Contributions

Contributed to Conception and design: CMH, MMG, ERI, ELK

Contributed to acquisition of data: CMH

Contributed to analysis and interpretation of data: CMH, MMG, ERI, ELK

Drafted and/or revised the article: CMH, MMG, ERI, ELK

Approved the submitted version for publication: CMH, MMG, ERI, ELK

Funding Information

The Study reported here was funded by University of Limerick, Education and Health Sciences seed funding. Study S5 was funded by Mary Immaculate College seed funding.

Data Accessibility Statement

All data and analysis code are publicly available on this project's OSF page at https://osf.io/fcd5r/?view_only=9fb6e506e53340c189b98453bb2b6eaf. Materials are also available including the full text of the jsPsych script.

Figure Titles

Main Manuscript

Figure 1: Hypothesized relationship between deliberation and responses in the dumbfounding paradigm

Figure 2: Responses to critical slide depending on cognitive load

Figure 3: Responses to critical slide and for the experimental group and the control group for each scenario

Supplementary Materials

Figure 1: Screenshot of Attention Check

Figure 2: Screenshot of Attention Check

Figure 3: Study S1: Responses to critical slide and for the experimental group ($N = 33$) and the control group ($N = 33$)

Figure 4: Study S1: Probability of selecting each response to the critical slide depending on Need for Cognition

Figure 5: Sample dot patterns - more simple for the control group (a) and higher complexity for the experimental condition (b)

Figure 6: Study S2: Responses to critical slide for (left) the experimental group ($N = 51$) vs the control group ($N = 49$); and (right) depending on engagement ($N = 56$) or non-engagement ($N = 44$) with the memory task

Figure 7: Study S2: Probability of selecting each response to the critical slide depending on Need for Cognition