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## Introduction

Numeracy

- Numeracy is the ability to understand and use probabilistic and numerical concepts ${ }^{1}$

Numeracy and the use of numbers

- People higher (vs. lower) in numeracy use numeric information more when numeric and non-numeric information is available ${ }^{\text {e.g. }, 2,3}$

Why do more (vs. less) numerate people use numbers more?

Numeracy and attention to numbers

- People higher (vs. lower) in numeracy are more inclined to work with numbers ${ }^{4}$ and sample more outcomes in decisions from experience ${ }^{\text {e.g., }}$,
- However, there is little research directly testing the relation of numeracy and attention to numbers
- It is also unclear whether the actual ability (objective numeracy) or the preference for numbers (subjective numeracy) drives numeric attention


## Numeric attention as a mediator

- The more people look at a piece of information, the more they use it when making decisions ${ }^{\text {e.g., }}$
- Therefore, we hypothesize that attention to numbers mediates the relation of objective numeracy and use of numbers:
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## M Method

Experiment (pre-registered)
Participants were asked to choose repeatedly between two products

- For each product, three reviewer ratings were provided
- In the numbers-only condition, only numeric ratings $(0-100)$ were provided
- In the numbers-and-labels condition, both numeric ratings and respective verbal labels (e.g., "good") were provided
- Crucially, in half of the trials the mean numeric rating and the "mean verbal rating suggested different products
- Participants were considered as using numbers (vs. labels) when they chose the option suggested by the numeric ratings

Mouselab
Ratings were hidden behind Mouselab boxes

- Participants had to hover their mouse cursor over a box to open it


## Measures

Objective numeracy
Subjective numeracy

- Intelligence

Sample
$N=399$

- MTurk sample
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## R Results

Numeracy and number use

- People higher (vs. lower) in objective numeracy used numeric information more ( $b=0.28, p=.001$ ); no effect of subjective numeracy or intelligence

Numeracy, numeric attention, and number use

- A multilevel SEM showed that people higher (vs. lower) in objective numeracy looked more often and longer at numeric information
- The number of times people attended to numeric information fully mediated the association of objective numeracy and number use (indirect effect: $b=0.06, p=.010$ )
- no effect of subjective numeracy or intelligence



## D Discussion

- Our research shows that people higher (vs. lower) in objective numeracy use numbers more at least partly because they attend to it more
- These findings help to understand the underlying processes of the effects of numeracy and can help to develop decision aids which require the use of numbers
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