**Mediated JOLs – Recognition Data Experiment 1 (USM & MSU), Experiment 2 (Prolific), and Experiment 3 (Prolific)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experiment | Encoding Group | Forward | Mediated | Unrelated | False Alarms |
| One | JOL | .80 (.04) | .83 (.03) | .74 (.04) | .17 (.03) |
|  | No-JOL | .65 (.05) | .71 (.05) | .64 (.05) | .30 (.04) |
| Two | JOL | .74 (.04) | .76 (.04) | .67 (.05) | .17 (.03) |
|  | No-JOL | .65 (.05) | .66 (.04) | .60 (.04) | .24 (.03) |
| Three | JOL | .75 (.04) | -- | .71 (.04) | .20 (.03) |
|  | No-JOL | .65 (.06) | -- | .63 (.05) | .25 (.04) |

*Note*: Parentheses display 95% CI; Experiment 1 *n* JOL = 63, *n* No-JOL = 62; Experiment 2 *n* JOL = 6, *n* No-JOL = 62; Experiment 3 n JOL = 61, n No-JOL = 59.

**Experiment 1 (Original)**

**Analysis: 3(Pair Type: F vs. M vs. U) x 2 (Encoding Group: JOL vs. No-JOL) mixed ANOVA**

Main Effect of Encoding Group: *F*(1, 123) = 22.15, *MSE* = .06, *η*p2 = .16

Main Effect of Pair Type: *F*(2, 246) = 16.84, *MSE* = 0.01, *η*p2 = .12

Interaction: *F*(2, 246) = 1.20, *MSE* = 0.01, *p* = .30, *p*BIC = .99

**Breaking down the interaction (Not significant, but we have positive reactivity on unrelated pairs, and I’d like to see what the *d* is)**

**Forward** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.80 vs. .65, *t*(123) = 4.77, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.88) Significant! (*p* < .001)

**Mediated** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.83 vs. .71, *t*(123) = 4.20, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.71) Significant! (*p* < .001)

**Unrelated** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.74 vs. .64, *t*(123) = 3.11, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.55) Significant! (*p* = .002)

**Comparison of false alarm rates**

JOL vs. No-JOL: (.17 vs. .30, *t*(123) = 5.30, *SEM* = 0.02, *d* = 0.95) Significant! (*p* < .001)

**Experiment 2 (Replication)**

**Analysis: 3(Pair Type: F vs. M vs. U) x 2 (Encoding Group: JOL vs. No-JOL) mixed ANOVA**

Main Effect of Encoding Group: *F*(1, 121) = 10.77, *MSE* = .06, *η*p2 = .08

Main Effect of Pair Type: *F*(2, 242) = 12.89, *MSE* = 0.02, *η*p2 = .10

Interaction: *F*(2, 242) = < 1, *MSE* = 0.01, *p* = .88, *p*BIC = .99

**Reactivity Comparisons**

**Forward** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.74 vs. .65, *t*(121) = 2.60, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.51) Significant! (*p* = .01)

**Mediated** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.76 vs. .66, *t*(121) = 3.07, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.59) Significant! (*p* = .002)

**Unrelated** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.67 vs. .60, *t*(121) = 2.41, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.39) Significant! (*p* = .02)

**Comparison of false alarm rates**

JOL vs. No-JOL: (.17 vs. .24, *t*(121) = 2.97, *SEM* = 0.02, *d* = 0.54) Significant! (*p* = .003)

**Experiment 3 (Myers Recognition Replication)**

**Analysis: 2(Pair Type: F vs. U) x 2 (Encoding Group: JOL vs. No-JOL) mixed ANOVA**

Main Effect of Encoding Group: *F*(1, 118) = 9.28, *MSE* = .06, *η*p2 = .07

Main Effect of Pair Type: *F*(1, 118) = 3.38, *MSE* = 0.01, *p* = .07, *p*BIC = .68

Interaction: *F*(1, 118) < 1, *MSE* = 0.01, *p* = .54, *p*BIC = .90

**Reactivity Patterns**

**Forward** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.75 vs. .65, *t*(118) = 2.95, *SEM* = 0.04, *d* = 0.61) Significant! (*p* = .004)

**Unrelated** – JOL vs. No-JOL: (.71 vs. .63, *t*(118) = 2.41, *SEM* = 0.03, *d* = 0.37) Significant! (*p* = .002)

**Comparison of false alarm rates**

JOL vs. No-JOL: (.20 vs. .25, *t*(118) = 1.82, *SEM* = 0.02) Marginal ( *p* = .07, *p*BIC = .67)