**Discussion**

In experiment 1, we have found that the episodic specificity induction reduces risk-taking compared to a control induction (see figure 2). This difference grows over time: While the episodic condition seems to be relatively consistent in risk-preferences over time, people in the control condition tend to progressively avoid risk more after making choices repeatedly. This seems to be at least due to the positive outcome being more salient for the episodic condition (see figure 4). However, risk-taking did not significantly change over time in the original study from Madan, Ludvig and Spetch (2013). Because of this, we wondered whether the difference between the two groups might have been due not to the episodic specificity induction but to the control induction (which still probes general impressions).

In experiment 2, we found that a baseline induction with no induction was much more like the episodic specificity condition than the control in terms of risk-preferences and in recall of the outcome most associated with risk (see figure 3 and 4). This suggests that the differences between both condition of experiment 1 was not due to the episodic specificity induction enhancing risk-taking, but to the control condition lowering risk-taking.

Why would this happen? When learning a task purely from experience, the only information we have are previous outcomes and we are forced to rely on our memory of these outcomes. One possibility is that learning choices from experience already requires and induces episodic memory, and the episodic specificity induction could not enhance the use of episodic memory beyond that point. However, even though the control induction was meant as a control, it requires participants to recall information in a general manner. It is possible that doing so dampens the normal use of episodic retrieval or enhances semantic retrieval in learning from experience. This would be coherent with results by Madan et al. (2013), which were closer to the baseline and the episodic conditions than to the control condition.

Madore, Gaesser and Schacter (2014) have previously addressed this issue by showing that the episodic specificity induction increases the number of internal (episodic) details recalled but not the number of external (semantic) details even in a second control condition where participants had to solve mathematical problems. However, this second control group had a small sample size (N = 12) and there was no explicit comparison between the two control conditions to see whether these were significantly different from each other. The task we used measured something quite different (learning from experience) and it is also possible that the control induction interacted with our task but not theirs.