Table 1: *Mean Recall Rates by Encoding Group*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Encoding Group | Forward | Backward | Symmetrical | Unrelated |
| JOL | 71.74 (5.33) | 35.61 (5.75) | 60.68 (5.93) | 13.41 (3.75) |
| JAM | 67.58 (6.74) | 36.36 (5.71) | 61.29 (6.42) | 14.68 (3.65) |
| Control | 55.16 (6.28) | 27.34 (6.13) | 46.41 (6.36) | 16.95 (4.24) |

Note: JOL *n* = 33, JAM *n* = 33, Control *n* = 32; parentheses denote 95% CI

**ANOVA Statistics:**

4 (Direction: Forward vs Backward vs Symmetrical vs Unrelated) X 3(Encoding Group: JOL vs JAM vs Control)

Main Effects and Interaction (All significant!)

Encoding: *F*(2, 95) = 3.90, *MSE* = 827.92, *ηp*2 = .06

Direction: *F*(3, 285) = 616.18, *MSE* = 81.46, *ηp*2 = .60

Interaction (Also significant!): *F*(6, 285) = 9.82, *MSE* = 81.46, *ηp*2 = .04

**Post-hoc t-tests**:

Will do these in greater detail when writing up the results, but for now just going to break down the interaction.

Forward pairs:

JAM and JOL didn’t differ; *t*(61) = 0.95, *p* = .35

JAM and Control differ; *t*(66) = 2.93, *p* = .02

JOL and Control differ; *t*(63) = 3.58, *p* < .001

Backward Pairs:

JAM and JOL didn’t differ; *t*(64) = 0.18, *p* = .86

JAM and Control differ; *t*(63) = 2.11, *p* = .03

JOL and Control are marginal; *t*(62) = 1.93, *p* = .06

Symmetrical Pairs:

JAM and JOL didn’t differ; *t*(64) = 0.14, *p* = .89

JAM and Control differ; *t*(66) = 2.73, *p* = .01

JOL and Control differ; *t*(64) = 2.70, *p* = .01

Unrelated Pairs:

JAM and JOL didn’t differ; *t*(64) = 0.28, *p* = .78

JAM and Control didn’t differ; *t*(54) = 1.51, *p* = .14

JOL and Control didn’t differ; *t*(55) = 1.70, *p* = .09