* = .885.