**Is there a cuing effect in terms of reaction time?**

2x3 ANOVA: Cue Type (Exogenous vs Gaze) X Cue Validity (Valid vs Neutral vs Invalid)

* **Main effect of cue type:** *F*(1, 9) = 1.65, *p* = .231 > .05 (non-significant)
  + **Statistical interpretation:** Mean overall reaction times for gaze-cuing trials were not significantly different from mean overall reaction times for exogenous cuing trials.
  + **Practical interpretation:** Participants were just as fast to respond to exogenous and gaze cued trials.
* **Main effect of cue validity:** *F*(1.89, 17.00) = 17.25, *p* < .0001 (significant)
  + **Statistical nterpretation:** There is a significant difference between the mean reaction times of the valid, invalid, and neutral conditions (but we don’t know the direction of these differences until reading our planned contrasts).
  + **Planned contrasts (*t*-tests):**
    - Valid vs Invalid: *t*(9) = -4.80, *p* = .0019 < .05 (significant)
      * Interpretation: Valid trials had significantly faster reaction times than invalid trials.
    - Valid vs Neutral: *t*(9) = -5.099, *p* = .0019 < .05 (significant)
      * Interpretation: Valid trials had significantly faster reaction times than neutral trials.
    - Invalid vs Neutral: *t*(9) = .612, *p* = .556 > .05 (non-significant).
      * Interpretation: Invalid trials did not have signficiantly different reaction times from neutral trials.
  + **Overall statistical interpretation:** There was a significant cuing effect, such that valid trials were significantly faster than invalid trials and neutral trials, but there was no difference between invalid and neutral trials.
  + Practical interpretation: When
* **Interaction of cue type and cue validity:** *F*(1.98, 17.78) = 6.68, *p* = .007 < .05 (significant)
  + **Statistical interpretation:** The size of the cuing effect was different between gaze and exogenous cues, but we’re not sure how yet without doing the planned contrasts.
  + **Planned contrasts (*t*-tests):**