Binghamton University

The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

Jozefowiez, Witnauer, Huang, Silverstein, Woltag, Chew, & Miller Associative interference and nonreinforcement in human contingency learning Supplementary material: Raw data, procedure details, and order of conditions

Psychology

2023

Associative interference and nonreinforcement in human contingency learning

Jérémie Jozefowiez
Université de Lille, jeremie.jozefowiez@univ-lille.fr

James E. Witnauer
State University of New York College at Brockport

Jovin Huang
Binghamton University--SUNY

Jared W. Silverstein
Binghamton University--SUNY

Samuel Woltag
Binghamton University--SUNY

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/jwhswcm_rawdata
See next page for additional authors

Recommended Citation

Authors

Jérémie Jozefowiez, James E. Witnauer, Jovin Huang, Jared W. Silverstein, Samuel Woltag, Sarah J. Chew, and Ralph Miller

Comparing Associative Interspersed Interference with Proactive and Retroactive Interference

Jozefowiez, Witnauer, Huang, Silverstein, Woltag, Chew, & Miller

Supplemental Materials: Readme

Experiment 1:

The accompanying Excel file labeled 'Experiment 1'" reports the data gathered in Experiment 1. For this experiment, Subject refers to the subject identification provided by the two recruiting platforms: SONA for SUNY-Binghamton students and MTURK for Amazon MTurk workers. 'Pool' then identifies which of these two recruitment platforms each participant was recruited from. The column labeled "Include" identifies participants who did not meet the learning criterion with a "0" as well as accompanying red text for why the data that were rejected. Experiment 1 was composed of an initial Warmup condition, followed by four experimental conditions (Control, Proactive, Interspersed, and Retroactive), as well as 5 'dummy' conditions, all of which are labeled at the top of the spreadsheet as 'WarmUp,' 'Proactive,' 'Interspersed,' 'Retroactive,' 'Dummy1-HLL,' 'Dummy2-LHL,' 'Dummy3-LLH,' 'Dummy4-HHL,' and 'Dummy5-LLL.' At the end of the stream, participants judged the contingency ratings between A and O1, C and O3, and E and O5, using an 11-point Likert scale (0-100 in steps of 10). As such, under each labeled condition section in the spreadsheet are the three labeled contingencies that were judged for each stream (labeled cues A, C, and E).

Experiment 2:

The accompanying Excel files labeled "Experiment 2" report the data gathered In Experiment 2. As in Experiment 1, 'Subject' refers to the subject identification provided by SONA while 'Pool' refers to the recruitment platform participants were recruited from, with Experiment 2 using only SONA. In Experiment 2, participants were presented with 8 blocks of eight streams: Control Negative, Control Positive, Interspersed Negative, Interspersed Positive, Proactive Negative, Proactive Positive, Retroactive Negative, and Retroactive Positive. In the spreadsheet, these are labelled Ctr-Neg, Ctr-Pos, Inter-Neg, Inter-Pos, Pro-Neg, Pro-Pos, Retro-Neg, and Retro-Pos, respectively. Reading the spreadsheet from left to right, after each labeled block (E.g., Ctr-Neg), are the eight ratings received from each participant for the block that the ratings follow, as measured on an 11-point Likert scale (0-100 in steps of 10). Following the eight ratings for each of the eight blocks, the averages of these ratings are found in the columns labeled by their respective blocks. As participants were asked to rate the X-O1, Y-O3, and Z-O4 contingencies at the end of the streams, there are three separate spreadsheets, one for each of these contingencies and they are labeled 'X-O1,' 'Y-O3,' and 'Z-O4.'