**Experiment 1A**

We assessed whether JOL resolution differed as a function of encoding manipulation and pair direction. Following the design of our primary analyses, we first compared changes in resolution between participants in the font-size group before comparing both large and small font pairs to the control group. Starting with font-size group, a 2(Font Size: Large vs. Small) × 4(Pair Type: Forward vs. Backward vs. Symmetrical vs. Unrelated) within-subject ANOVA revealed no differences in resolution as a function of Font-Size or Pair Type *F*s< 1, *p*BICs≥ .83, nor was the interaction significant, *F*(3, 165) = 1.08, *MSE* = 0.23, *p*BIC= .81.

We then compared changes in resolution for large and small font pairs relative to the control group. Starting with the comparison between large-font and control pairs, no main effects were detected *F*s≤ 1, *p*s ≥ .30, *p*BICs≥ .82. However, a significant interaction emerged between Font-Size and Pair Type, *F*(3, 189) = 1.26, *MSE* = 0.15, *p* = .04, *η*p2 = .04. Post-hoc testing, however, indicated that this interaction was driven by a marginal difference in resolution between large font unrelated pairs and control pairs (.27 vs. -.01 *t*(78) = 1.87, *SEM* = .07, *p* = .06, *p*BIC = .63). All other comparisons between large font and control pairs were non-significant, *t*s ≤ 1.23, *p*s ≥ .22, *p*BICs≥ .81.

Finally, for small font pairs compared to control pairs, resolution did not change as a function of Font-Size, *F*(1, 60) < 1, *p*BIC= .84. However, collapsed across encoding groups, resolution differed as a function of Pair Type, *F*(3, 180) = 3.80, *MSE* = 0.16, *η*p2 = .06. Resolution was greatest for symmetrical pairs (.26), followed by backward pairs (.22), forward pairs (.22), and lowest for unrelated pairs (.03). All comparisons were non-significant *t*s < 1, *p*BICs≥ .90, with the exception of the comparisons between unrelated pairs and each of three related pairs types *t*s ≥ 2.11, *p*s ≤ .04, *d*s ≥ 0.38. Finally, the interaction between Font-Size and Pair Type was non-significant, *F*(3, 180) = 1.03, *MSE* = 0.17, *p* = .38, *p*BIC = .82. Font-size did not affect JOL resolution.

**Experiment 1B**

We next assessed whether JOL resolution differed as a function of both the highlighting manipulation and pair direction in Experiment 1B. We first compared changes in resolution between participants in the highlight group before comparing both highlighted and non-highlighted pairs to the control group. Starting with the highlighting group, a 2(Highlighting: Highlight vs. No-Highlight) × 4(Pair Type: Forward vs. Backward vs. Symmetrical vs. Unrelated) within-subject ANOVA revealed no differences in resolution as a function of highlighting, *F*(1, 50) = 2.40, *MSE* = 0.18, *p* = .13, *p*BIC = .69. A significant main effect of pair direction, however, was detected *F*(3, 150) = 4.26, *MSE* = 0.18, *η*p2 = .08, as well as the interaction between Highlight and Pair Type, *F*(3, 150) = 4.25, *MSE* = 0.18, *η*p2 = .08. Follow up *t*-tests, however, revealed that this interaction was driven by differences in resolution between unrelated pairs that were highlighted and not highlighted (.26 vs. -.16), *t*(54) = 2.92, *SEM* = 0.15, *p* = .01, *d* = 0.80). All other comparisons were non-significant, *t*s < 1, *p*BICs≥ .87.

Next, we compared changes in resolution for highlighted and non-highlighted pairs relative to the control group. Starting with highlighted pairs, no differences were detected as a function of Highlighting or Pair Type, and the interaction was non-significant *F*s ≤ 3.18, *p*s ≥ .08, *p*BICs≥ .63. Resolution of non-highlighted pairs similarly did not differ from control pairs as a function of Highlighting, *F* < 1, *p*BIC = .88. However, collapsed across encoding group, a main effect of Pair Type was detected, *F*(3, 168) = 14.00, *MSE* = 0.13, *η*p2 = .20, though the interaction between Highlighting and Pair Type was non-significant, *F*(3, 168) = 2.09, *MSE* = 0.13, *p* = .10, *p*BIC = .73. Thus, like font-size, highlighting largely did not appear to affect JOL resolution.

**Experiment 2A**

Next, we assessed the effects of font-size on JOL resolution in Experiment 2A using only unrelated pairs. As with Experiment 1A, we first compared resolution between large and small font pairs for participants in the font-size group before separately comparing both large and small font pairs to the control group. Starting with the comparison between large and small font pairs, no differences in resolution were detected between small and large pairs (.37 vs. .31) , *t* < 1, *p*BIC = .84. Resolution did not differ between large and control pairs (.31 vs. .38) *t*(66) = 1.14, *SEM* = .07, *p* = .25, *p*BIC = .81, nor small and control pairs (.37 vs. .31), *t* < 1, *p*BIC = .89.

**Experiment 2B**

We then assessed the effects of highlighting on JOL resolution in Experiment 2B. Starting with the comparison between highlight and no-highlight pairs, no differences in resolution were detected between pairs that were highlighted and those that were not (.12 vs. .28), *t*(71) = 1.60, *SEM* = .10, *p* = .11, *p*BIC = .71. However, resolution for highlighted pairs was decreased relative to the control (.12 vs. .38), *t*(66) = 2.99, *SEM* = .09, *p* = .01, *d* = 0.71. Finally, no differences in resolution were detected between the no highlight and control pairs (.28 vs. .38), *t*(67) = 1.25, *SEM* = .08, *p* = .21 *p*BIC = .79.

**Experiment 3**

Finally, we assessed the effects of Sans Forgetica on resolution in Experiment 3. Starting with the comparison between Sans Forgetica and standard font pairs, no differences in resolution were detected between pairs (.33 vs .28, respectively; *t*(75) < 1, *SEM* = 0.09, *p* = 0.63, *p*BIC = .89). Furthermore, no differences in resolution were detected between Sans Forgetica pairs and the control group (.34) or standard font pairs and the control group, *t*s < 1, *p*BICs≥ .90.