9 Evidence

Who/When	WTDD	Method	ROF	Implications	Ps	Section
Craik & Tulving (1975)	L: Visual word decision task at 4 increasing levels of processing. Graphemic: table/TABLE is capitalised Phonetic: crate/market rhymes with WEIGHT Semantic categorisation: shark/heaven is a type of fish Semantic meaning: "The man peeled the orange/roof. T: Word recognition.	Experiment	Recognition improves with depth of processing.	Changed focus from memory stores to processing.		2.1
Glenberg et al. (1977)	L1: Learn numbers L2: Concurrently maintenance rehearse words (for various intervals). T: Surprise free recall of words (not numbers).	Experiment	No effect on free recall but improved recognition.	Levels of processing can't explain this because it only considers differences at encoding.		2.1

Who/When	WTDD	Method	ROF	Implications	Ps	Section
Eysenck & Eysenck (1980)	Noun processing. Semantic modifiers: distinct (D)/non-distinct (ND) adjectives Phonetic modifiers: D (pronounce silent letter)/ND	Experiment	Phonetically distinct condition raised recognition to levels in semantic conditions.	Distinctiveness and depth of processing are independent for recognition.		2.2
Hunt & Einstein (1981)	Word lists. 1: From 6 categories (spontaneous relational) 2: Unrelated (spontaneous item-specific) Processing tasks 1: Sort words into specified categories (relational) OR 2: Rate pleasantness (item-specific) T1: Free recall T2: Recognition	Experiment	Opposite processing mode benefits recall 1+2 > 1+1 2+1 > 2+2 Recognition 1+2 > 1+1 2+1 = 2+2	Relational and item-specific processing benefit recall. Additional item-specific processing becomes redundant for free recall but continues to benefit recognition.		2.2.1
Anderson & Ross (1980)	L: 4 conditions with various relevant episodic information sentences e.g. 'A spaniel retrieves a ball.', 1 with none. T: Sentence verification (tests SM) A spaniel is a dog. (T/F)	Experiment	Episodic information affected RTs	EM and SM interact. EM affects SM.		3.1

Who/When	WTDD	Method	ROF	Implications	Ps	Section
Anderson (1974)	Sentence recognition (tests EM) regarding particular concept.	Experiment	Fan effect RTs increase as more information acquired regarding concept.	EM and SM interact. SM affects EM.		3.1
Milner (1966)	Bi-lateral hippocampal removal (damage).	Case study/ Natural experiment	Post-op. Recall for events up to operation but anterograde amnesia.	EM/SM dissociation.	H.M. anterograde amneisa (Similar for Korsakoff syndrome)	3.1
Cermak & O'Connor (1983)	Read article on laser technology.	Case study/ Natural experiment	Immediately able to explain new developments. Later, no memory of learning information and can't answer related questions.	Learning (EM->SM) means impaired EM but spared SM can't explain anterograde amneisa.	Anterograde amnesic laser expert	3.1
Tulving & Osler (1968)	Capitalised target words and weak associated words. CITY, dirty, village Associated words highlighted as helping to remember target. T: Recall	Experiment	1 associate improves recall if presented at learning. No improvement if both presented at test but not at presentation.	Encoding specificity Retrieval increases with overlap of information stored in memory and cues at retrieval.		4.1

Who/When	WTDD	Method	ROF	Implications	Ps	Section
Morris et al. (1977)	Word list: CAT, TABLE F: Orienting question. L1: Rhyme: Does word rhyme with hat? L2: Semantic: Do you sit at it? 1 day F: Recognition test type L1: Semantic L2: Rhyme	Experiment	Recognition RR > RS SS > SR	Transfer-appropriate processing (TAP) Matching **processing** at learning and test improve memory performance.		
Tulving (1985)	L: category-EXEMPLAR pairs e.g. fruit-PEAR T: Ps judge feeling of remember/know for 1: Free recall (unordered) 2: Category cued recall (fruit) 3: T2 + first letter (fruit-P)	Experiment	Immediate test P(remember): Highest(T1), Middle(T2), Lowest(T3). After 8 days P(remember) reduced.	Remember judgements reflect richer EM information and this diminishes over time.		7

Who/When	WTDD	Method	ROF	Implications	Ps	Section
Conway et al. (1997)	Same multiple choice test with 6 month delay. Correct and incorrect-plausible answers delivered in same lecture. Judge answers as a) Remember b) Know c) Neither but familiar d) Guess	(Natural?) experiment	T1: R > K(low) T2: K > R(low) Remember to know shift for all Ps but higher for those Ps with highest grades.	Know judgements associated with stronger memories.	Psychology undergraduates	7.1 Do remember and know judgements reflect different response criteria?
Henson et al. (cited in Henson, 2005)	Word recognition using remember/know paradigm.	fMRI (subtractive)	Crossover interaction.	Dual process. cf. Donaldson		Offprint