```
$contrasts
 contrast                                             estimate         SE      df t.ratio p.value
 Negative,Negative - Positive,Negative -153.37807  50.68254 20.94   -3.026   0.0064
 Negative,Negative - Negative,Positive -120.56791  92.61292 30.57   -1.302   0.2027
 Negative,Negative - Positive,Positive -105.21905  92.22803 29.04   -1.141   0.2633
 Positive,Negative - Negative,Positive   32.81016  97.35194 31.48    0.337   0.7383
 Positive,Negative - Positive,Positive   48.15902  97.23988 26.58    0.495   0.6245
 Negative,Positive - Positive,Positive   15.34886  62.02003 27.31    0.247   0.8064
```

- The two key comparisons reveal that Positive sentences are read no more quickly after Positive than after Negative context (1579 vs. 1595 ms.) while Negative Sentences are read more quickly after Negative than after Positive contexts (1474 vs. 1627 ms.)

- Note, the estimates in each contrast pairing corresponds to the difference between the comparison conditions for that pair.

- If we had re-reading (i.e., regression) data, we would also have to run an analysis using the *glmer* function on those data. The code would look like:

```
model.full <- glmer(Regressions ~ Context * Sentence + (1 + Context * Sentence |
Subject) + (1 + Context * Sentence | Item), data = RO, family = binomial)
```

- To generate the pairwise comparisons (and to report the descriptives using the original measurement scale), we would use:

```
emmeans(model.full, pairwise ~ Context * Sentence, adjust = "none", type =
"response")
```

- If we did not set the `type` parameter, then the descriptives would be on a log odds ratio scale (and harder to interpret).