Appendix A: Exploratory Factor Analysis

Anita Crescenzi, Austin R. Ward, Yuan Li, Rob Capra. 2021. Supporting metacognition during exploratory search with the OrgBox. In Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '21), July 11–15, 2021, Virtual Event, Canada. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462955

This appendix contains

- the full text of the 13 metacognition items on the post-task questionnaire (also shown in Table 4 in the paper),
- overall descriptive statistics (*M*, *SD*, *min*, *max*) and correlations between items (Pearson's r)
- results of exploratory factor analysis
- a description of the composite variable creations and descriptive statistics

Metacognition items on Post-task Questionnaire

Participants indicated their agreement with the following statements on a 1-7 point scale with labeled endpoints (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree).

The OrgDoc/OrgBox helped me to...

...keep track of how broadly I was covering the topic. (track broad)

...keep track of how deeply I was covering some aspects of the topic. (track deep)

... organize the information about the topic. (*org info*)

...keep track of my progress towards completing the task. (track progress)

...decide when I had met the task goal. (met goal)

... evaluate whether my strategy for the task was working. (evaluate strategy)

...change my approach to the task. (change approach)

...ask myself if I had included important facets of the topic. (important facets)

...figure out how the information about the topic fits together. (*info fits together*)determine facets of the topic. (*determine facets*)

... understand what the task was asking me to do. (understand task)

...develop a plan for approaching the task. (plan task)

...decide where to begin my search. (begin search

Descriptive statistics

Appendix Table 1. Post-task questionnaire metacognition items: descriptive statistics (Mean, SD, Min, Max), pairwise correlations (Pearson's r with uncorrected statistical
significance. $\ddagger p < .001$, $\dagger p < .01$, * $p < .05$), and composite variable (after exploratory factor analysis)

Item Descriptive Statistics				Correlations									Composite					
# Name	М	SD	Min	Max	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	Name
(1) track broad	5.23	1.26	2	7	1													monitor
(2) track deep	4.96	1.35	2	7	† .44	1												monitor
(3) org info	5.58	1.20	2	7	\$.53	‡ .46	1											monitor
(4) track progress	5.08	1.61	1	7	* .30	† .37	.24	1										evaluate
(5) met goal	4.42	1.47	1	7	.20	† .46	.11	\$.61	1									evaluate
(6) eval. strategy	4.73	1.30	1	7	.12	* .34	* .34	† .38	‡ .47	1								evaluate
(7) change approach	4.31	1.49	1	7	.19	.14	.18	.27	* .34	\$.63	1							evaluate
(8) important facets	5.15	1.37	2	7	† .38	* .34	* .32	‡ .52	* .34	‡ .51	† .44	1						evaluate
(9) info fits together	4.85	1.53	2	7	† .44	* .33	† .41	† .42	.27	.25	* .32	† .38	1					understand topic
(10) determine facets	4.79	1.40	2	7	† .38	.25	† .45	† .38	.21	.27	.19	‡ .54	‡ .75	1				understand topic
(11) understand task	3.83	1.55	1	7	.18	.04	.10	* .36	.25	.17	.24	.22	‡ .53	\$.50	1			plan
(12) plan task	4.65	1.54	1	7	.15	.26	.05	0.27	.25	† .42	* .36	† .44	† .44	† .37	‡ .48	1		plan
(13) begin search	3.31	1.52	1	6	.08	.03	.05	† .37	* .33	.25	.18	* .31	.26	.28	‡ .54	* .37	1	plan

Exploratory factor analysis

Before exploratory factor analysis, two tests were run to ascertain whether or not it was advisable to pursue factor analysis: Barlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.

Barlett's test of sphericity. $\chi^2(78)=265.57$, *p*<.001 H₀ items are not correlated.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. KMO=.729

Then exploratory factor analysis was conducted using principal factor with a pre-specified three factor solution. Oblique, promax rotation to allow for correlated factors. Pattern matrix of promax-rotated loadings Structural matrix of unrotated loadings after principal factors extraction. Requirements for item retention: (1) loading >= .4, (2) no crossloadings > .32, (3) communality >=.4

Factor loadings > .4 are shaded.

Item	Rot	ated loadir	ngs		Unro	tated loadi	dings
Name	F1	F2	F3	Communality	F1	F2	F3
track broad	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.51	0.50	0.44	-0.10
track deep	0.34	-0.23	0.57	0.59	0.51	0.39	0.24
organize info	0.02	-0.13	0.77	0.61	0.49	0.55	-0.03
track progress	0.46	0.24	0.16	0.61	0.66	-0.07	0.13
met goal	0.65	0.06	0.03	0.62	0.57	-0.13	0.35
evaluate strategy	0.78	-0.02	0.04	0.71	0.62	-0.12	0.47
change approach	0.61	0.10	-0.04	0.59	0.53	-0.18	0.32
important facets	0.46	0.18	0.27	0.68	0.71	0.02	0.15
info fits together	-0.06	0.57	0.46	0.76	0.73	0.10	-0.39
determine facets	-0.12	0.58	0.49	0.78	0.71	0.13	-0.44
understand task	0.00	0.82	-0.11	0.65	0.55	-0.38	-0.41
plan task	0.33	0.51	-0.10	0.57	0.58	-0.32	-0.06
begin search	0.24	0.57	-0.23	0.46	0.45	-0.41	-0.12
Variance/Eigenvalues	3.18	3.14	3.03		4.55	1.16	1.08
Variance explained	0.44	0.43	0.42		0.62	0.16	0.15

Appendix Table 3: Correlation matrix of promax rotated factors

	F1	F2	F3
F1	1		
F2	0.36	1	
F3	0.37	0.40	1

Composite variables

Composite variables were created by averaging the values of the items in the factors.

Monitor = (track broad + track deep + organize info) / 3

Evaluate = (track progress + met goal + evaluate strategy + change approach + important facets) / 5

Plan = (understand task + plan task + begin search) / 3

Understand topic = (info fits together + determine facets) / 2

Appendix Table 4: Descriptive statististics (Mean, SD, min, max, skew, kurtosis), and correlation matrix for composite variables. Note: kurtosis = 3 for normal distribution

Item]	Descriț	otive sta	atistics		Correlations			
#	Name	М	SD	Min	Max	Skew	Kurtosis	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(1)	Monitor	5.26	1.03	3	7	19	2.14	1.00			
(2)	Evaluate	4.74	1.08	1.4	6.8	55	3.77	† .45	1.00		
(3)	Understand topic	4,82	1.37	2	7	19	2.43	\$.50	‡ .46	1.00	
(4)	Plan	3.93	1.23	1	6.7	28	3.05	.16	‡ .49	‡ .53	1