PAPERS:

* Three debias experiments together – maybe send to Cognition?
* Experiment 0, 3, 4 together with working memory part
* Experiment 1, 2?
* One or two papers of the judgments together in the same experiment versus separately in different experiments
  + Need to check what’s been published of those.
* Longitudinal Judgments

List of Experiments:

**Debiasing 2008:**

* First attempt at moving the JAM FSG slope by giving instructions on BSG.
* FSGXBSG interaction was significant, so hi and lo BSG slopes were examined.
* Participants were given normal associative instructions, then BSG was explained and examples were given.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Regular JAM task | Debiasing Task |
|  |  |

**Debiasing 2010:**

* Second attempt at changing the slope and BSG interaction by giving instructions on inflated scores.
* This version included feedback on overall judgments (they are too high!) by including a rating page that participants saw how close their answers were.
* The debiasing page included a comparison to their neighbor, who had the same judgment pairs, but in reverse.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Regular JAM | Debiasing Group |
|  |  |

* deleted one control group due to missing an entire page (24) ratings (1/4th data).
* Deleted three debias group for same issue as above.

**Load and Debiasing 2011**

* Control group got normal JAM instructions, Debiasing group got BSG instructions from the 2010 experiment (comparing to a neighbor).
* No load group completed the judgments, while the load group had to remember the first word from each judgment pair.
* It was expected that the load condition would raise the intercept and lower the slope because it took up brain power (High, Low group – which is bad).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Control No Load | Control Load |
|  |  |
| Debiasing No Load | Debiasing Load |
|  |  |

**Frequency Assessment**

* On all these experiments, I scaled the intercept to 100 points to match all the other JAM experiments
* Experiment 0
  + This experiment was the traditional judgments of memory task, where they guessed the relationship between word pairs.
* Experiment 4
  + This experiment instead of listing a raw number or 0-9 on how many people would give lost to found, they guessed low-medium-high.
  + Looked like this: CIGARETTE-ASHTRAY – low medium high
* Experiment 1
  + Instead of guessing how many people out of 100 would give lost to found, they did a free association task.
  + They were asked to list as many words as they could think of when given the cue (first) word.
  + Looked like this: MELODY – list as many words that pop into your head
* Experiment 2
  + They were given a cue word and asked to list how many associates they think it had (to see if they can get at frequency)
  + Looked like this: MELODY – list how many associates you think it has
* Experiment 3
  + They were given a cue word and asked to guess if it had a few associates or a lot of associations
  + Looked like this: MELODY – low or high

**Associative and Semantic Judgments**

* In these experiments participants did both semantic judgments and associative judgments on word pairs.
  + Some they did one or the other, some they did both.
  + I’ve separated out the experiments were they did both or separately (but in the same “experiment”).
* Associative Judgments
  + We want high FSG slope, low FSG intercept and very low (zero) JCN influence.
  + Generally that’s what happens – JCN isn’t a predictor when both are included in the equation.
* Semantic Judgments
  + We want high JCN slope, low JCN intercept, and very low (zero) FSG slope.
  + Generally, what we actually find is that associations cannot be blocked out, so we get a significant FSG slope.

**Both Judgments Together (Speeded RT)**

* This experiment was originally designed to see if the relationship between the word pairs would speed up judgments due to priming.
* Participants did both semantic and associative judgments together, and their judgment speed was recorded.
* Here, we just want to look at the predictive ability of FSG (associative) and JCN (semantic) – ignoring reaction times since that was part of the original paper.
* See above for predictions.
* Experiments:
  + 1 = they just judged word pairs on their associations or semantics, then switched did the other. The range of values for FSG and JCN varied throughout the scale
  + 2 = same experiment, different word set. The range of FSG varied more toward the bottom end (which does it make it harder for them to judge associations…)
  + 3 = same as experiment 1
  + All three of these can be combined into one experiment

**Both Judgments Together (4 cues)**

* This experiment used two different groups to see if they could get better at judgments if they were given cue-target pairs where the cue repeated.
* So, for instance, they would get pairs like this:
  + Computer – program
  + Computer – mouse
  + Computer – game
  + Computer – keyboard
* One group got the four pairs together (labeled blocked in the SPSS file) and the other group got the four pairs mixed up (mixed). We expected the same pattern as above, but for either blocked or mixed to have higher slopes.
* Honestly, expected blocked to have higher slopes, since they were getting them all in a row, so they couldn’t rate all of them 9 (because it adds up to 100) BUT we found that mixed groups actually do better than blocked, but not really better than the normal high intercept, low slope business.

**Both Judgments Together (priming exps)**

* All of these experiments, participants got semantic and associative judgments in the same experiment.
* They also were doing a priming task, which was either before or after the judgment. The priming task was an RSVP (rapid serial visual presentation) task, where they were shown a bunch of fast symbols, and they had to figure out what word was presented in the symbols.
* Experiments
  + 2A – normal judgments after they had seen the RSVP trial. They were shown the judgment words at the beginning, then the RSVP, then they did the judgment. The RSVP was long.
  + 2B – same as above with different word pairs.
  + 2D – the judgment task was shortened to only one lag (short RSVP). Also, the word pairs were changed so that priming was with the bottom word (which shouldn’t affect judgments).
  + 2C – first versus last. The judgment pairs were either given first or last. Shouldn’t affect judgments – we were testing the effect of priming.
* With all of these I would test them separately, then see if we can combine them.

|  |
| --- |
| 2A/2B |
| 2C |
| 2D |

**Separate Judgments In the Same Experiment (judgments 2009)**

* Participants got either a semantic judgment task or an associative judgment task (not both together).
* Both groups got normal instructions for their condition (associative or semantic).
* Predictions are listed above in the overview.

**Separate Judgments In the Same Experiment (sem debiasing 2011)**

* Participants got either a semantic judgment task or an associative judgment task (not both together).
* Four conditions:
  + Associative judgments – normal instructions
  + Semantic judgments – normal instructions
  + Semantic no association – normal instructions for a semantic judgment task, but the word pairs were not associatively related, which should increase the slopes for the semantic judgment and lower the intercept.
  + Debiasing Judgments – instructions that explained associations and how they inflate judgments. In essence, it’s similar to the associative debiasing from above, but they got instructions on how to ignore associations as a whole (not just backward ones). This group, in theory, should have higher slopes.
* For the separate judgments in the same experiment – I separated the files into associative judgments and semantic judgments, but with codes as to which experiment was which
* You can probably combine the “regular” ones from 2009 and 2011, but not the debiasing sem, or sem no association.