Log book:

Participant 01: S:

Participant did not try to predict in the last 4 blocks;

Participant suggested that we enlarge the range of joystick output;

Participant 02: JZ:

After block 3, Netstation said there wasn’t enough disk space, so I checked that I had the pilot data on my USB stick, and deleted the data on the BCNI mac;

After block 7, participant realised that local deviant could be a global standard – we re-ran block 7, and agreed that we would re-run block 6 if there is time left;

Block 6 and block 7 have blocktype 1- participant predicting the wrong thing at this block, need to discard data.

In block 7, participant forgot which sequence was the standard, then picked it up afterwards;

We did not re-run block 6

Participant did not try to predict in the last 4 blocks;

Participant 03: YP:

Participant tried to predict in the last 4 blocks.

Participant 04: AK:

Participant’s head circumference was just smaller than 54cm – the net for 54cm- is broken. So we used the bigger one starting from 54cm.

Lots of spontaneous eye movements in block 1

I realised that the names for different deviants are not existent on the event markers sent to NetStation – the only place for this is saloglo\_input.

We re-ran block 6 because the participant did not understand the task;

Participants’ choices were rather binary in block 6

Participant understood the last in the 2nd block 6, and was reminded after block 6 to make fewer eye movements;

Block 6 re-ran itself for some reason – so in total I have 3 block 6s, the first one is not usable as participant did not understand the task.

Participant trying to make out of a pattern – said this was sub conscious

Participant 05: AG:

Did not get the rules until after block 9; re-ran from block 6 (the first joystick block).

In block 10, participant made many definitely not coming predictions

In the last few blocks, participant reported that she was trying to predict only in the first bit of every block.

Participant 06: MM:

Reported that there was a deviant at the start of block 11 where there shouldn’t be any deviant.

Participant was just listening to the sequence in the last few blocks.

Participant 07: JH:

The codes re-ran block 9 on its own after block 9 – so we re-started things to run block 10.

In block 10 the earphone fell out before the block (with the earplug inside) – so we re-ran block 10.

Throughout the blocks, the EEG signals have small invaginations constantly, I don’t really know why. It doesn’t look like eye movement or sweat.

Participant was just listening in the last few blocks.

Participant 08: CW:

Participant was very nice & understood the tasks.

Participant was not trying to predict in the last few blocks.

Participant 09: TL:

The left (blue) earphone did not work, so I used my own earphone – I tried and heard sounds on both ears. As I have a participant in the afternoon, I will use my earphones for them as well.

I instructed the participant not to mind wander after block 3. She said ‘oh’ – she probably mind wandered in the previous blocks.

Participant was not trying to predict in the last few blocks;

Participant 10: JM:

Participant appeared as if he was falling asleep in the first block.

Participant was falling asleep in block 4 – this is a caveat in your study: when they are not given tasks, it’s likely that they are less alert.

Participant was not trying to predict in the last few blocks.

Participant 11: MR:

Before joystick blocks, participant had the intuition that the next one either is or isn’t a deviant.

In the first block of joystick, participant gave a lot of high predictions. When asked, he said he ‘felt it in his heart’

After the first block, participant explained that he still thought that it either comes or it doesn’t. He was then told to do it as he predicts.

Participant had to go to the bathroom after block 9 (1 block of joystick prediction, and 2 blocks of joystick left). So we needed to restart afterwards.

Participant was not trying to predict in the last few blocks.

Participant 12: JS:

Participant thinks that the occurrences of deviances were truly random, and hence every next sequence has 20% probability of being a deviant. But the joystick drifted too far, so we ran block 6 again.

In block 8 (training block), participant showed ‘normal’ behaviour: 0% for the first few sequences, and adjusting according to latenesses; when asked, she said that the percentage of deviant sequences may differ between blocks, so she needed to establish a baseline first for the later (unitary) predictions.

In block 9, most of her predictions were 0% - she intended 25%.

In block 10, with online feedback of joystick positions, the choices stabilised after trial 38.

Joystick position can differ from what the participants intend to tell me.

In block 13, around trial 90, participant said the sounds stopped completely and then started again.

Participant 13: AB:

Participant had occasional movements;

Participant was trying to predict, but only for the first block in the last 4 blocks.

Participant 14: AC:

Participant has very clean signal;

Participant did not have a huge variation of predictions in the first 3 blocks; participant adjusted in the last block with (kind of) in-time feedback – this will be corrected with normalisation.

Participant was trying to predict!

But I feel the cap is slightly biased to the right…I did the measurements though.

Participant 15: DM:

Participant had some eye movements for the first few blocks;

Proprioceptive feedback is not sufficient for percentages.

We realised that the top percentages (the most forward of the joystick) was not very sensitive – participant said he would compensate for it.

The joystick was too insensitive – so we ran block 9 again (first block of reversed rule).

Participant had many movements in block 9

Participant was trying to predict!

Participant 16: NS:

Participant’s data showed quite a lot of sweat – big waves on EEG signal.

Participant said that the sounds stopped towards the end of block 12 when she moved.

Participant said the sounds stopped in the middle of block 14 (倒数第二个) – so we ran block 14 again.

In the second time block 14 did not stop in the middle

Much eye movements in the last block, block 15.

Participant was not trying to predict in the last blocks.

Participant 17: AW:

Participant counted in the first block and concluded that the occurrences were kind of random – participant was told after the first block to just focus on the sequences

Participant was not counting in block 2

Before joystick blocks, participant said he was predicting the next deviant anyways, but was only doing it occasionally;

We ran the first training block twice;

In the joystick 1 after training, participant’s choices were rather binary

I asked the participant and he said the giving a percentage would be difficult (as in cognitively expensive). He checked whether he should do it with percentages, but I encouraged him to think the way he thinks.

After block 7 (2nd joystick block) participant said it was helpful to use the percentages;

Participant was kind of trying to predict in the last 4 blocks – but this was less so than the first 4 blocks. When asked for a binary answer, he said he was not trying to predict.

Part 18: KD:

Participant appeared sleepy in the first block.

Participant appeared very sleepy in the second block, but she said she was okay.

Participant had to go to the bathroom after block 3, so we started from block 4 (the last block of global-local before joystick) afterwards.

In block 11 (no deviant block), the earphones fell out at around trial 110 – participant put it back in.

Participant was not trying to predict.

Part 19: KM:

Participant had many eye movements in the first block;

Participant appeared asleep in the second block, and there were fewer eye movements.

Participant had many movements towards the end of the second block.

After block 2, I turned on the air conditioning because the signals looked like there were big sweats

After the first run of block 3, participant said she got distracted in the middle, and we agreed to run block 3 again – we re-started to test that she could hear from both ears – so this is another 2 files – the testing and the file with only block 3, both of which I do not need.

Participant still had sweats in the new block 3, but it looks not terrible.

The sweat was better in block 4.

Participant had sweats throughout – if I’m running ICA for another participant, I should run this again.

Participant was trying to predict!

Part 20: CKN:

Participant fell asleep in the first block – but he remembered which sequence was the standard sequence;

We ran block 7 (2nd block of joystick) again as participant used the backward side of the joystick;

In many trials in block 7, participant maintained predictions to be rather high – the joystick is not sensitive enough to capture all the changes so there were a lot of 1s;

Earplug fell out during block 14 – we stopped in the middle of block 14 （倒数第二个）and re-started.

Participant was not trying to predict.

Part 21: RU:

There are only 20 rows in the saloglo\_input, so I used the block structure for participant 01 for this participant

Participant’s EEG signal has heart beats in.

Participant showed big sweats in block 2 – may be useful to pick out with ICA

Participant still showed large sweats in block 3&4 after I turned the air conditioning on – ICA before epoching would help.

Participant did not understand the task after block 6, so we ran it again – in the re-run version, participant brought the joystick back after prediction – participant’s choices were binary in block 6, when asked, she said it was what she intended.

But in block 7, participant’s choices stopped being binary.

In block 9, participant gave quite a lot of high predictions, and seemed to have understood that she needed to predict the global deviants not local (the block type = 1).

Participant’s last block was very very noisy – but she has to go.

Participant was trying to predict!

Predicting participants: 14, 15, 19, 21

Funky one: 17

Contrast between C1 & C2