APPENDIX

The following Tables 11 and 12 report the uncorrected p-values for pairwise analyses that complement the one-sample location tests reported in the main body of the paper. No groups were significantly different at $\alpha = 0.05$ when corrected for the (66) multiple comparisons. The value < 0.01 for *Other+Police* in Table 12 comes closest, correcting to a p of 0.11.

TABLE 11: Uncorrected p values for pairwise t-tests between final score of non-bust teams by player background subgroups.

	Board Member	Finance	Government	Legal	Manager	Other	Physical Security	Police	Risk Analyst	Cyber Security	Student
Finance	0.97										
Government	0.08	0.28									
Legal	0.97	0.95	0.20								
Manager	0.71	0.81	0.16	0.82							
Other	0.84	0.95	0.05	0.86	0.57						
Physical Security	0.79	0.81	0.45	0.82	0.95	0.71					
Police	0.95	0.94	0.08	0.99	0.75	0.78	0.81				
Risk Analyst	0.72	0.82	0.10	0.84	0.95	0.55	0.92	0.76			
Cyber Security	0.56	0.81	0.02	0.68	0.33	0.72	0.58	0.49	0.25		
Student	0.72	0.82	0.13	0.74	0.55	0.81	0.62	0.68	0.56	0.95	
Technical	0.76	0.84	0.13	0.86	0.94	0.61	0.91	0.81	0.98	0.35	0.58

TABLE 12: Uncorrected p values for pairwise test of proportions between bust status by player background subgroups.

	Board Member	Finance	Government	Legal	Manager	Other	Physical Security	Police	Risk Analyst	Cyber Security	Student
Finance	0.42										
Government	0.03	0.30									
Legal	0.99	0.76	0.11								
Manager	0.39	0.94	0.11	0.87							
Other	0.63	0.20	0.01	0.65	0.11						
Physical Security	0.73	1.00	1.00	0.91	1.00	0.56					
Police	0.03	0.91	0.28	0.35	0.34	0.00	1.00				
Risk Analyst	0.34	0.87	0.09	0.87	1.00	0.07	1.00	0.20			
Cyber Security	0.09	1.00	0.13	0.60	0.75	0.01	1.00	0.41	0.57		
Student	0.28	0.97	0.11	0.80	1.00	0.05	1.00	0.32	0.96	0.77	
Technical	0.74	0.25	0.01	0.71	0.20	1.00	0.59	0.01	0.15	0.04	0.13

TABLE 13: Codebook

Code	Description
No reasoning demonstrated	Teams make a decision without demonstrating any reasoning at all. A suggestion is raised and met with agreement, or with a counter-suggestion.
Minimal reasoning demonstrated	Teams demonstrate minimal reasoning—suggestions may be met with some questioning, typically by only a single participant, but the topic is not pursued for very long.
Extensive reasoning demonstrated	Teams spend a lot of time exploring potential suggestions, multiple lines of questioning are explored by multiple participants.
Expertise demonstrated	Participant(s) demonstrate extensive knowledge of a particular aspect of conversation indicative of expertise.
Potential impact from choice	Team consider the potential impact from making a particular choice.
Consideration of threats actors?	Team explore the potential threat actors interested in attacking an aspect of the business.
Use of threat modelling?	Teams demonstrate a structured approach for considering threats. Does not have to be a formally recognised model.
Identification/speculation of vulnerabilities	Team explore the potential vulnerabilities that may affect a particular asset or area of the the business.
Futuristic tech prioritised	Team chooses to prioritise network monitoring ahead of other alternatives.
Futuristic tech understood?	Team explores network monitoring, but does not appear to understand it entirely.
Narrow range of options considered?	Team discusses only a few potential alternatives when make choices.
Wide range of options considered?	Team explores a wide range of potential alternative actions that could be taken.
Identifying potential new information	Team sets out to derive information or theories.
Evaluating value of information	Team evaluates validity and value of information.
Anticipating future actions	Team takes an action to enable a future action to take place.
Cost of investments	Teams evaluate investments based on their cost, often using to prioritise order of investments.