|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Table 4: Parameter estimates for the reading time measures for the *critical* region of interest, the *question*. Significant effects are in bold. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Reading Time measures | | | | | | | | | Binomial measures | | | | | | | |
|  | First Pass | | | Regression Path | | | Total Time | | | Regressions Out | | | Regressions | | | | |
| In | | | | |
|  | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *z* | | *b* | SE | *z* |
| Critical Region: Question | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| Intercept  Facilitated | **1559** | **71** | **21.85** | **1767** | **80** | **22.20** | **1803** | **77** | **23.31** | **-2.724** | **0.187** | **-14.58** | | **-2.002** | **0.140** | **-14.29** |
| Unfacilitated | **72** | **33** | **2.20** | 22 | 35 | 0.63 | **109** | **28** | **3.96** | 0.063 | 0.220 | 0.29 | | 0.214 | 0.147 | 1.46 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

For **first pass reading** times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (**but higher BIC**) than the null model and a chisq < 0.05

For regression path reading times the model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC than the full model and a chisq = 0.525

**\*For total time reading times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (43253) and BIC (43294) than the null model and a chisq < 0.001**

For FPROthe model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC than the full model and a chisq = 0.772

For regressions inthe model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has the same AIC and a lower BIC than the full model and a chisq = 0.162

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5: Parameter estimates for the binomial measures for the post-*critical* region of interest, the *reply*. Significant effects are in bold. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Reading Time measures | | | | | | | | | Binomial measures | | | | | | | |
|  | First Pass | | | Regression Path | | | Total Time | | | Regressions Out | | | Regressions | | | | |
| In | | | | |
|  | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *z* | | *b* | SE | *z* |
| Post-Critical Region: Reply | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| Intercept  Facilitated | **1243** | **53** | **23.60** | **1362** | **60** | **22.58** | **1412** | **58** | **24.27** | **-3.175** | **0.237** | **-13.42** | | **-1.808** | **0.136** | **-13.30** |
| Unfacilitated | **54** | **22** | **2.47** | **126** | **33** | **3.79** | **82** | **21** | **3.85** | **0.650** | **0.243** | **2.67** | | 0.080 | 0.147 | 0.55 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

For **first pass reading** times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (**but higher BIC**) than the null model and a chisq < 0.05

**\*For regression path reading times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC and BIC than the null model and a chisq < 0.001**

**\*For total time reading times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (41409) and BIC (41462) than the null model and a chisq < 0.001**

For **FPRO** the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (1427) (**but the same BIC**) than the null model and a chisq < 0.05

For regressions inthe model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC than the full model and a chisq = 0.525

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6: Parameter estimates for the reading time measures for the *critical* region of interest, the *question* when controlling variables included. Significant effects are in bold. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Reading Time measures | | | | | | | | | Binomial measures | | | | | | | |
|  | First Pass | | | Regression Path | | | Total Time | | | Regressions Out | | | Regressions | | | | |
| In | | | | |
|  | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *z* | | *b* | SE | *z* |
| Critical Region: Question | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| Intercept  Facilitated | **1559** | **70** | **22.14** | **1769** | **79** | **22.28** | **1802** | **77** | **23.30** | **-2.596** | **0.144** | **-18.07** | | **-2.071** | **0.141** | **-14.73** |
| Unfacilitated | **73** | **32** | **2.27** | 21 | 94 | 0.62 | **108** | **43** | **2.53** | -0.117 | 0.146 | -0.80 | | **0.315** | **0.135** | **2.34** |
| SRS-2 | -34 | 73 | -0.46 | -1 | 82 | -0.01 | 13 | 81 | 0.16 | 0.131 | 0.138 | 0.95 | | 0.103 | 0.126 | 0.81 |
| EQ | 8 | 73 | 0.12 | 17 | 83 | 0.21 | -11 | 81 | -0.13 | 0.236 | 0.134 | 0.18 | | -0.071 | 0.127 | -0.56 |
| WRMT-III | -62 | 59 | -1.04 | 43 | 67 | -0.64 | -6 | 66 | -0.10 | 0.106 | 0.112 | 0.95 | | **0.310** | **0.104** | **2.98** |
| RAN | **136** | **59** | **2.29** | 131 | 67 | 1.96 | 126 | 66 | 1.90 | 0.012 | 0.114 | 0.10 | | 0.109 | 0.109 | 1.05 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

For **first pass reading** times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (**but higher BIC**) than the null model and a chisq < 0.05.

Correlation matrix shows EQ and SRS-2 highly correlated (.6), interestingly.

For regression path reading times the model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC then the full model and a chisq = 0.527

For **total time reading** times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (42706; **but higher BIC** (42783) than the null model and a chisq < 0.001

For FPROthe model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC then the full model and a chisq = 0.423

For **regressions in** the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (2212.8; **but higher BIC** (2272) than the null model and a chisq < 0.05

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7: Parameter estimates for the binomial measures for the post-*critical* region of interest, the *reply* when controlling variables included. Significant effects are in bold. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Reading Time measures | | | | | | | | | Binomial measures | | | | | | | | |
|  | First Pass | | | Regression Path | | | Total Time | | | Regressions Out | | |  | | | Regressions  In | | |
|  | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *t* | *b* | SE | *z* |  |  |  | *b* | SE | *z* |
| Post-Critical Region: Reply | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept  Facilitated | **1245** | **52** | **23.78** | **1361** | **60** | **22.68** | **1409** | **58** | **24.35** | **-3.034** | **0.175** | **-17.35** |  |  |  | **-1.840** | **0.134** | **-13.74** |
| Unfacilitated | **51** | **22** | **2.32** | **128** | **29** | **4.35** | **81** | **20** | **4.06** | **0.482** | **0.152** | **3.17** |  |  |  | 0.113 | 0.138 | 0.82 |
| SRS-2 | -44 | 52 | -0.85 | -44 | 57 | -0.77 | -20 | 55 | -0.37 | 0.041 | 0.138 | 0.30 |  |  |  | -0.019 | 0.118 | -0.16 |
| EQ | -32 | 52 | -0.62 | -45 | 58 | -0.79 | -52 | 55 | -0.95 | 0.043 | 0.137 | 0.32 |  |  |  | -0.140 | 0.119 | -1.18 |
| WRMT-III | -10 | 42 | -0.23 | 6 | 46 | 0.14 | 27 | 45 | 0.61 | **0.303** | **0.117** | **2.59** |  |  |  | **0.233** | **0.096** | **2.42** |
| RAN | **102** | **42** | **2.41** | 91 | 47 | 1.96 | **95** | **45** | **2.12** | -0.010 | 0.115 | -0.09 |  |  |  | 0.122 | 0.097 | 1.26 |

For **first pass reading** times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (**but higher BIC**) then the null model and a chisq < 0.05

**\*For regression path reading times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC and BIC than the null model and a chisq < 0.001**

**\*For total time reading times the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (40787) and BIC (40863) than the null model and a chisq < 0.001**

**\*For FPRO the model is significantly better at explaining the variance with a lower AIC (1414) and BIC (1461) than the null model and a chisq < 0.01**

For regressions in the model is no better at explaining the variance than the null model. The null model has a lower AIC and BIC than the full model and a chisq = 0.419