**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 unrelated pairs presented in the control group (-.01) and presented in large font (.27; *t*(78) = 1.87, *SEM* = 0.07, *p* = 0.06, *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 ≤ xx, *p*s ≥ .50, *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.

**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, [STATS]. A significant main effect of pair direction, however, was detected [STATS]. Post-hoc testing [EXPAND]. Finally, the interaction between Highlight and Pair Type was significant, [STATS], though post-hoc testing [EXPAND].

Next, we compared changes in resolution for highlighted and non-highlighted pairs in the highlight group to pairs in the control group. Starting with highlighted pairs, no differences were detected as a function of Highlighting or Pair Type [STATS], and further, the interaction was non-significant [STATS]. Resolution of non-highlighted pairs similarly did not differ from control pairs as a function of Highlighting [STATS], however, collapsed across encoding group, a main effect of Pair Type was detected, such that [POST-HOCS]. However, the interaction between Highlighting and Pair Type was non-significant, [STATS]
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