

With regard to the interpretation, it is problematic that the episodic judgments for HP and MP are not significantly different. In fact, it is indicated that MP episodes were perceived and judged slightly worse than HP. This leaves three interpretations. Either this is an artifact of the between-subject design, HP and MP were not different enough, or a peak effect could be observed. Thus, H₄ must be left unanswered.

H₅: Recovery after LP Episodes

In H₅, the recovery of the multi-episodic judgments is investigated. This is investigated in E₁ by comparing C_{5b} and C₇. Both present 9 episodes while non-HP is presented for the 5th and 6th episode. Table 4.11 shows the three multi-episodic judgments of these conditions.

Table 4.11: One-session experiments: multi-episodic judgments after the 3rd, 6th, and 9th episode for H₅. Reported as MOS with standard deviation in brackets.

Conditions	Episodic Performance	Multi-episodic Judgment		
		3rd	6th	9th
C _{5b}	4:HP, 5:LP, 6:LP	4.1 (0.6)	2.3 (0.9)	3.6 (0.6)
C ₇	4:HP, 5:LP, 6:MP	4.4 (0.8)	3.1 (0.7)	4.1 (0.6)

For each condition, the three multi-episodic judgments are significantly different (C_{5b}: $H(2) = 25.4401$, $p < 0.001$; C₇: $H(2) = 46.8101$, $p < 0.001$). For C_{5b}, a paired post-hoc test shows significant differences between the judgment after the 3rd and 6th episode ($p = 0.003$), the 6th and 9th episode ($p = 0.003$), and the 3rd and 9th episode ($p = 0.010$). A paired post-hoc test for C₇ yields similar findings (3rd vs. 6th: $p < 0.001$; 6th vs. 9th: $p < 0.001$; 3rd vs. 9th: $p = 0.013$). Between these two conditions, the judgments after the 6th episode ($W = 146.00$, $p < 0.001$) and the 9th episodes ($W = 182.50$, $p = 0.006$) are significantly different.

Both conditions show an increase in the final multi-episodic judgment due to the three additional HP episodes. In fact, both conditions do still show a significant difference between the multi-episodic judgments after the 3rd and 9th episode. Thus, a negative effect of the presented non-HP episodes is still present, as these remain lower than the first multi-episodic judgment.

It must be concluded that the multi-episodic judgment recovers if three additional HP episodes are presented, and thus H₅ is accepted. However, from the two conditions alone it cannot be deduced, if a recency effect occurred or the increased number of HP episodes alone lead to the increase.