

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/68707/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Hanczakowski, Maciej , Zawadzka, Katarzyna and Macken, William John 2015. Continued effects of context reinstatement in recognition. *Memory and Cognition* 43 (5) , pp. 788-797. 10.3758/s13421-014-0502-2

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13421-014-0502-2>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Continued effects of context reinstatement in recognition

Journal:	<i>Memory & Cognition</i>
Manuscript ID:	MC-ORIG-14-188.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Hanczakowski, Maciej; Cardiff University, Psychology Zawadzka, Katarzyna; University of Southampton, Psychology Macken, William; Cardiff University, School of Psychology
Keywords:	context effects, recognition

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Continued effects of context reinstatement in recognition

Maciej Hanczakowski¹, Katarzyna Zawadzka², and Bill Macken¹

¹ Cardiff University, UK

² University of Southampton, UK

Running head: CONTINUED CONTEXT EFFECTS

Word count: 6464 (excluding references)

Author Notes

Maciej Hanczakowski, School of Psychology, Cardiff University, UK; Katarzyna Zawadzka, Psychology, University of Southampton, UK; Bill Macken, School of Psychology, Cardiff University, UK.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maciej Hanczakowski, School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Tower Building, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, United Kingdom, email: HanczakowskiM@cardiff.ac.uk, ph: +44 (0) 29 2087 5030.

Abstract

The context reinstatement effect refers to the enhanced memory performance found when the context information paired with a target item at study is re-presented at test. Here we investigated the consequences of the way context information is processed in such a setting that gives rise to its beneficial effect on item recognition memory. Specifically, we assessed whether reinstating context in a recognition test facilitates subsequent memory for this context beyond facilitation conferred by presentation of the same context with a different study item. Reinstating study context at test led to better accuracy in 2-alternative forced choice recognition for target faces than did re-pairing those faces with another context encountered during the study phase. The advantage for reinstated over re-paired conditions occurred for both within (Experiment 1) and between subjects (Experiment 2) manipulations. Critically, in a subsequent recognition test for the contexts themselves, contexts serving previously in the reinstated condition were recognized better than contexts serving previously in the re-paired context condition. This constitutes the first demonstration of continuous effects of context reinstatement for memory for context.

Keywords: Context effects, Recognition, Recollection

Continued effects of context reinstatement in recognition

When an item one tries to memorize occurs in a certain context, reinstating this particular context at the time of the test may enhance memory performance. Decades of research have documented that such an enhancement is readily observed when the memory test takes the shape of free recall (see Smith & Vela, 2001, for a review). However, the results are less consistent with respect to recognition. Although instances of improved recognition discrimination due to context reinstatement have been reported (e.g., Murnane, Phelps, & Malmberg, 1999; Rutherford, 2004), there are also numerous examples of studies in which reinstating study context at the time of a recognition test failed to enhance discrimination (e.g., Dodson & Shimamura, 2000; Hockley, Bancroft, & Bryant, 2012; Murnane & Phelps, 1993; 1995; Reder et al., 2013).

A recent comprehensive investigation into the context reinstatement effect in recognition (Hockley, 2008) demonstrated that a reinstated context is likely to aid discrimination only when study instructions emphasize interactive encoding of context and study items. Hockley compared item recognition across conditions using reinstated contexts and re-paired contexts taken from a different study item. Across five experiments, in which participants were not asked to attend to context information at encoding, item discrimination was the same in the reinstated and re-paired context conditions. By contrast, in the final experiment in which participants were asked to associate studied words with their picture backgrounds (contexts), reinstating pictures at the time of the recognition test reliably improved recognition discrimination as compared to presenting test items with re-paired picture backgrounds. These results remain consistent with an observation that the majority of studies documenting the context reinstatement effect employed instructions

1
2
3 which specifically aimed at facilitating the interactive encoding of items and their contexts
4
5 (e.g., Gruppuso, Lindsay, & Masson, 2007; Koen, Aly, Wang, & Yonelinas, 2013; but see
6
7 Macken, 2002, Russo, Ward, Geurts, & Sheres, 1999) or required intentional encoding of
8
9 both studied items and their contexts (Hanczakowski, Zawadzka, & Coote, 2014).
10
11

12
13 The observation that interactive encoding increases the likelihood of observing the
14
15 context reinstatement effect in recognition suggests that context is capable of augmenting
16
17 item recognition only when it is strongly integrated with this item. In this case, reinstating
18
19 context at test allows people to access a linked representation of both item and its context,
20
21 supporting the correct identification of the tested item as a target. In contrast, presenting
22
23 test items with re-paired contexts means that an integrated representation of an item and
24
25 the original study context of this item is relatively less likely to be accessed, and people
26
27 need to rely solely on memory for the item.
28
29
30
31

32
33 Evidence for the simultaneous memory access to both item and its context when
34
35 context is reinstated at test comes from studies analyzing the context reinstatement effect
36
37 from the perspective of dual-process models of recognition. Dual-process models postulate
38
39 that identification of a target in a recognition test may occur either by assessment of item
40
41 information only – a process termed familiarity – or by retrieval of context features
42
43 associated with an item – a process termed recollection (e.g., Mandler, 1980; Yonelinas,
44
45 1994; see Yonelinas, 2002, for a review). In this approach, memory access to both item and
46
47 context information should manifest as recollection of the test item and indeed studies of
48
49 context reinstatement have demonstrated that the benefits of reinstating context for item
50
51 memory, whenever they are observed, come by the recollective component of recognition.
52
53
54
55 Hockley (2008) and Macken (2002) demonstrated this by showing that the benefits of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context reinstatement are revealed in recognition decisions accompanied by ‘remember’
4
5 responses – a commonly used indicator of recollective access (but see Wixted & Stretch,
6
7 2004, for a different view). Furthermore, Reder et al. (2003) showed that benefits of context
8
9 reinstatement in recognition of famous faces are specific to conditions of low contextual
10
11 fan, when specific contexts are associated with a single item. Again, sensitivity to the fan
12
13 effect is a hallmark of recollective processes in recognition (Diana, Reder, Arndt, & Park,
14
15 2006), supporting the argument that reinstating context may augment item recognition by
16
17 facilitating recollective retrieval of both item and its context.
18
19
20
21
22

23 The studies on context-dependent recognition conducted thus far have been
24
25 preoccupied with delineating the conditions under which context is likely to affect
26
27 recognition decisions concerning the tested item, and the way in which the context
28
29 information itself is processed at retrieval has been inferred indirectly from its influence on
30
31 item recognition. However, the idea that context-dependent recognition boils down to
32
33 simultaneous access to integrated item and context information indicates that context
34
35 reinstatement may have important consequences not only for memory of the tested item
36
37 but also for the memory of the context itself. Specifically, it is possible that context
38
39 reinstatement may not only benefit item recognition but may also strengthen memory
40
41 representation of context more than processing of the same context with a different study
42
43 item (in the re-paired context condition). This idea comes from a growing body of research
44
45 concerning the consequences of retrieval from memory. A broad literature on a so-called
46
47 *testing effect* (e.g., Kornell, Bjork, & Garcia, 2011; Lehman, Smith, & Karpicke, 2014) shows
48
49 that the act of recollection is a particularly powerful way of strengthening memory
50
51 representations. Specifically, what the testing effect demonstrates is that retrieval is more
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 beneficial for memory than simply restudying the information. Thus, if memory information
4
5 for a reinstated context is retrieved alongside item information when context is reinstated,
6
7 then this could lead to better subsequent memory for this context compared to a condition
8
9 in which this context is presented again but not retrieved.
10
11

12
13 A second strand of evidence supporting the idea that context reinstatement may
14
15 affect memory for context via successful retrieval comes from the literature on reminding.
16
17 Recent studies show that when cue-target pairs of words are studied in one list and then a
18
19 second list is presented, in which the same cues are paired with different targets, retrieval
20
21 of an original target in response to the novel cue-target pair leads to strengthening of the
22
23 memory for this original target (e.g., Wahlheim & Jacoby, 2013; Wahlheim, Maddox, &
24
25 Jacoby, 2014; see also MacLeod, Pottruff, Forrin, & Masson, 2012, for related findings).
26
27 Thus, presenting cues for the second time leads to strengthening of memory for the original
28
29 targets for these cues, even under conditions under which participants are not explicitly
30
31 directed towards retrieval of these targets. This is related to the issue of context
32
33 reinstatement inasmuch as participants in the context reinstatement studies are also not
34
35 directed towards retrieval of context information. To the extent, however, to which covert
36
37 reminding of the original targets during study of related cue target-pairs is similar to covert
38
39 retrieval of memory for the reinstated context, this line of research also suggests that the
40
41 effects of context reinstatement may extend beyond facilitating item recognition to
42
43 augmenting long-term retention of context information.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The present study examined the effect of context reinstatement for subsequent
53
54 memory for context itself. We used the basic context reinstatement procedure based on our
55
56 previous study of this effect (Hanczakowski et al., 2014). Thus, participants first studied,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 under intentional encoding instructions, photographs of faces paired with contextual
4
5 photographs of landscapes. In a subsequent two-alternative forced-choice (2AFC)
6
7 recognition test, participants on each trial were presented with two faces, one studied and
8
9 one new, and were asked to indicate the studied face. A context photograph was presented
10
11 in the recognition test between the photographs of the faces. This context could be the
12
13 context photograph presented with the target face at study (the reinstated context
14
15 condition), a context photograph presented with a different face at study (the re-paired
16
17 context condition) or a context photograph not presented earlier (the novel context
18
19 condition). For the present investigation, the comparison of the reinstated and re-paired
20
21 context conditions is crucial. This comparison holds the number of presentations of contexts
22
23 equal and varies only their item pairing during the recognition test. Any difference in
24
25 recognition performance between the reinstated and re-paired conditions constitutes the
26
27 context reinstatement effect. The novel element of the procedure – a second recognition
28
29 test – was administered after the first test was over. In the second two-alternative
30
31 recognition test, participants' memory for contexts that previously served in the reinstated
32
33 and re-paired context conditions was assessed. Thus, contexts used in the reinstated and re-
34
35 paired context conditions of the first test were presented along with new contexts that
36
37 were not used in any of the previous phases of the experiment and participants were asked
38
39 to endorse the context that they had seen before. Since contexts appearing in both the re-
40
41 paired and reinstated test forms in the preceding recognition test will have been
42
43 encountered equally often during the procedure, any difference in their recognisability will
44
45 directly reveal the effects of context reinstatement on context memory.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the present study, we also supplemented the 2AFC tests with the requirement for
4 participants to provide confidence judgements and decide whether to volunteer or withhold
5 a response in recognition test. The primary motivation for these additional measures here is
6 to provide a more detailed picture of the influence of context information on performance
7 at the various stages of the procedure, since it has been shown elsewhere that effects of
8 context may emerge in metacognitive judgments even when they are absent on measures
9 of discrimination accuracy (Hanczakowski et al., 2014). We expected to replicate previous
10 results showing reliable effects of context reinstatement for recognition, at least in the
11 metamemory measures. We further assessed whether context reinstatement would
12 enhance subsequent recognition of contexts themselves. Experiment 1 used the same
13 design as Experiment 1 of Hanczakowski et al. (2014), i.e. with context conditions
14 manipulated within a single study-test list, with one exception of an additional second test
15 in which recognition for contexts used previously in the reinstated and re-paired context
16 conditions was tested. Experiment 2 investigated the same issues in a between-participants
17 design.

38 Experiment 1

42 Method

43 **Participants.** Forty-six undergraduates of Cardiff University participated for course
44 credit.

45 **Materials and design.** A set of 96 black-and-white photographs of male and female
46 faces (in equal proportions) was taken from the Psychological Image Collection at Stirling. A

1
2
3 novel set of 96 black-and-white context photographs depicting landscape, buildings, and
4
5 animals, was assembled from various Internet sources.
6
7

8
9 Faces were divided into two sets of 48 and each face was yoked with a face from the
10 other set as well as with a unique context photograph. At study, faces from one set
11 (counterbalanced across participants) were presented with their context photographs. The
12 first recognition test immediately followed the study list. All studied faces were presented
13 with yoked faces which served as foils in a recognition test. Three within-participants
14 context conditions, with 16 trials per condition, were included: reinstated (the studied face
15 re-presented with the same context at study), re-paired (using context photographs
16 presented with a different face), and novel (using 16 context photographs not yoked with
17 any faces and thus not presented at study). The assignment of faces to context conditions
18 was counterbalanced. The novel context condition was not crucial for the present study,
19 which focused on a comparison of reinstated and re-paired context conditions, but was
20 included in order to ascertain that the results of Hanczakowski et al. (2014) fully replicate
21 with the present set of materials.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 For the present study we adopted the testing procedure used in Hanczakowski et al.
41 (2014; see also Hanczakowski, Pasek, Zawadzka, & Mazzoni, 2013; Beaman, Hanczakowski,
42 & Jones, 2014). This testing procedure includes, apart from the usual 2AFC recognition test,
43 two additional steps that require participants to make metamemory decisions. Thus, each
44 trial of the test included three steps. In the free-report step, participants were presented
45 with two faces and the context photograph and three response options were available.
46
47 Participants could endorse the face on the left by pressing the 'a' key, endorse the face on
48 the right by pressing the 'l' key or respond 'don't know' (DK) by pressing the spacebar. In the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 immediately following forced-report step, which corresponds to the usual 2AFC recognition,
4
5 the same faces and context photographs were presented and only two response options
6
7 were available. Participants could only endorse the face on the left or the face on the right.
8
9 Finally, in the third step participants were asked to provide a confidence judgment in their
10
11 forced-report response on a scale 1 (guessing) to 6 (very sure). Three dependent measures
12
13 were derived from this procedure: the rate of DK responses in the free-report step, the hit
14
15 rate (accuracy) in the forced-report step, and the mean of confidence judgments. The three-
16
17 step testing procedure was used here because the results obtained by Hanczakowski et al.
18
19 (2014, Experiment 1) showed that metacognitive measures – the rate of DK responses in the
20
21 free-report test and the mean of confidence judgments – may be more sensitive to the
22
23 effects of context reinstatement than the measure of hit rates in the common 2AFC test.
24
25 Also, both the rate of DK responses and the mean of confidence judgments were examined
26
27 despite their conceptual similarity because these two measures were not always consistent
28
29 in the study of Hanczakowski et al. (see Experiment 2).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The first test of face recognition was immediately followed by a second recognition
38
39 test in which memory for context was probed. Thirty-two context photographs used in the
40
41 reinstated and re-paired context conditions were presented individually with 32 new
42
43 context photographs, not used in any of the previous phases of the experiment. The
44
45 procedure for the second test was the same as the procedure for the face recognition test,
46
47 with the same three steps of responding: free-report, forced-report and confidence
48
49 judgment.
50
51
52
53

54 **Procedure.** At study, 48 face-context compounds (with the face always presented on
55
56 the right of the context photograph) were presented individually for 5 s each. Participants
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were specifically asked to study both pictures for an unspecified memory test. In the first
4
5
6 test, two faces – a target and a foil – were presented on two sides of the screen (with equal
7
8 number of targets on both sides) and a context photograph was presented in between.
9
10 Participants were clearly instructed that their recognition decisions should concern faces
11
12 alone. The faces and contexts remained on screen throughout the free- and forced-report
13
14 steps but were removed during the confidence judgment step. The confidence judgment
15
16 was made on a 1 (guessing) - 6 (very confident) scale. Responses for each step were self-
17
18 paced. In the following recognition test for context, studied contexts and novel foils were
19
20 presented on two sides of the screen (with equal number of studied contexts on both sides)
21
22 and participants made the same three judgments as in the first recognition test.
23
24
25
26

27 **Results and discussion**

28
29
30 The descriptive statistics for the rates of DK responses, mean confidence judgements, and
31
32 forced-report recognition accuracy can be found in Table 1. We first analyzed performance
33
34 in the face recognition test across reinstated, re-paired and novel context conditions and
35
36 then we analyzed the aftereffects of processing context in the reinstated and re-paired
37
38 context conditions on subsequent context recognition.
39
40
41
42

43 *Face recognition.* The full analysis of face recognition results was conducted with a set of
44
45 one-way ANOVAs with three levels: reinstated, re-paired and novel context that looked at
46
47 the rate of DK responses for the free-report recognition, hit rates in forced-report
48
49 recognition, and the means of confidence judgments¹. All ANOVAs were significant, $F(2, 90)$
50
51 $= 14.39$, $MSE = .02$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .24$, for the rate of DK responses, $F(2, 90) = 11.14$, $MSE =$
52
53
54

55 ¹ Across the paper, we report the analyses of confidence judgments collapsed across correct and incorrect
56 responses in the preceding forced-report recognition step. The analyses of the mean of confidence judgments
57 only for trials for which a correct answer was given in forced-report recognition test produced the same
58 pattern of results in all tests for both experiments.
59
60

1
2
3 .02, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$, for the 2AFC recognition hit rates, and $F(2, 90) = 24.79$, $MSE = .31$, p
4
5
6 $< .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .36$, for the means of confidence judgments. We conducted planned
7
8 comparisons contrasting first novel and re-paired context conditions and then re-paired and
9
10 reinstated context conditions. The former comparison is not crucial for the purpose of the
11
12 study and serves mostly to replicate the full pattern reported in Hanczakowski et al. (2014).
13
14 The main focus here on the latter comparison which speaks directly to the presence or
15
16 absence of the context reinstatement effect.
17
18
19

20
21 The comparison of novel and re-paired context conditions in terms of metamemory
22
23 measures revealed that participants responded DK more often in the novel context than in
24
25 the re-paired context condition, $t(45) = 2.20$, $SE = .03$, $p = .03$, $d = 0.34$, and also that
26
27 participants were more confident in their forced-report recognition decisions in the re-
28
29 paired context than in the novel context condition, $t(45) = -2.86$, $SE = 0.09$, $p = .01$, $d = 0.41$.
30
31 By contrast, the comparison of the hit rates in forced-report recognition revealed no
32
33 difference between the conditions, $t(45) = 1.24$, $SE = .03$, $p = .22$, $d = 0.21$. This is the pattern
34
35 of results documented in Hanczakowski et al. (2014), which shows that familiar context
36
37 affect metamemory measures but not forced-report recognition performance, leading to a
38
39 confidence-accuracy dissociation.
40
41
42
43

44
45 The comparison of re-paired and reinstated context conditions in terms of
46
47 metamemory measures revealed that participants responded DK more often in the re-
48
49 paired context than in the reinstated context condition, $t(45) = 3.21$, $SE = .03$, $p = .002$, $d =$
50
51 0.49 , and also that participants were more confident in their forced-report recognition
52
53 decisions in the reinstated context than in the re-paired context condition, $t(45) = 4.45$, $SE =$
54
55 $.12$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.66$. Further, the comparison of the hit rates in forced-report recognition
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 revealed that discrimination was better in the reinstated context than re-paired context
4
5 condition, $t(45) = 3.26$, $SE = .03$, $p = .002$, $d = 0.49$. These results are broadly consistent with
6
7 the results reported by Hanczakowski et al. (2014), inasmuch as they show that context
8
9 reinstatement reliably affects face recognition performance in this setup. Although in our
10
11 previous investigation that used the same procedure (albeit with a different set of
12
13 materials) we found a reliable effect of context reinstatement only in metamemory
14
15 measures (see Experiment 1 in Hanczakowski et al., 2014), our other experiments found
16
17 such effects also in the measure of recognition discrimination (Experiments 2 and 3 in
18
19 Hanczakowski et al., 2014; see also Russo et al., 1999). To summarize, the present results
20
21 clearly demonstrate that reinstating context aids recognition performance.
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Context recognition.* The comparison of recognition performance for contexts previously
28
29 serving in the reinstated context and re-paired context conditions was also performed for
30
31 both metamemory measures and the measure of forced-report recognition hit rates. The
32
33 analyses of metamemory measures failed to demonstrate any differences between
34
35 conditions in either the measure of confidence or response withholding (DK), both $t_s < 1$. By
36
37 contrast, context recognition hit rates in the forced-report step were higher for contexts
38
39 that previously served in the reinstated context condition compared to contexts that
40
41 previously served in the re-paired context condition, $t(45) = 2.18$, $SE = .02$, $p = .034$, $d = 0.31$.
42
43 This result indicates that memory for context is augmented when this context serves in the
44
45 reinstated context condition, beyond strengthening resulting from a mere re-presentation
46
47 of context in the re-paired context condition. This observation remains consistent with the
48
49 hypothesis according to which reinstating context in a recognition test results in memory
50
51 access to the traces of both item and its context.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For exploratory purposes, we also analyzed performance in the context recognition
4 task conditionalized on performance on item recognition in the presence of the same
5 contexts. The descriptive statistics for this analysis can be found in Table 2. Thus, we divided
6 context recognition trials into sets of trials for which the tested context accompanied
7 successful and unsuccessful item recognition in the first test. Four participants were
8 excluded due to missing cells. A resulting 2 (context condition: reinstated vs. re-paired) x 2
9 (item recognition: successful vs. unsuccessful) ANOVA yielded a significant main effect of
10 context condition, $F(1, 41) = 4.28$, $MSE = .01$, $p = .045$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$, with generally higher
11 context recognition performance for context previously serving in the reinstated context
12 condition. The main effect of item recognition was also significant, $F(1, 41) = 4.44$, $MSE =$
13 $.01$, $p = .041$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$, with higher context recognition performance for context that
14 previously accompanied successful item recognition. The interaction was not significant, $F <$
15 1 . Interestingly, these results suggest that there may be a benefit of reinstating context for
16 context memory even when participants fail to capitalize on context reinstatement in terms
17 of item recognition performance. This, however, needs to be treated with caution as a
18 direct contrast between reinstated and re-paired contexts for which an incorrect item
19 recognition decision was made in the first test was not significant, $t(41) = 1.14$, $p = .26$.

20
21
22 Overall, the results of the present experiment point to clear benefits of context
23 reinstatement in recognition. Not only did reinstating context affect metamemory measures
24 by increasing confidence and reducing DK responding, but it also clearly augmented
25 recognition performance in the 2AFC test, a result which has often been elusive in the
26 recognition literature (e.g., Hockley, 2008; Reder et al., 2013). The novel contribution
27 provided here lies, however, in the examination of the consequences of reinstating a
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context for subsequent memory for this context. This analysis revealed that reinstated
4
5 contexts are subsequently remembered better than re-paired contexts. This result indicates
6
7 that memory access to representations of reinstated contexts strengthens these
8
9 representations, supporting subsequently better ability to discriminate these contexts from
10
11 novel ones, over and above the advantage that accrues merely from encountering contexts
12
13 in a recognition test (and at study).
14
15

16
17
18 The support for the benefits of memory retrieval of context information comes,
19
20 however, with a caveat. Benefits of context reinstatement for context memory were
21
22 observed here in the recognition accuracy measure, but not in the metamemory measures.
23
24 The reason for this pattern is unclear. Metamemory is often conceived as a by-product of
25
26 memory processes themselves (Koriat, 2012) and thus differences in memory performance
27
28 are more often than not accompanied by differences in metamemory measures. It seems
29
30 thus possible that the lack of metamemory effects in the present study may reflect shortage
31
32 of statistical power rather than some fundamental memory-metamemory dissociation.
33
34
35
36

37
38 In order to investigate whether this pattern, and - more importantly - the
39
40 observation of continued benefits of context reinstatement, replicate, we conducted a
41
42 second experiment in which we manipulated item-to-context pairings in a between-
43
44 participants design. Thus, for one group all contexts encountered at the first test (and then
45
46 tested in the second test) were reinstated with their original face, whereas the other group
47
48 of participants were presented only with re-paired context-face test cues. We reasoned that
49
50 in the reinstated context group, contexts presented at test will be able to consistently
51
52 support face recognition, which could induce participants in this group to rely more on
53
54 context information at test. By contrast, contexts in the re-paired context group will be
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consistently unable to support face recognition, discouraging reliance on context
4
5 information. This difference could lead to more consistent context reinstatement effects,
6
7 helping to clarify the issue of a discrepant pattern of findings concerning memory and
8
9 metamemory measures in the recognition test for contexts observed in Experiment 1.
10
11

12 13 **Experiment 2**

14 15 **Method**

16
17
18
19 **Participants.** Eighty undergraduates at Cardiff University participated for course
20
21 credit. They were randomly assigned to reinstated and re-paired context groups, with 40
22
23 participants in each group.
24
25

26
27 **Materials, design, and procedure.** All elements of the present experiment were the
28
29 same as in Experiment 1, except for the change of the design. Using the between-
30
31 participants design meant that in the reinstated context group all 48 target faces in the first
32
33 test were presented with their yoked context photographs along with a novel face, whereas
34
35 in the re-paired context group all 48 target faces in the first test were presented with
36
37 context photographs yoked with a different face. The novel context condition was not
38
39 included in the present study which meant that 16 context photographs used for this
40
41 condition in Experiment 1 were dropped from the materials.
42
43
44
45

46 47 **Results and discussion**

48
49
50 The descriptive statistics for the rates of DK responses, mean confidence judgements, and
51
52 forced-report recognition accuracy can be found in Table 1.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Face recognition.* The analyses of metamemory measures on the first test revealed that the
4 rate of DK responses was lower and confidence in forced report responses was higher when
5 context was reinstated rather than re-paired, $t(78) = 2.01$, $SE = .05$, $p = .041$, $d = 0.50$, and
6
7
8
9
10 $t(78) = 3.70$, $SE = .19$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.83$, respectively. In the forced-report step recognition
11 accuracy was better in the reinstated than in the re-paired context group, $t(78) = 2.21$, $SE =$
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Context recognition. The analysis of metamemory measures revealed that the rate of DK
responses was lower and confidence in forced report responses was higher for previously
reinstated compared to previously re-paired contexts $t(78) = 2.82$, $SE = .04$, $p = .006$, $d =$
0.65, and $t(78) = 2.28$, $SE = .16$, $p = .025$, $d = 0.51$, respectively. Finally, the analysis of the hit
rate in the forced-report step revealed that participants were better at recognizing
previously reinstated than previously re-paired contexts, $t(78) = 2.46$, $SE = .02$, $p = .016$, $d =$
0.50.

For the present experiment, we again analyzed context recognition conditionalized
on item recognition on trials on which these contexts were presented. The descriptive
statistics for this analysis can be found in Table 2. A 2 (context condition: reinstated vs. re-
paired) x 2 (item recognition: successful vs. unsuccessful) mixed ANOVA yielded a significant
main effect of context condition, $F(1, 78) = 4.20$, $MSE = .01$, $p = .044$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, with better
performance for contexts previously serving in the reinstated context condition. The main
effect of item recognition was also significant, $F(1, 78) = 4.83$, $MSE = .004$, $p = .031$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$,
with overall higher context recognition for context previously accompanying a successfully
recognized item. The interaction was not significant, $F(1, 78) = 1.52$, $p = .22$. As in
Experiment 1, these results may suggest that reinstating context can benefit context

1
2
3 memory even when participants fail to correctly recognize items accompanied by reinstated
4
5 contexts. However, once more, this needs to be treated with caution as a direct contrast
6
7 between reinstated and re-paired contexts for which an incorrect item recognition decision
8
9 was made in the first test was not significant, $t(78) = 1.06, p = .29$.

10
11
12 Overall, the recognition accuracy results for contexts replicate those found in
13
14 Experiment 1, once again showing that contexts serving in the reinstated condition are
15
16 subsequently more accurately recognized than contexts serving in the re-paired condition.
17
18 This occurs despite each type of context having been encountered equally often during the
19
20 procedure. This result again indicates that memory representations of reinstated context
21
22 are retrieved at the time of a recognition test, leading to better memory for these contexts,
23
24 an effect that accompanies the benefits of context reinstatement for item recognition. In
25
26 the present experiment this conclusion, derived in Experiment 1 only from the recognition
27
28 accuracy measure, is augmented by the results from the metamemory measures. In contrast
29
30 to Experiment 1, where recognition accuracy and metamemory measures produced
31
32 inconsistent results, in the present experiment both types of measures pointed to stronger
33
34 memory representation for contexts previously reinstated rather than re-paired. This finding
35
36 suggests that the lack of effect on metamemory measures in Experiment 1 was likely due to
37
38 insufficient statistical power.

39
40 Although the present results are well accounted for by the hypothesis postulating
41
42 retrieval-based enhancement of context memory, an alternative explanation is also
43
44 possible. As argued earlier, the use of the between-participants design in the present
45
46 experiment could induce participants to rely on context more in the reinstated rather than
47
48 the re-paired context group. This increased reliance on context may also mean that
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants in the reinstated context group spent longer time scrutinizing context
4
5 photographs at test than participants in the re-paired context group. Thus, differences in
6
7 memory for context in the present experiment could be at least partially explained by the
8
9 duration of exposure to context photographs rather than to the way associative retrieval
10
11 affected reinstated contexts. To assess this possibility, we analyzed response latencies for
12
13 free- and forced-report steps of the face recognition test. A 2 (test step) x 2 (context group)
14
15 mixed ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of test step, $F(1, 78) = 1159.47, p < .001$,
16
17 which unsurprisingly demonstrates that participants were faster to respond in the second,
18
19 forced-report step of the test. Importantly, both the main effect of condition and the
20
21 interaction were not significant, $F_s < 1$, and, if anything, mean response latencies were
22
23 numerically *shorter* in the reinstated context compared to re-paired context group ($M =$
24
25 2876 ms vs. $M = 2983$ ms, collapsed across test steps). Thus, as well as the contexts being
26
27 encountered an equal number of times, it is clear that the subsequent recognition
28
29 advantage for reinstated versus re-paired contexts cannot be due to additional time spent
30
31 processing those contexts, but rather must be due to the particular item-context
32
33 configuration in which they were encountered in the face recognition test.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 42 **General Discussion**

43
44
45 In the present study we investigated the consequences of reinstating context at the
46
47 time of a recognition test for memory of the context itself. Previous investigations revealed
48
49 that reinstated context may augment item recognition discrimination, particularly when
50
51 participants integrate item and context information at study (Hockley, 2008). The present
52
53 investigation confirms the reliability of this context reinstatement effect under encoding
54
55 instructions emphasizing intentional processing of both studied items and their contexts.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Going beyond these previous findings, the present study reveals also lasting aftereffects of
4
5 processing a reinstated context for memory of contexts. These continued effects of context
6
7 reinstatement take the shape of enhanced subsequent memory for contexts relative to
8
9 contexts that were presented at test re-paired with different items to those with which they
10
11 were paired at study.
12
13

14
15 The first point discussed here concerns the basic context reinstatement effect. The
16
17 present study documented reliable context reinstatement effects for recognition
18
19 discrimination, which remains in contrast to several previous studies in which this effect
20
21 failed to materialize (e.g., Dodson & Shimamura, 2002; Murnane & Phelps, 1993; 1995).
22
23 Indeed, the present study used the procedure developed for our previous investigation of
24
25 the context effects in recognition (Hanczakowski et al., 2014, Experiment 1), where similar
26
27 study and testing conditions revealed the context reinstatement effect in metamemory
28
29 measures, but not in the measure of recognition discrimination. Apart from the experiments
30
31 presented here and previously in Hanczakowski et al. (2014), our group conducted several
32
33 as yet unpublished experiments using both faces and words as study materials with
34
35 encoding instructions either asking participants to intentionally encode context information
36
37 or instructions not mentioning context information at all. All of these experiments showed a
38
39 reliable context reinstatement effect in metamemory measures, such as the mean of
40
41 retrospective confidence judgments. At the same time, the context reinstatement effect
42
43 was sometimes present and sometimes absent from the measure of recognition
44
45 discrimination, without any obvious relation to the type of materials or encoding
46
47 instructions. Following the suggestions formulated in Hanczakowski et al., we again stipulate
48
49 that context reinstatement reliably affects recognition processes, which is more easily
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 detected in metamemory measures, but because the effect is relatively subtle it may not
4
5 always be detected by seemingly insensitive measure of recognition discrimination. At the
6
7 same time, we do not deny that factors such as encoding instructions (see Hockley, 2008) or
8
9 distinctiveness of context (see Murnane et al., 1999) may well play an important role in
10
11 determining the magnitude of the context reinstatement effect, a role that could be further
12
13 elucidated with the use of metamemory measures.
14
15

16
17
18 It is worth noting that context effects on metamemory measures are not only
19
20 convenient means of investigating how context affects memory processing but they may
21
22 also be related to final test performance. In the present experiment, we assessed
23
24 recognition performance as hit rate on forced-report recognition, which is considered a
25
26 relatively pure measure of memory quality (e.g., Hanczakowski et al., 2014). However,
27
28 another way of looking at performance in a memory task is to focus only on responses
29
30 volunteered in a free-report test. We performed such an analysis for Experiment 1,
31
32 comparing again reinstated and re-paired context conditions but also re-paired and novel
33
34 context conditions (two participants were removed due to missing cells). The first
35
36 comparison again revealed the context reinstatement effect with higher accuracy of
37
38 volunteered responses in the reinstated ($M = .76, SD = .18$) than in the re-paired context
39
40 condition ($M = .67, SD = .23, t(43) = 2.32, p = .025$). More importantly, and contrary to the
41
42 results reported earlier for forced-report accuracy, this time a comparison of re-paired and
43
44 novel context conditions revealed a marginally significant difference, with higher
45
46 performance in the re-paired ($M = .67, SD = .23$) than in the novel context condition ($M = .60,$
47
48 $SD = .26, t(43) = 1.92, p = .061$). To understand this apparent discrepancy between free- and
49
50 forced-report results, it is vital to note that the measure of hit rates in free-report
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 recognition depends not only on memory but also on a number of metacognitive factors,
4
5 such as overall confidence, the propensity to use DK responses and accuracy of
6
7 metacognitive monitoring (see Higham, 2007; Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996, for models of free-
8
9 and forced-report performance). While discussion of such complex relationships is beyond
10
11 the scope of the present study, it is still useful to acknowledge here that context effects may
12
13 affect free-report performance while having no discernable effect on actual memory quality.
14
15

16
17
18 Finally, returning to the basic observation that context reinstatement does enhance
19
20 item recognition memory, it is also worth noting that previous studies on the context
21
22 reinstatement effect using unique contexts for each studied item invariably employed a
23
24 within-participants design. The present study extends the demonstrations of the context
25
26 reinstatement effect in such a setting to a between-participants design. It is often the case
27
28 that empirical patterns observed in within- and between-participants designs can differ. In
29
30 fact, McDaniel and Bugg (2008) argued that a vast number of manipulations known to
31
32 enhance memory often do so only in a within-participants design. As a striking example
33
34 comes from a recent investigation by Jones and Pyc (2013) of the production effect – an
35
36 enhancement in memory performance due to speaking aloud studied items. Jones and Pyc
37
38 not only showed that the production effect is absent from the between-participants design
39
40 (but see Bodner, Taikh, & Fawcett, 2014, for different results) but also demonstrated that
41
42 relative benefits of words spoken aloud in a within-participants design actually derive from
43
44 an impairment to memory for words read silently in the within-participants design when
45
46 compared to the between-participants design. Against this background, it is reassuring that
47
48 context reinstatement can reliably augment recognition when it is contrasted with re-paired
49
50 context conditions both within and between participants.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The main novel contribution of the present study lies in revealing that whether the
4
5 context serves in the reinstated or re-paired context conditions has important
6
7 consequences for subsequent memory for this context. Specifically, reinstating the exact
8
9 item-context probe at a recognition test augments subsequent recognition of this context.
10
11 We argue that this observation of enhanced memory for contexts serving in the reinstated
12
13 condition is related to recent investigations into the effects of testing (cf. Kornell et al.,
14
15 2011) as well as the research on the memorial benefits of reminding (MacLeod et al., 2012).
16
17 The common feature of these lines of investigation is that re-presentation of previously
18
19 studied information is not sufficient to confer full benefits for subsequent memory
20
21 performance. The testing effect demonstrates that active retrieval of information from
22
23 memory is better than simple restudy whereas the effect of reminding shows that additional
24
25 presentations of study stimuli benefit memory most if they lead to retrieval of previous
26
27 presentations (e.g., Wahlheim, Maddox, & Jacoby, 2014). The present study links these
28
29 recent lines of investigations to the literature on the context reinstatement effect.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The effects of context reinstatement in recognition are often considered from the
37
38 perspective of dual-process theories of recognition. It has been argued that reinstating
39
40 context may at least sometimes lead to recollection of item-context associations (e.g., Koen
41
42 et al., 2013; Macken, 2002). The recollection account of the context reinstatement effect
43
44 remains consistent with our finding of continued effects of context reinstatement.
45
46
47
48
49 Recollection is often described as a memory process of retrieving both item and contextual
50
51 information, and memory access to contextual information is precisely the mechanism we
52
53 deem responsible for augmenting memory for context in our study.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Importantly, there is also a second mechanism that is sometimes postulated to be
4
5 responsible for the effects of context reinstatement. Winograd, Karchmer, and Russell
6
7 (1971) argued that context reinstatement benefits may occur if context becomes so
8
9 integrated with item information as to become unitized (see also Levy, Rabinyan, Vakil,
10
11 2008; Tibon, Vakil, Goldstein, & Levy, 2012). In this scenario, reinstating context at test
12
13 means presenting the full unitized representation, which results in a stronger feeling of
14
15 familiarity as compared to a situation when item is presented out of context. Although in
16
17 principle it is possible that such unitized processing could contribute to the context
18
19 reinstatement effect in our study, we consider such possibility unlikely. First, our materials
20
21 that included random pairings of separate faces and landscape photographs would most
22
23 likely be difficult to unitize. Second, unitized processing of item and context may lead to
24
25 better recognition of a unit but some recent observations indicate that such facilitation
26
27 comes as a cost to memory for parts of the unit (Ahmad & Hockley, 2014; Pilgrim, Murray, &
28
29 Donaldson, 2012). In our study we tested memory for isolated contexts in the second test
30
31 and if benefits to item memory in the first test came from unitized processing, then this
32
33 would suggest that we should detect costs to memory for contexts in the second test, when
34
35 these contexts were presented in isolation. In fact, we found a benefit, which seems
36
37 inconsistent with the unitized processing hypothesis. Further studies could pursue this line
38
39 of reasoning by employing study conditions more favourable for item-context unitization
40
41 and investigating whether reinstating context under such conditions leads to a cost in
42
43 memory for context.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 To summarize, our study demonstrates that context reinstatement plays an
54
55 important role in recognition, affecting both memory for tested items and memory for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

context itself, as well as metamemory processes building on memory information. The next step in research on the immediate and continued effects of processing a reinstated context could be directed towards integrating various measures (e.g., memory accuracy, metamemory measures, introspective measures like remember/know procedure) and specific effects (e.g., context reinstatement, continued effects of context reinstatement, the fan effect) that have been used to gain insight into the nature of the context reinstatement effect.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Ahmad, F. N., & Hockley, W. E. (2014). The role of familiarity in associative recognition of
7
8 unitized compound word pairs. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *67*, 2301-
9
10 2324.
- 11
12
13
14 Beaman, C. P., Hanczakowski, M., & Jones, D. M. (2014). The effects of distraction on
15
16 metacognition and metacognition on distraction: Evidence from recognition memory.
17
18 *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*:439.
- 19
20
21
22 Bodner, G. E., Taikh, A., & Fawcett, J. M. (2014). Assessing the costs and benefits of
23
24 production in recognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *21*, 149-154.
- 25
26
27
28 Diana, R. A., Yonelinas, A. P., & Ranganath, C. (2008). The effects of unitization on
29
30 familiarity-based source memory: Testing a behavioral prediction derived from
31
32 neuroimaging data. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
33
34 *Cognition*, *34*, 730-740.
- 35
36
37
38 Dodson, C. S., & Shimamura, A. P. (2000). Differential effects of cue dependency on item
39
40 and source memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
41
42 *Cognition*, *26*, 1023-1044.
- 43
44
45
46 Gruppuso, V., Lindsay, D. S., & Masson, M. E. J. (2007). I'd know that face anywhere!
47
48 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *14*, 1085-1089.
- 49
50
51
52 Hanczakowski, M., Pasek, T., Zawadzka, K., & Mazzoni, G. (2013). Cue familiarity and 'don't
53
54 know' responding in episodic memory tasks. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *69*, 368-
55
56 383.
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hanczakowski, M., Zawadzka, K., & Coote, L. (2014). Context reinstatement in recognition:
4
5 Memory and beyond. *Journal of Memory and Language, 72*, 85-97.
6
7
8
9 Higham, P. A. (2007). No special K! A signal detection framework for the strategic regulation
10
11 of memory accuracy. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 136*, 1-22.
12
13
14 Hockley, W. E. (2008). The effect of environmental context on recognition memory and
15
16 claims of remembering. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
17
18 *Cognition, 34*, 1412-1429.
19
20
21
22 Hockley, W. E., Bancroft, T. D., & Bryant, E. (2012). Associative and familiarity-based effects
23
24 of environmental context on memory. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology, 66*,
25
26 81-89.
27
28
29
30 Jones, A. C., & Pyc, M. A. (2013). The production effect: Costs and benefits in free recall.
31
32 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 40*, 300-305.
33
34
35
36 Koen, J. D., Aly, M., Wang, W.-C., & Yonelinas, A. P. (2013). Examining the causes of memory
37
38 strength variability: Recollection, attention failure, or encoding variability? *Journal of*
39
40 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 39*, 1726-1741.
41
42
43
44 Koriat, A. (2012). The self-consistency model of subjective confidence. *Psychological Review,*
45
46 *119*, 80-113.
47
48
49
50 Koriat, A., & Goldsmith, M. (1996). Monitoring and control process in the strategic
51
52 regulation of memory accuracy. *Psychological Review, 103*, 490-517.
53
54
55
56 Kornell, N., Bjork, R. A., & Garcia, M. A. (2011). Why tests appear to prevent forgetting: A
57
58 distribution-based bifurcation model. *Journal of Memory and Language, 65*, 85-97.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lehman, M., Smith, M. A., & Karpicke, J. D. (2014). Toward an episodic context account of
4
5 retrieval-based learning: Dissociating retrieval practice and elaboration. *Journal of*
6
7 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *40*, 1787-1794.
8
9
- 10
11 Levy, D. A., Rabinyan, E., & Vakil, E. (2008). Forgotten but not gone: Context effects on
12
13 recognition memory do not require explicit context memory. *Quarterly Journal of*
14
15 *Experimental Psychology*, *61*, 1620-1628.
16
17
- 18
19 Macken, W. J. (2002). Environmental context and recognition: The role of recollection and
20
21 familiarity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *28*,
22
23 153-161.
24
25
- 26
27 MacLeod, C. M., Pottruff, M. M., Forrin, N. D., & Masson, M. E. J. (2012). The next
28
29 generation: The value of reminding. *Memory & Cognition*, *40*, 693-702.
30
31
- 32
33 McDaniel, M. A., & Bugg, J. M. (2008). Instability in memory phenomena: A common puzzle
34
35 and a unifying explanation. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *15*, 237-255.
36
37
- 38
39 Murnane, K., & Phelps, M. P. (1993). A global activation approach to the effects of changes
40
41 in environmental context on recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
42
43 *Memory, and Cognition*, *19*, 882-894.
44
45
- 46
47 Murnane, K., & Phelps, M. P. (1995). Effects of changes in relative cue strength on context-
48
49 dependent recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
50
51 *Cognition*, *21*, 158-172.
52
- 53
54 Murnane, K., Phelps, M. P., & Malmberg, K. (1999). Context-dependent recognition
55
56 memory: The ICE theory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *128*, 403-415.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pilgrim, L. K., Murray, J. G., & Donaldson, D. I. (2012). Characterizing episodic memory
4
5 retrieval: Electrophysiological evidence for diminished familiarity following unitization.
6
7 *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24, 1671-1681.
8
9
10
11 Reder, L. M., Victoria, L. W., Manelis, A., Oates, J. M., Dutcher, J. M., Bates, J. T., Cook, S.,
12
13 Aizenstein, H. A., Quinlan, J., & Gyulai, F. (2013). Why it's easier to remember seeing a
14
15 face we already know than one we don't: Pre-existing memory representations facilitate
16
17 memory formation. *Psychological Science*, 24, 363-372.
18
19
20
21 Russo, R., Ward, G., Geurts, H., & Sheres, A. (1999). When unfamiliarity matters: Changing
22
23 environmental context between study and test affects recognition memory for unfamiliar
24
25 stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25, 488-
26
27 499.
28
29
30
31 Rutherford, A. (2004). Environmental context-dependent recognition memory effects: An
32
33 examination of ICE model and cue-overload hypotheses. *The Quarterly Journal of*
34
35 *Experimental Psychology*, 57A, 107-127.
36
37
38
39 Smith, S. M., Vela, E. (2001). Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and
40
41 meta-analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 8, 203-220.
42
43
44
45 Tibon, R., Vakil, E., Goldstein, A., & Levy, D. A. (2012). Unitization and temporality in
46
47 associative memory: Evidence for modulation of context effects. *Journal of Memory and*
48
49 *Language*, 67, 93-105.
50
51
52
53 Wahlheim, C. N., & Jacoby, L. L. (2013). Remembering change: The critical role of recursive
54
55 reminders in proactive interference effects of memory. *Memory & Cognition*, 41, 1-15.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wahlheim, C. N., Maddox, G. B., & Jacoby, L. L. (2014). The role of reminding in the effects
4
5 of spaced repetitions on cued recall: Sufficient but not necessary. *Journal of Experimental*
6
7 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40, 94-105.
8
9

10
11 Winograd, E., Karchmer, M. A., & Russell, I. S. (1971). Role of encoding unitization in cued
12
13 recognition memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 10, 199-206.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. The rate of 'don't know' responses, means of confidence judgments and mean hit rates in the forced-report step in Experiments 1 and 2, presented as a function of test (the first test of face recognition and the second test of context recognition) and the context condition (reinstated, re-paired and novel for the face recognition test and reinstated and re-paired for the context recognition test). The novel context condition was not included in the design of Experiment 2. Experiment 1 was a within-participants design whereas Experiment 2 was a between-participants design. Standard errors of the means are given in parentheses.

	Face recognition			Context recognition	
	Reinstated context	Re-paired context	Novel context	Reinstated context	Re-paired context
Experiment 1					
DK responses	.31 (.04)	.41 (.04)	.47 (.05)	.20 (.03)	.21 (.03)
Confidence	3.62 (0.13)	3.07 (0.13)	2.83 (0.13)	4.70 (0.15)	4.66 (0.15)
Hit rate	.72 (.02)	.62 (.03)	.58 (.03)	.89 (.02)	.86 (.02)
Experiment 2					
DK responses	.31 (.03)	.43 (.05)	-	.16 (.02)	.27 (.03)
Confidence	3.84 (0.13)	3.14 (0.14)	-	4.98 (0.11)	4.61 (0.12)
Hit rate	.73 (.01)	.67 (.02)	-	.93 (.01)	.89 (.01)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2. Mean hit rates in the forced-report context recognition as a function of context condition and face recognition performance in Experiments 1 and 2. Standard errors of the means are given in parentheses.

	Reinstated context		Re-paired context	
	Face recognition hit	Face recognition miss	Face recognition hit	Face recognition miss
Experiment 1	.90 (.02)	.86 (.02)	.86 (.02)	.83 (.03)
Experiment 2	.94 (.01)	.91 (.02)	.89 (.01)	.88 (.02)