
Untitled

# Exp 1


## Test1

### Accuracy



Except for those that did the very subtle test, all subjects had lower accuracy for the non predictive vs the predictive targets. However, there are no significant effects: *similarity* : *F*(2, 87) = 0.87, *p* = .425, = .02, BF10 = 0.17 ± 0.87%; *predictiveness*: *F*(1, 87) = 0.23, *p* = .635, < .01, BF10 = 0.18 ± 1.1%; *similarity x predictiveness*: *F*(2, 87) = 1.72, *p* = .185, = .04, BF10 = 0.17 ± 0.87%.


###Just correct ratings



In this first test, there was a significant effect of the predictiveness, *F*(1, 82) = 4.70, *p* = .033, = .05, BF10 = 1.13 ± 0.76%, but not of the *similarity*, *F*(2, 82) = 0.86, *p* = .428, = .02, BF10 = 0.25 ± 0.48%, nor of the *similarity x predictiveness* interaction, *F*(2, 82) = 0.43, *p* = .653, = .01, BF10 = 0.25 ± 0.48%.


##Test2

### Accuracy



There are no significant differences due to any effect or interaction in accuracy in the second test, Except for those that did the very subtle test, all subjects had lower accuracy for the non predictive vs the predictive targets. However, there are no significant effects: *similarity* : *F*(2, 87) = 0.05, *p* = .949, < .01, BF10 = 0.09 ± 0.46%; *predictiveness*: *F*(1, 87) = 1.02, *p* = .314, = .01, BF10 = 0.24 ± 2.13%; *congruence*: *F*(1, 87) = 0.07, *p* = .787, < .01, BF10 = 0.12 ± 2.6%; *similarity x predictiveness*: *F*(2, 87) = 0.30, *p* = .739, < .01, BF10 = 0.09 ± 6.93%; *predictiveness x congruence*: *F*(1, 87) = 0.09, *p* = .760, < .01, BF10 = 0.16 ± 2.94%; *similarity x congruence*: *F*(2, 87) = 1.23, *p* = .298, = .03, BF10 = 0.1 ± 2.82%; *similarity x predictiveness x congruence*: *F*(2, 87) = 0.07, *p* = .929, < .01, BF10 = 0.11 ± 5.48%.

###Just correct ratings



When the confidence ratings for the correct options were analysed, there was a clear effect of predictiveness, *predictiveness*: *F*(1, 82) = 18.76, *p* < .001, = .19, BF10 = 52736 ± 1.28%. The rest of the main effects and interactions were not significant: *similarity* : *F*(2, 82) = 0.50, *p* = .606, = .01, BF10 = 0.29 ± 3.32%; ; *congruence*: *F*(1, 82) = 0.22, *p* = .643, < .01, BF10 = 0.12 ± 3.61%; *similarity x predictiveness*: *F*(2, 82) = 1.60, *p* = .208, = .04, BF10 = 0.48 ± 6.47%; *predictiveness x congruence*: *F*(1, 82) = 2.33, *p* = .131, = .03, BF10 = 0.39 ± 14.04%; *similarity x congruence*: *F*(2, 82) = 0.73, *p* = .483, = .02, BF10 = 0.08 ± 7.33%; *similarity x predictiveness x congruence*: *F*(2, 82) = 0.38, *p* = .688, < .01, BF10 = 0.11 ± 19.89%

#### Group Low

No significant effects or interactions were found in group Low similarity: *predictiveness*, *F*(1, 27) = 2.55, *p* = .122, = .09, BF10 = 1.29 ± 0.94%, nor of *congruence*, *F*(1, 27) = 0.67, *p* = .420, = .02, BF10 = 0.2 ± 1.02% and no interaction, , BF10 = 0.24 ± 4.23%.

#### Group Medium


For group Medium, there was also no effect of *predictiveness*: *F*(1, 27) = 3.42, *p* = .075, = .11, BF10 = 1.39 ± 0.81%, *congruence*: *F*(1, 27) = 0.61, *p* = .443, = .02, BF10 = 0.21 ± 1.53%, and no interaction *group x predictiveness*: , BF10 = 0.37 ± 2.86%).

#### Group High

For group High there was a significant effect of *predictiveness*, *F*(1, 28) = 18.32, *p* < .001, = .40, BF10 = 23018.92 ± 1%, and an effect of the *predictiveness x congruence*, *F*(1, 28) = 4.47, *p* = .044, = .14, BF10 = 0.82 ± 9.21%, but no main effect of *congruence*, *F*(1, 28) = 0.44, *p* = .513, = .02, BF10 = 0.24 ± 3.88%. The main effect of predictiveness was significant in both the congruent, *F* (1, 28) = 16.961, *p* < .001, $\\eta^2\_p$ = .377, and incongruent trials, *F* (1, 28) = 9.490, *p* = .008, $\\eta^2\_p$ = .247. However, there was an effect of congruence in predictive trials, *F* (1, 28) = 7.457, *p* = .022, $\\eta^2\_p$ = .21, but not on the non-predictive trials, *F* (1, 28) = 0.654, *p* = .852, $\\eta^2\_p$ = .023.


# Exp 2

## Accuracy



There were no significant differences due to the main effect of *group*, *F*(1, 92) = 0.05, *p* = .831, < .01, BF10 = 0.2 ± 0.96%, nor of *predictiveness*: *F*(1, 92) = 2.86, *p* = .094, = .03, BF10 = 0.53 ± 1.03%, but there was a significant *group x predictiveness* interaction, *F*(1, 92) = 6.69, *p* = .011, = .07, BF10 = 4.57 ± 3.5%. There was a simple main effect of *predictiveness* in the Certain group, *F*(1, 45) = 6.537, *p* = 0.028, $\\eta^2\_p$ = 0.127, but not in the Uncertain group, *F*(1, 47) = 0.636, *p* = 0.858, $\\eta^2\_p$ = 0.013.


## Just correct ratings



There weas no significant effect of the *group*, *F*(1, 92) = 0.00, *p* = .949, < .01, BF10 = 0.33 ± 2.53%, nor *predictiveness*, *F*(1, 92) = 0.18, *p* = .673, < .01, BF10 = 0.17 ± 2.12%, neither of the *group x predictiveness* interaction, *F*(1, 92) = 3.56, *p* = .062, = .04, BF10 = 0.33 ± 2.53%. It is worth mentioning that the effect of the *group x predictiveness* interaction is very close to significance and that the bayesian evidence is anecdotal, but simple main effects were not significant.


# Exp 3

## Accuracy



There was a significant effect of *predictiveness*, *F*(1, 103) = 14.63, *p* < .001, = .12, BF10 = 52.13 ± 11.44%, and a significant main effect of *group*, *F*(2, 103) = 3.07, *p* = .051, = .06, BF10 = 1.08 ± 0.8%, but not of the *group x predictiveness* interaction, *F*(2, 103) = 2.49, *p* = .088, = .05, BF10 = 1.08 ± 0.8%. Bonferroni corrected post-hoc comparisons on the factor of group showed that group Uncertain differed significantly from the average of the Certain groups, *t*(73) = 3.269, *p* = .002, BF10 = 7.09 ± 0%, but memory scores for the two Certain groups did not differ the one from the other, *t*(73) = 0.097, *p* = 1, BF10 = 0.19 ± 0.04%, with the Bayesian evidence suggesting that memory performance was the same in these two groups. SME show diff in Certain Long, and marginally sig in Certain Short.

## Just correct ratings



There was a significant effect *predictiveness*, *F*(1, 103) = 14.51, *p* < .001, = .12, BF10 = 44.75 ± 8.06%, but no significant effect of the *group*, *F*(2, 103) = 0.81, *p* = .448, = .02, BF10 = 0.3 ± 1.66%, nor of the *group x predictiveness* interaction, *F*(2, 103) = 2.51, *p* = .086, = .05, BF10 = 0.69 ± 5.49%. A simple main effects analysis showed a significant effect of *predictiveness* on the Certain Long group, *F*(1, 31) = 9.89, *p* = 0.012, $\\eta^2\_p$ = 0.242, and on the Certain Short group, *F*(1, 33) = 4.739, *p* = 0.111, $\\eta^2\_p$ = 0.126, but not on the Uncertain group, *F*(1, 39) = 0.532, *p* = 1, $\\eta^2\_p$ = 0.013.