

#### **Text S4**

*Analyses of complete latency distributions.* We summarized the latency distributions as cumulative frequency scores given by the area under the cumulative distribution plot (average cumulative distributions for each option are presented in Figure S1). Higher scores capture shorter latencies to respond because in such cases more latencies occur in earlier bins (e.g. the maximum score of 20 occurs when all latencies fall in the first of 20 bins). The interesting comparisons are between A<sub>5</sub> and C<sub>10</sub> and between B<sub>10</sub> and C<sub>10</sub> as these options were involved in the preference tests. As suggested by Figure S1, the cumulative scores for option C<sub>10</sub> were significantly larger than those found for option B<sub>10</sub> [ $t(6)=-2.699, p=.036$ ], coinciding with the analysis based on central tendency of the latencies. Also coinciding with the analysis of central trends, we found no significant differences in cumulative scores between A<sub>5</sub> and C<sub>10</sub> [ $t(6)=1.502, p=.184$ ], which goes against the predictions of the SCM and suggests that A<sub>5</sub>'s higher immediacy was counteracted by the options' common ranking or masked by a floor effect as described and discussed in the results and discussion sections, respectively.