

## Participants and design

Undergraduate and graduate phonetics and psychology students (80.8% female, median age = 21, range = [18, 31], total  $N = 207$ ) participated in the study in exchange for course credit. We employed a 2 (interpolated activity: episodic vs semantic recall)  $\times$  2 (feedback: given vs not given) between-subjects design. Rereading served as a comparison interpolated activity, which was given to an additional control group. In total, this amounts to five separate groups, to which the participants were randomly assigned.

## Materials and procedure

Participants read an expository text about weeds, drawn from a chapter in an university-level textbook. Some sentences and passages were slightly modified, so as to avoid odd language constructions; terms from the binomial nomenclature were translated, and, taking into account the characteristics of the target participant population, some plant names were removed from the text to make it more approachable. The text was divided into three interrelated parts (874, 754, and 835 words) constituting an integrated body of knowledge. Additionally, a practice text (768 words), not directly related to any of the other three parts, was taken from the same chapter. The materials were presented on a PC, in an application constructed using the open source *oTree* framework (version 2.1.35, ?) for the *Python* programming language (version 3.6.4, October 20, 2018).

For the interpolated activity, participants either (i) answered ten multiple choice questions related to the content of the part they have previously read (episodic recall, hereafter referred to as content-related testing), (ii) answered ten general knowledge multiple choice questions (semantic recall, hereafter referred to as general-knowledge testing) or (iii) reread the same part of the text they have previously read.

Further, we manipulated whether or not participants received feedback on their accomplishment on the interpolated tests. Feedback was presented on a separate screen which listed the questions, the participant's answers, and the correct answers in a tabular format. Incorrectly answered questions were highlighted in red, and correctly answered questions in green. After 40 seconds elapsed, a "Next" button appeared, allowing participants to proceed with reading the next part of the text. By setting this cooldown period, by emphasising that there would be a cumulative test, and by explicitly asking through written instructions, we wanted to encourage our participants to carefully examine the feedback. The feedback was presented for maximally 60 seconds, after which the application proceeded to the next part.

The general procedure is shown in Figure 1. Participants were first given a brief introduction to the study, and were encouraged to carefully read and follow the written instructions. Then, they were led




Figure 1. A flowchart depicting the experimental procedure.

to a computer which was running a fullscreen instance of the *oTree* application with a randomly chosen experimental condition. There, participants read the informed consent form and, in case there were no questions, started the experiment.

After entering their personal information, participants were presented with the instructions for their first task, which was to read the practice text at a speed that comes naturally to them. Unbeknownst to the participants, the time they took to read the practice text was recorded, and used as the basis for determining the reading time limits for the remaining texts. However, the lowest possible time limit was set to 5 minutes, and the longest to 8 minutes.

Next, participants were familiarised with the interpolated activity they were going to perform during the main part of the procedure. The content-related test group answered four questions based on the practice text, the general-knowledge test group answered four general knowledge questions, and the rereading group reread the practice text (this time with the time limit applied). Subjects in the rereading and general knowledge conditions also answered the four questions related to the practice text, in order to familiarise themselves with the scope and specificity level of the questions they will receive after reading the final text. All tests were self-paced and no time limit was applied. Participants assigned to the feedback condition also received feedback on their interpolated activity practice test achievement.

After the practice round, participants proceeded to the main part of the study, engaging in the interpolated activities they were assigned. Depending on the condition they were assigned to, they also received feedback after every interpolated test.

All participants were forewarned through initial instructions that there would be a cumulative test after the final part of the text, examining their knowledge of all three parts. In reality, the final test examined only the knowledge of the final part. Participants were presented with twenty novel questions examining their knowledge of that part. No feedback was presented after the final test, irrespective of the experimental condition. The computer recorded whether a participant correctly answered a question and whether the participant chose an intrusive distractor. This allowed us to compute our dependent variables — the total number of correct answers and the total number of intrusive distractors chosen.

In total, forty-four content related questions with four response options were generated from the presented parts of the text. Four questions were presented after the practice text, ten after each of the first two parts (only to the participants in the content related test condition), and twenty after the third part of the text (to all participants). Starting from the second ten-question-set, the distractor options were chosen so that

(i) two distractors were plausible, but unrelated to the text, and (ii) one distractor was a term or concept mentioned in the previous part of the text — this was considered to be the “intrusive” distractor (sometimes referred to as the “intruder” in the rest of this article). For example, a question in the final test was *The agricultural habitat on which a plant grows is called the...* The response options were (a) agrobiosphere (distractor, never mentioned in the text), (b) agrosphere (intrusive distractor, mentioned in the previous part of the text), (c) biotope (distractor), (d) agrobiotope (correct answer).

Further, twenty-four general knowledge questions were generated. These questions were presented to participants in the general-knowledge test condition, after the first two parts of the text and after the practice text. The questions spanned recent history, popular culture, and art (e.g. *Kurt Vonnegut’s famous anti-war novel is called...*).