Participants and design

Undergraduate and graduate phonetics and psychology students (80.8% female, median age = 21, IQR = 3, range = [18, 31], total $N = 207$) from the University of Zagreb participated in the study in exchange for course credit. Participants were randomly assigned to one of five groups which differed in the type of activity they engaged in between parts of the text they have read and in whether they received feedback on their intermittent test achievement or not.

Materials and procedure

Materials

Participants read a text on the evolution, ecological and biological characteristics of weeds. The text was taken from a chapter in a Croatian university-level textbook. Some sentences and passages were slightly modified, so as to avoid odd language constructions; Latin plant names were translated to Croatian, and some plants were removed from the text to make it less difficult for the target participant population. The text was divided into three parts of 874, 754, and 835 words, respectively. Additionally, there was a practice text taken from the same chapter, but unrelated to any of the other three parts of the text (768 words).

Forty-four content related questions with four response options were generated from the presented texts. 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 (a) two distractors were plausible, but unrelated to the text, and (b) one distractor was a term or concept mentioned in the previous part of the text — this was considered to be the "intrusive" option. 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.

At the beginning of the session, participants' ID, age and sex information was collected. At the end of the session, participants were asked to estimate how much of each text they have read. The texts and questions were presented on a personal computer, in an application constructed using the

Figure 1. A flowchart depicting the experimental procedure.

open source *oTree* framework (version 2.1.35, Chen, Schonger, & Wickens, 2016) for the *Python* programming language (version 3.6.4, October 20, 2018).

Procedure

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 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. A flowchart for the experiment is displayed in Figure 1.

After entering their personal information, participants were presented with instructions for their first task, which was to read the practice text at a speed that comes naturally to them. They were to click a button at the bottom of the text when they have finished reading it. 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 rereading group reread the practice text (this time with the time limit applied), the general knowledge test group answered four general knowledge questions, and the content related test group answered four questions based on the practice text.

Subjects in the rereading and general knowledge conditions also answered the four questions related to the practice text, so as to familiarise themselves with the scope and specificity level of the

questions they will receive after reading the final text. All participants were told that there would be a cumulative test after the final text, examining their knowledge of the three texts following the practice text. In reality, the final test examined only the knowledge of the final text.

Participants assigned to the feedback condition also received feedback on their practice test achievement. 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 to the next text. By setting this cooldown period, by emphasising that there would be a cumulative test, and 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 text.

After the practice round, participants proceeded to the main texts, engaging in the interpolated activities they were assigned. Depending on the condition they were assigned to, they also received feedback after every interpolated test, except for the last one. After the third text, all participants were presented with twenty questions examining their knowledge of the third text. 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.

Results

Exclusion criteria

Prior to analysing the data, we have excluded participants based on a priori set criteria. Participants who have spent less than or equal to 90 seconds on the practice text were excluded (1 exclusion). Further, we wanted to exclude participants who have had no correct answers on the final test (0 exclusions). Finally, we have excluded participants who have stated that they have reading deficits (3 exclusions). This left us with a total sample of 203 participants. The descriptives for the sample are shown in Table 1. There is another set of exclusion criteria based on the number of times the participants have read each of the three texts. These are used in robustness check analyses (see supplementary materials).

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the DVs broken down by experimental condition.

Measure	Condition	n	M	SE_M	SD	min	max
Total correct	Content, feedback	41	13.22	0.508	3.25	2	19
	Content, no feedback	42	12.79	0.465	3.02	7	19
	General, feedback	40	10.97	0.533	3.37	1	17
	General, no feedback	40	10.47	0.449	2.84	5	16
	Rereading	40	10.88	0.443	2.80	4	17
Total intrusors	Content, feedback	41	3.15	0.258	1.65	0	7
	Content, no feedback	42	3.38	0.257	1.67	0	7
	General, feedback	40	4.17	0.318	2.01	0	8
	General, no feedback	40	4.58	0.288	1.82	1	9
	Rereading	40	4.62	0.350	2.21	1	10

Interpolated activity effect

Our first two hypotheses are concerned with the effects of different interpolated activities on the total number of correct answers and total number of intrusive distractors chosen. To test these hypotheses, we have focused only on the groups which have not received feedback ($n = 122$). This was done because there was no feedback option for the rereading group, and we did not want to treat the feedback and no-feedback general-knowledge and content-related testing groups as equivalent without strong evidence supporting that assumption. We conducted a one-way MANOVA with interpolated activity as the independent variable and the total number of correct and intrusive options chosen as dependent variables. The correlation between our DVs calculated on the whole sample is r = -.707 (95% CI: [-.77, -.63], $p < .0001$).

Pillai's V for the analysis is .126, $p = .004$ (Wilks' $\Lambda = .875$, $p = .003$). The effect size, calculated as $\omega^2_{mult} = .109$ (bootstrap median[1] = .132, BC_α 95% CI = [.012, .201]). To further inspect the relationship of the interpolated activities with our dependent variables, we have conducted a Roy-Bargmann stepdown analysis, as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2012; a linear discriminant analysis with the same aim is available in the supplementary materials). The total number of correct answers was a priori chosen to be the higher priority variable. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2012), the higher priority variable can be chosen based on theoretical or practical grounds. Since,

---

[1]All bootstrap estimates taken from 10000 replications.

the total number of correct answers is the criterion that determines a student's success in a testing context, we have chosen this dependent variable as the higher priority one. Therefore, we first conducted an ANOVA with interpolated activity type as the independent variable and the total number of correct answers as the dependent variable.

As could be expected, the ANOVA points to an interpolated activity effect, with $F(2, 119) = 7.541$, $p = .001$. Following the ANOVA, we conducted an ANCOVA, with the total number of correct answers as the covariate, and the total number of intrusors as the dependent variable. The results imply a main effect of the total number of correct answers ($F(1, 118) = 79.674$, $p < .0001$), but after taking into account the number of correct answers, there is no evidence for an effect of interpolated activity on the total number of chosen intrusors ($F(2, 118) = 0.844$, $p = .433$). For now, we may claim that we do not have any evidence to support our second hypothesis that the type of interpolated activity will have an effect on the number of intrusors.

In order to test our first hypothesis, we have contrasted (i) the rereading group with the two test groups, and (ii) the two test groups with each other, taking only the total number of correct answers as the DV. The first contrast finds no evidence of a difference between the rereading group and the two test groups ($t = 1.355$, $p = .178$, $g_s = 0.19$, 95% CI = [-0.19, 0.57], Cohen's $U_{3,g_s} = 57.6\%$, probability of superiority = 55.39%). However, there is a difference between the two test groups ($t = 3.62$, $p = .0004$, $g_s = 0.66$, 95% CI = [0.21, 1.1], Cohen's $U_{3,g_s} = 74.43\%$, probability of superiority = 67.88%). Participants in the content related test group scored higher on the final test than participants in the general knowledge test condition. These two findings are not in line with our predictions.

The interaction between feedback and interpolated activity type

The remaining hypotheses deal with the effect of feedback on the total number of correct answers and the total number of intrusors. Therefore, these analyses are carried out only on the data from participants in the general and content related test conditions ($n = 163$). To test these hypotheses, we first conducted a two-way MANOVA with interpolated activity and feedback as independent variables, and total number of correct answers and total number of intrusors as the dependent variables.

Pillai's V for the interpolated activity effect (calculated with type III sums of squares) is .071, $p = .003$ (Wilks' $\Lambda = .929$, $p = .003$) confirming the main effect of interpolated activity type. The effect size $\omega^2_{mult} = .065$ (bootstrap median $= .072$, BC_α 95% CI $= [.007, .139]$).

On the other hand, we find no evidence for an effect of giving feedback on the linear combination of our two dependent variables — Pillai's V $= .003$, $p = .800$ (Wilks' $\Lambda = .997$, $p = .800$). The effect size is $\omega^2_{mult} = $ -.003 (bootstrap median $= .003$[2]).

Furthermore, we find no evidence for an interaction effect between activity type and feedback — Pillai's V $= .001$, $p = .941$ (Wilks' $\Lambda = .999$, $p = .941$). The effect size $\omega^2_{mult} = $ -.005 (bootstrap median $= .003$[3]). Both the feedback and the interaction estimates of ω^2_{mult} are to be considered to be zero, given their negative values.

Again, we have conducted a follow-up Roy-Bargmann stepdown analysis. In the ANOVA model with the total number of correct answers as the dependent variable and the type of interpolated activity, feedback and their interaction as predictors, only the type of activity seems to be relevant ($F(1, 159) = 11.2, p = .001$). This result also shows that participants in the content related test condition scored higher on the final test than the participants in the general knowledge test condition, which should be no surprise given the results of the first stepdown analysis. In the second step, we fit an ANCOVA model with the total number of correct answers as the covariate. In this model, the type of interpolated activity ceases to be a relevant predictor ($F(1, 155) = 0.175, p = .676$). The full models are shown in Table 2.

Additional analyses

Because it is theoretically interesting to see whether there is evidence for no difference between certain conditions, or no effect of certain manipulations, we have conducted a Bayesian reanalysis of the two Roy-Bargmann stepdown procedures. Since these analyses were not planned, we have decided to use the default priors provided in the *BayesFactor* (Morey & Rouder, 2018) package.[4]

---

[2]The BC_α 95% CI for this estimate is $[-.006, .004]$.

[3]The BC_α 95% CI $= [-.006, -.005]$. Our guess is that this odd result is due to the fact that most of the density is concentrated around 0, causing an unreliable estimate. The same could be said for the CI in footnote 2.

[4]All posteriors obtained from 6000 simulations.

Table 2

ANOVA and ANCOVA models for the second Roy-Bargmann procedure.

Term	SS	df	F	p
ANOVA				
Activity	109.393	1	11.200	.001
Feedback	3.904	1	0.400	.528
Activity x Feedback	0.045	1	0.005	.946
Residuals	1553.046	159		
ANCOVA				
Activity	0.301	1	0.175	.676
Feedback	0.173	1	0.100	.752
Total correct	63.216	1	36.760	< .0001
Activity x Feedback	0.813	1	0.473	.493
Activity x Total correct	0.862	1	0.501	.480
Feedback x Total correct	0.130	1	0.075	.784
Activity x Feedback x Total correct	1.229	1	0.715	.399
Residuals	266.551	155		

Bayesian reanalysis of the first Roy-Bargmann procedure

As was earlier done in a frequentist setting, we first fit an ANOVA model with the total number of correct answers as the dependent variable, and the type of interpolated activity as the predictor. The mean of the posterior intercept distribution is 11.381 (95% highest density interval (HDI) = [10.863, 11.888]). The estimated mean of the effect of content related testing is 1.254 (95% HDI = [0.553, 2.005]). The 95% highest density interval for the posterior indicates that there is a fair amount of uncertainty around the exact magnitude of the effect of content-related testing. However, most of the probability density is quite far above the null value, implying that we can be certain that there really is a positive effect (given the used priors, of course). The means of the posterior distributions for the general-knowledge-test and rereading conditions *b*s are -0.805 (95% HDI = [-1.549, -0.116]) and -0.449, (95% HDI = [-1.125, 0.257]) respectively. Most of the posterior distribution for the effect of general knowledge testing lies below the null value, although the distance is not as marked as in the content-related condition. On the other hand, there is a lot of uncertainty about the effect of rereading, compared to the other two estimates (89.8% of the posterior lies below 0).

Furthermore, we wanted to explore the difference between the rereading and general-knowledge-test conditions, given their somewhat similar coefficient and HDI estimates. To do this, we conducted

a Bayesian t-test, again with the *BayesFactor* package's default priors. The estimated posterior mean of the difference in the total number of correct answers between the general-knowledge-test and rereading groups is -0.362 (95% HDI = [-1.49, 0.856]). As can be seen from the HDI, there is a lot of uncertainty around the estimate of the difference. This points to a lack of evidence either for or against a difference between the two conditions.

In the second step of the Roy-Bargmann procedure, we fit an ANCOVA model with the total number of correct answers as the covariate and the total number of intrusive options chosen as the dependent variable. The mean of the posterior intercept distribution is 4.193 (95% HDI = [3.92, 4.473]). There is uncertainty around the estimates of the effects of the different experimental conditions — content related testing b = -0.214 (95% HDI = [-0.583, 0.146]), general-knowledge testing b = 0.072 (95% HDI = [-0.288, 0.424]), rereading b = 0.142 (95% HDI = [-0.216, 0.494]). The HDIs show that the effects could be either slightly positive (decreasing the number of intrusors) or slightly negative (increasing the number of intrusors), preventing us from making a conclusion about the nature of the effects. However, given the current data and priors, we find the following — 87.433% of the posterior for the effect of content related testing falls below zero; 65.567% of the posterior for the effect of general knowledge testing falls above zero; 77.683% of the posterior for the effect of rereading falls above zero. Given the stated, there is some evidence implying that content related testing decreases the number of intrusors chosen, after controlling for the effect of the total number of correct answers. Further, there is some, albeit weaker evidence that rereading leads to an increase in the number of chosen intrusive distractors. Lastly, the posterior of the general knowledge testing effect points to no particular direction.

Bayesian reanalysis of the second Roy-Bargmann procedure

In the second Roy-Bargmann analysis, we wanted to test whether there is an effect of the type of interpolated activity, receiving feedback, and their interaction on the total number of correct answers and chosen intrusors. Again, we first fit an ANOVA model with the two predictors and the total number of correct answers as the dependent variable.

The mean of the posterior distribution of the intercept is 11.868 (95% HDI = [11.39, 12.35]). We find that being in the content-related-testing condition leads to an increase in the total number

of correct answers, $b = 1.086$ (95% HDI = [0.589, 1.559]), compared to the general-knowledge-testing condition. This is aligned with the finding obtained in the frequentist setting. The mean of the posterior for the effect of receiving feedback is 0.218 (95% HDI = [-0.251, 0.679]). The HDI around the estimate prevents us from making any relevant conclusions regarding the effect of receiving feedback. However, we will mention that 82.25% of the posterior lies above zero. Finally, the estimate for the interaction effect (being in the content condition and receiving feedback) is -0.013 (95% HDI = [-0.46, 0.432]). This could point to there not being a relevant interaction effect. According to the collected data and the priors, we could claim that the effect is practically equivalent to zero if we were not interested in a half-point increase or decrease in the average scores (i.e. defining a region of practical equivalence (ROPE) between [-0.5, 0.5]). However, greater precision, which would require further data collection, is desired.

We continue with the ANCOVA model, taking the total number of correct answers as the covariate. The estimate of the model intercept is 3.821 (95% HDI = [3.6, 4.03]). The estimate for the effect of content related testing on the total number of intrusive distractors chosen is $b = $ -0.118 (95% HDI = [-0.325, 0.092]), compared to general knowledge testing. There is some evidence for a slight decrease in the number of intrusive distractors chosen in the content related testing condition. However, an increase is also possible, but less likely and negligibly small. The estimate for the effect of receiving feedback is -0.091 (95% HDI = [-0.302, 0.121]). Although the mean of the posterior is close to zero, the lower bound of the HDI shows that values which may be considered non-negligible are still somewhat probable. Therefore, we shall refrain from making a judgement regarding the effect of feedback on choosing intrusive distractors. Finally, the estimate of the interaction effect is $b = 0.047$ (95% HDI = [-0.153, 0.244]). The mean of the posterior is close to zero, and we could declare the effect to be practically equivalent to zero with a ROPE of approximately [-0.25, 0.25].

As previously stated, all these analyses were not planned a priori. This warrants certain caveats. The *BayesFactor* package's default priors were used. The appropriateness of these priors should certainly be questioned. However, we have decided to use them because we did not want to choose priors after already seeing the data. Further, the statements about effects made in this section are noncommittal. Whether a 0.5 increase or decrease in the total number of correct answers is practically equivalent to zero or not is left to the reader. We conclude by reminding the reader that

the data is available online, at [URL].

Notes

Analyses conducted using the *R* language (R Core Team, 2019). Plots created using *ggplot2* (Wickham, 2016). Bootstrap conducted using the *boot* package (Canty & Ripley, 2017). Methods and analyses written using *rmarkdown* (Allaire et al., 2019) and *knitr* (Xie, 2019). The package *car* (Fox & Weisberg, 2011) was used to obtain type III sums of squares. *compute.es* (Re, 2013) was used to obtain effect sizes for contrasts. *kableExtra* was used to help generate tables (Zhu, 2019). Other utilities used are *tidyverse* (Wickham, 2017), *magrittr* (Bache & Wickham, 2014), *here* (Müller, 2017), *conflicted* (Wickham, 2018), *psych* (Revelle, 2018). Highest density intervals obtained using *HDInterval* (Meredith & Kruschke, 2018).

References

Allaire, J. J., Xie, Y., McPherson, J., Luraschi, J., Ushey, K., Atkins, A., . . . Iannone, R. (2019). *rmarkdown: Dynamic Documents for R.* Retrieved from `https://rmarkdown.rstudio.com`

Bache, S. M., & Wickham, H. (2014). *magrittr: A Forward-Pipe Operator for R.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magrittr`

Canty, A., & Ripley, B. D. (2017). *boot: Bootstrap R (S-Plus) Functions.*

Chen, D. L., Schonger, M., & Wickens, C. (2016). oTree—An open-source platform for laboratory, online, and field experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, *9*, 88–97.

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2011). *An R Companion to Applied Regression* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Retrieved from `http://socserv.socsci.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion`

Meredith, M., & Kruschke, J. (2018). *HDInterval: Highest (Posterior) Density Intervals.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HDInterval`

Morey, R. D., & Rouder, J. N. (2018). *BayesFactor: Computation of Bayes Factors for Common Designs.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BayesFactor`

Müller, K. (2017). *here: A Simpler Way to Find Your Files.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here`

R Core Team. (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from `https://www.R-project.org/`

Re, A. C. D. (2013). *compute.es: Compute Effect Sizes.* Retrieved from `http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/compute.es`

Revelle, W. (2018). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research.* Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych`

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using Multivariate Statistics.* Pearson.

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis.* Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from `http://ggplot2.org`

Wickham, H. (2017). *tidyverse: Easily Install and Load the 'Tidyverse'.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse`

Wickham, H. (2018). *conflicted: An Alternative Conflict Resolution Strategy.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=conflicted`

Xie, Y. (2019). *knitr: A General-Purpose Package for Dynamic Report Generation in R.* Retrieved from `https://yihui.name/knitr/`

Zhu, H. (2019). *kableExtra: Construct Complex Table with 'kable' and Pipe Syntax.* Retrieved from `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra`