

Supplementary Methods 2. Model selection

To identify the model best fitting our data, we used the deviance information criterion (Spiegelhalter *et al.*, 2002), a measurement of goodness-of-fit for Bayesian hierarchical models with a penalty for the number of free parameters.

The difference in deviance information criterion between the full and parsimonious models was not significant (<10) (Supplementary Table 1), indicating that the two models fit the data equally well.

We also checked the ability of the models to generate the observed data, by performing posterior predictive checks. We sampled 500 sets of parameters from the posterior distributions of the fitted models and simulated 500 sets of data corresponding to our original design (number of trials and participants). The posterior predictions were generated by averaging these 500 sets, and were compared with the observed data.

The posterior predictive checks showed that both models yielded data similar to the observed data. All the statistics reported are in the 95% credible interval of the observed data.

Finally, the parameters of the full and parsimonious models (e.g. correlations between the response thresholds of the two models) were all highly correlated ($r(91)=1$, $p<0.001$ for all parameters). Altogether, this indicates the lack of added value of the full model and we selected the parsimonious model for further analyses.

Spiegelhalter DJ, Best NG, Carlin BP, van der Linde A. Bayesian Measures of Model Complexity and Fit. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* 2002; 64: 583–639.