**Cognitive Performance:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table of Number and percentage of Correct responses | | | | |
|  | Old Participants | | Young Participants | |
| modality | Average Correct Responses M (SD) | Percentage | Average Correct Responses M (SD) | Percentage |
| allocentric | 4.508 (1.736) | 56% | 4.795 (2.015) | 60% |
| egocentric | 6.034 (1.661) | 75% | 5.846 (2.033) | 73% |
| All | 8.288 (2.101) | 69% | 9.103 (2.371) | 75% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table X. Cognitive performance (d’ and criterion) overall and across Spatial Conditions | | | | | | |
|  | Old Participants | | | Young Participants | | |
| Modality | n | c | d' | n | c | d' |
| All | 56 | - 0.012 (0.223) | 0.503 (0.305) | 39 | - 0.047 (0.258) | 0.610 (0.390) |
| Allocentric | 59 | - 0.046 (0.146) | 0.244 (0.227) | 39 | - 0.081 (0.159) | 0.279 (0.240) |
| Egocentric | 59 | 0.002 (0.151) | 0.341 (0.238) | 39 | - 0.036 (0.147) | 0.373 (0.261) |

**Metacognitive Bias:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table. Average Confidence across metacognitive judgements for old and young | | | | |
|  | Old Participants | | Young Participants | |
|  | n | Average Confidence M (SD) | n | Average Confidence M (SD) |
| Confidence in Response 0-100 | 59 | 3.727 (0.633) | 39 | 3.963 (0.604) |
| Exact Scene 0-100 | 59 | 3.046 (0.567) | 39 | 3.196 (0.577) |
| Familiarity 0-100 | 59 | 3.482 (0.601) | 39 | 3.774 (0.655) |
| Recognition Confidence 0-100 | 59 | 3.276 (0.786) | 39 | 3.536 (0.766) |
| Visualise 0-100 | 59 | 3.210 (0.855) | 39 | 3.454 (0.797) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table. Average Confidence across Spatial Condition for old and young | | | | |
|  | Old Participants | | Young Participants | |
| modality | n | Average Confidence M (SD) | n | Average Confidence M (SD) |
| allocentric | 59 | 3.629 (0.711) | 39 | 3.949 (0.649) |
| egocentric | 59 | 3.706 (0.663) | 39 | 4.010 (0.721) |
| same | 59 | 3.806 (0.722) | 39 | 4.083 (0.670) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table X. Correlation of Metacognitive Bias (Avg. Confidence) Young Participants | | | | |
|  | Visualise | Prospective | Familiarity | Exact |
| Prospective | 0.87\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Familiarity | 0.547\*\*\* | 0.533\*\*\* |  |  |
| Exact | 0.56\*\*\* | 0.509\*\*\* | 0.553\*\*\* |  |
| Retrospective | 0.656\*\*\* | 0.602\*\*\* | 0.411\* | 0.485\*\* |
| Table X. Correlation of Metacognitive Bias (Avg. Confidence) Old Participants | | | | |
|  | Visualise | Prospective | Familiarity | Exact |
| Prospective | 0.893\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Familiarity | 0.571\*\*\* | 0.596\*\*\* |  |  |
| Exact | 0.491\*\*\* | 0.507\*\*\* | 0.786\*\*\* |  |
| Retrospective | 0.523\*\*\* | 0.485\*\*\* | 0.281\* | 0.342\*\* |

**Metacognitive Efficiency:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table x. Mratio (mean and HDI) across Spatial conditions for Young and OLd | | |
|  | Old Participants | Young Participants |
|  | Meta-d’/d’ [HDI] | Meta-d’/d’ [HDI] |
| Egocentric | 0.668 [0.367;1.171] | 1.001 [0.587;1.571] |
| Allocentric | 0.584[0.252;1.218] | 0.625 [0.249;1.343] |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table x. Mratio (mean and HDI) across metacognitive judgements for Young and OLd | | |
|  | Old Participants | Young Participants |
|  | Meta-d’/d’ [HDI] | Meta-d’/d’ [HDI] |
| Visualisation | 0.178 [0.068;0.249] | 0.248953 [0.018;0.521] |
| Prospective | 0.198 [0.079;0.446] | 0.263663 [0.115;0.557] |
| Retrospective | 0.553[0.340;0.857] | 0.766739[0.539;1.072] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table X. Difference score (Young versus Old) of group-level point estimate of meta-d’/d’ | |
| Modality | Difference score |
| Visualisation | 0.071 |
| Prospective | 0.065 |
| Retrospective | 0.214 |
| Egocentric | 0.333 |
| Allocentric | 0.041 |

“Perspective-change”: Change.

Neural mechanisms supporting which support normally from own eye.

Visual process.

Can remember like encoded from own eye. Visual process.

And then there

Ylim: sit them.

Exact split between correct and incorrect.

Delete exact from results and methods.

More clear about t/test and correlation> bullet points.

Statistical measures: colour code, and same order as the graphs.

Cognitive sensitive: xlim> /1 and -2 and make bigger.

First paragraph of findings: remember the way you encode it likely to include greater metacog awareness.

May be due to older people employing observer at recall. E.g. 3. Reference.

Old and young different for the metacognitive efficiency.