**SOM-R: Additional Studies**

Please see this document for the method and results sections for three pilot studies (Study 1S, Study 2S, Study 3S). These studies were run prior to the studies included in the manuscript. They informed our power calculations, and general approach.

We next report Study 4S, which tested whether the observed difference between learning from failure versus success depends on an incidental feature of the manipulation—the fact that feedback was presented following the questions (as opposed to alongside them).

**Study 1S: Learning From Success More Than Failure**

**Method**

**Participants.** We opened the experiment to 100 participants on Prolific. Participants of any nationality were invited to participate, so long as their Prolific approval rating was at or above 50%. Prolific returned 99 responses (56.4% female; *M*age = 30.69, *SD*age = 9.72).

**Procedure.** The task manipulation was the same as the manipulation used in Study 2c in the manuscript, with one exception: unlike Study 2c, this study was not incentivized.

**Results and Discussion**

Supporting our hypothesis, participants in the failure condition (*M* = 63%, *SD* = 34%) learned less—they had fewer correct answers on the test—than participants in the success condition (*M* = 85%, *SD* = 23%), *t*(97) = 3.80, *p* < .001 *d* = .76, 95% CI = [.35, 1.16].

**Study 2S: Remembering Failure Feedback Less Than No Feedback At All**

**Method**

**Participants**. We opened the survey to 100 participants on Prolific. Participants of any nationality were invited to participate, so long as their Prolific approval rating was at or above 50%. Prolific returned 100 responses (40.0% female; *M*age = 33.07, *SD*age = 11.10).

**Procedure.** We followed the procedure outlined in Study 3 in the manuscript, with one exception: unlike Study 3, this study was not incentivized.

**Results and Discussion**

Supporting our hypothesis, participants in the failure condition (*M* = 72%, *SD* = 35%) remembered fewer of their initial answer choices than participants who received no feedback (*M* = 89%, *SD* = 19%), *t*(98) = 3.09, *p* = .003, *d* = .65, 95% CI = [.24, 1.05]. Thus, over and above any effect that success may have on motivating people to tune in, failure led participants to tune out—they failed to remember their previous answers.

**Study 3S: Learning From Personal versus Vicarious Experience**

**Method**

**Participants.** We opened the experiment to200 participants. Participants of any nationality were invited to participate, so long as their Prolific approval rating was at or above 50%. Prolific returned 198 respondents, 196 of whom completed the session (49.5% female; *M*age = 42.81, *SD*age = 13.22).

**Procedure.** This study used a 2 (Feedback: success vs. failure; within-participants) × 2 (Perspective: self vs. other; between-participants) mixed design. Specifically, in this study, each participant received failure feedback on one set of three trials and success feedback on another set of three trials, in counterbalanced order.

The script task shown to the “self” condition was similar to the script task used in Study 2a. Participants answered script questions following which they received feedback on their answer choices (Round 1), and after this, they took a test that measured learning (Round 2). In contrast, for the “other” condition, the script task showed someone else’s performance. Prior to each set, participants in the “other” condition read: “In this set, you will see how someone else answered three questions, and get feedback on this other person's answers.” Participants in the “other” condition then clicked through Round 1 questions and saw the answer choices someone else had selected, followed by feedback on that person’s answer choices (success or failure, depending on condition). Next, they completed the same test as those in the “self” condition. Prior to completing the task, all participants learned that the goal of each set was to learn as much as they could from the feedback in Round 1, because they would be re-tested on the script symbols in Round 2, and bonused $0.10 for each Round 2 question they answered correctly.

**Results and Discussion**

An ANOVA of Feedback × Perspective revealed no main effect of Perspective, *F* (1, 194) = 0.48, *p* = .491, and a main effect of Feedback, *F* (1, 194) = 19.00, *p* < .001. Participants learned more from success than failure feedback. In support of our hypothesis, we found a Feedback × Perspective interaction, *F*(1, 194) = 10.40, *p* = .001. Replicating the effect from prior studies, participants learned less from personal failures (*M* = 58%, *SD* = 38%) than personal successes (*M* = 80%, *SD* = 31%), *t*(103) = 5.90, *p* < .001, *d* = .63, 95% CI = [.36, .91]. In contrast, participants did not learn significantly less from others’ failures (*M* = 64%, *SD* = 34%) compared with others’ successes (*M* = 68%, *SD* = 33%), *t*(91) = .73, *p* = .467, *d* = .12, 95% CI = [-.41, .12].

**Study 4S: Presenting the Feedback Following versus Alongside the Questions**

**Method**

**Participants.** We opened the experiment to400 participants. Participants of any nationality were invited to participate, so long as their MTurk approval rating was at or above 50%. MTurk returned 407 respondents (47.9% female; *M*age = 39.03, *SD*age = 12.68).

**Procedure.** This study used a 2 (Feedback: success vs. failure) × 2 (Presentation: same vs. next page) between-subjects design. Specifically, in this study, participants received either failure or success feedback. We varied whether that feedback was presented on the same page as the question and answer choices, or on a separate, follow-up page.

**Results and Discussion**

An ANOVA of Feedback × Presentation revealed a main effect of Feedback, *F*(1, 403) = 39.30, *p* < .001; participants learned more from success than failure. There was also a main effect of Presentation, *F*(1, 403) = 4.21, *p* = .041; participants learned more when feedback was presented on a separate page, as opposed to alongside the answer choices. The Feedback × Presentation interaction was not significant, *F*(1, 403) = 2.55, *p* = .111. Specifically, when feedback was presented on a different page than the answer choices, replicating the effect from prior studies, participants learned less from failure (*M* = 70%, *SD* = 31%) than success (*M* = 93%, *SD* = 19%), *F*(1, 403) = 31.16, *p* < .001. So too, when feedback was presented on the same page as the answer choices, participants continued to learn less from failure (*M* = 67%, *SD* = 35%) than success (*M* = 83%, *SD* = 32%), *F*(1, 403) = 10.84, *p* = .001.