



**Different answers to different audiences: Effects of social context on the accuracy-informativeness trade-off**

Journal:	<i>Memory</i>
Manuscript ID	MEM-OP 17-101.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Martín-Luengo, Beatriz; Center for Cognition and Decision Making, National Research University - Higher School of Economics Shtyrov, Yury; Aarhus Universitet, CFIN; Center for Cognition and Decision Making, National Research University - Higher School of Economics Luna, Karlos; University of Minho, School of Psychology Myachykov, Andriy; Northumbria University; Center for Cognition and Decision Making, National Research University - Higher School of Economics
Keywords:	informativeness-accuracy trade off, answering questions, metamemory, uncertainty, conversational pragmatics

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Different answers to different audiences: Effects of social context on the accuracy-  
informativeness trade-off

Beatriz Martín-Luengo<sup>1</sup>, Yury Shtyrov<sup>1,2</sup>, Karlos Luna<sup>3</sup>, Andriy Myachykov<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Cognition and Decision Making, National Research University Higher  
School of Economics, Russian Federation

<sup>2</sup> Center of Functionally Integrative Neuroscience (CFIN), Department of Clinical Med-  
icine, Aarhus University, Denmark

<sup>3</sup> Psychology Research Centre, School of Psychology, University of Minho, Portugal

<sup>4</sup> Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, United Kingdom

**Author's contact details:**

Dr Beatriz Martín-Luengo, Centre for Cognition and Decision Making, National Research Uni-  
versity Higher School of Economics, 20 Myasnitskaya Ulitsa, 101000 (School of Psychology)

Moscow (Russian Federation), E-mail: [bmartinluengo@hse.ru](mailto:bmartinluengo@hse.ru)

Professor Yury Shtyrov, Center of Functionally Integrative Neuroscience (CFIN)

Institute for Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University / Aarhus University Hospital

Running head: CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION 2

Nørrebrogade 44, bldg 10G, 8000 Aarhus, Denmark, E-mail: [yury.shtyrov@cfin.au.dk](mailto:yury.shtyrov@cfin.au.dk)

<http://cfin.au.dk/nedcomm/>

Dr. Karlos Luna, Research Center on Psychology, University of Minho, Campus de Gualtar,

4710-057, Braga, Portugal, E-mail: [karlos.luna.ortega@gmail.com](mailto:karlos.luna.ortega@gmail.com)

Dr Andriy Myachykov, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, United King-

dom, E-mail: [andriy.myachykov@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:andriy.myachykov@northumbria.ac.uk)

For Peer Review Only

**Abstract**

Research on conversational exchanges shows that people attempt to optimize their responses' relevance when they definitely know the correct answer (e.g., "What time is it?"). However, such certainty is often unavailable while speakers may still be under social pressure to provide an answer. We investigated how social context influences the informativeness level when answering questions under uncertainty. In three experiments, participants answered difficult general-knowledge questions placed in different social contexts (formal vs. informal). Participants generated their answers, then they were presented with a given context, and decided on the number of alternative responses they wanted to provide (single, with one alternative vs. plural, with several alternatives) and whether the answer should be reported or withheld (report option). Participants reported more answers in the informal context. In the formal context, single answers were preferred, and they were more frequently reported. We conclude that social context influences the level of informativeness in a conversation, affecting achievable accuracy. Our results also show the joint influence of the confidence and the social context on willingness to share information.

**Keywords:** informativeness-accuracy trade off, conversational pragmatics, answering questions, uncertainty, metamemory

**Different answers to different audiences: Effects of social context on the accuracy-informativeness trade-off**

Communicators tailor their messages to the audiences they approach (Clark & Murphy, 1982; Higgins, 1992), as well as modify their interactions and the language used depending on pre-supposed shared common grounds (Isaacs & Clark, 1987) or the communicative goals (Yoon, Koh, & Brown-Schmidt, 2012). For example, we do not report the same amount of information about our weekend activities when asked by a friend (e.g., “I went skydiving wearing a swim suit because I was going to parachute on to a beach”), by our grandmother (“I went to the beach with friends and we had a good time”) or by our boss (e.g. “I went to the beach”). While the first answer is more informative and specific, the others are progressively less informative and more vague. Deciding which information to share becomes even more challenging when we do not have all the information at our disposal. When asked by a friend about the content of the astrophysics article we read, we may not hesitate to state that we did not remember much about it, while in the context of a university exam in astrophysics, we would try to highlight as much as we possibly could remember about the subject. That is, we vary the quality and, especially, the amount of detail of the information we provide (the so-called *informativeness*, see Goldsmith, 2016) depending on the nature of the target audience (Higgins, 1992).

Although there is substantial research on the subject, one aspect that remains largely neglected is the joint effect of the social context and the role of the self-perceived certainty about our memories (retrospective confidence) on the nature of conversational exchanges. In this study we, therefore, pursued three aims: First, we aimed to study how social context influences the amount of conveyed information when the speaker is unsure about the correct answer, i.e., under uncertainty. Second, we aimed

1  
2  
3 to study the role of the retrospective confidence in this process. Third, we aimed to  
4  
5 examine the applicability of a cued-recall memory test (compared with the usual  
6  
7 recognition memory tests) to studies of the informativeness-accuracy trade-off.  
8

### 9 **Informativeness, pragmatics, and uncertainty**

10  
11 Research in pragmatics addresses, among other things, the question of how we  
12  
13 use language differently in different situations. Specifically, pragmatics is often  
14  
15 contrasted to semantics in that it focuses on what is intended rather than on what is said  
16  
17 (Gibbs & Moise, 1997). One aspect often discussed in existing literature is the conveyed  
18  
19 informativeness or the scalar level of a clause (Huang & Snedeker, 2009; Papafragou &  
20  
21 Musolino, 2003). The focus of many scalarity studies is what the *listener* would  
22  
23 understand depending on the quantifier used by the *speaker* (some/all, less/much). A  
24  
25 typical result is that people may interpret a sentence like “Some presents are ready” as  
26  
27 “Not all presents are ready”, even though the use of *some* is in principle consistent with  
28  
29 *all*. This assumption derives from the maxim of Quantity (Grice, 1989): The listener  
30  
31 expects that the speaker will use the more informative wording in relation to her  
32  
33 knowledge. In this case, if all the presents are ready, it makes no sense to use a less  
34  
35 informative word like “some”.  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 In the present study we approached the subject of informativeness from the  
41  
42 speaker’s perspective. Specifically, we were interested in the relative change in the  
43  
44 informativeness of the speakers’ answers as a function of the social context in which  
45  
46 they feature. There are few studies addressing informativeness in natural conversation  
47  
48 (e.g., Huang, 2012) and in simple conversational exchanges (i.e., asking for time:  
49  
50 Gibbs, & Bryant, 2008; Van der Herfst, Carles, & Sperber, 2002). In the latter studies,  
51  
52 participants were approached on the street with a question “Excuse me, do you have the  
53  
54 time?” (Gibbs & Bryant, 2008; Van der Herfst, et al., 2002). In both studies,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION 6

1  
2  
3 participants with analogue and digital watches did not provide the exact time (e.g., “it's  
4 four fifty-eight”) but an approximate estimate (e.g., “it's almost five o'clock”).

5  
6  
7 Interestingly, when additional pragmatic information was added (e.g., “my watch has  
8 stopped”), the percentage of rounded responses such as “almost five o'clock” (less  
9 informative than the actual time) decreased for both analogue and digital watch users.

10  
11  
12 That is, participants varied the level of the informativeness in accordance with what  
13 they presumed was preferred by the questioner, following the maxim of Quantity  
14 (Grice, 1989). However, these results contradict the maxim of Quality (Grice, 1989) that  
15 assumes that speakers would strive to be as truthful as possible in their responses. In the  
16 example above, to be as truthful as possible is to answer “4:58”. Even though  
17 participants could provide an accurate reading, the percentage of rounded responses was  
18 never nil, even with the inclusion of pragmatic cues. These results lend support to the  
19 relevance theory that states that people provide *optimal* (i.e., adjusted to the questioner's  
20 needs) rather than *accurate*, information relevant to the given situation (Wilson &  
21 Sperber, 1981; 2004).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Studies using social context manipulations report similar results. For example,  
37 Vandierendonck and Van Damme (1988) asked participants to recall a previously heard  
38 story. Results showed that participants varied their responses' informativeness  
39 depending on the audience (peers, “Martians”, or a public contest). In a recent study by  
40 McCallun, Weber, and Brewer (2016, Exp. 1), participants were more willing to provide  
41 more specific answers when they were anonymous, suggesting that people are less  
42 concerned about providing answers with higher chances of being incorrect when their  
43 identity is protected. However, the composition of the audience (high authority, low  
44 authority) did not affect the specificity or the responses. The authors explained this  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 result by the relatively young age of the participants (university students) who may not  
4  
5 have differentiated between the two authority levels.

6  
7 In all of the studies reviewed thus far, participants were always certain about the  
8  
9 required responses as the necessary information was available in advance (e.g., in the  
10  
11 studies asking for the time participants knew the exact time). None of these studies  
12  
13 considered the degree of participants' own certainty or uncertainty about the  
14  
15 information they choose to provide. In real life conversations, however, uncertainty  
16  
17 features prominently as we are often unsure about the information we are providing.  
18  
19

20 The nature of the relationship between the social context and uncertainty has not  
21  
22 been comprehensively studied in the literature (although see FeldmanHall, Raio,  
23  
24 Kubota, Seiler, & Phelps, 2015; Yaniv & Foster, 1997). Here, we set out to fill this gap  
25  
26 by investigating how participants change the degree of their responses' informativeness  
27  
28 under uncertainty in varying social contexts. This research sheds light on the processes  
29  
30 underlying speakers' choice on how much information to share with the audience. As  
31  
32 such, it will help us to further our understanding of complex dynamics of real-life  
33  
34 conversational interactions.  
35  
36

37 To address the question of social context effects on informativeness under  
38  
39 uncertainty, we used difficult general knowledge questions. These questions were  
40  
41 placed in two possible scenarios: (1) informal: a conversation with friends and (2)  
42  
43 formal: a job interview. These two contexts differ in terms of their social constraints:  
44  
45 When we are talking with friends, it is more important to be informative than to be  
46  
47 accurate (Yaniv & Foster, 1997) and there is no need to hide a lack of certainty about  
48  
49 the answers. However, in a job interview there is a pressure to present oneself as an  
50  
51 expert in the topic and as accurate as possible, including not reporting incorrect  
52  
53 answers. We are more likely to try to hide our lack of knowledge in formal contexts  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



(Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2015). Thus, in the informal (“friends”) context we may expect that participants would try to maximize the informativeness since they would be less concerned about the answer’s accuracy, while for the formal context (“job interview”) we expect that participants will strive to provide the most accurate answers. However, how can one measure the informativeness of a given answer? Similarly, how could we combine the measurement of the informativeness with the confidence of remembering?

### **Measuring informativeness and confidence**

The study of informativeness in memory research has been directly linked to response accuracy, and the available results suggest that there is a trade-off between the two: If we want to provide a more accurate response, we tend to decrease its informativeness, and vice-versa (Yaniv & Foster, 1997). In studies of memory and metamemory (the knowledge we hold about memory and our self-awareness of it), there are three procedures to study the accuracy-informativeness trade-off that also provide a measure of the informativeness of an answer: report option, grain-size, and plurality option. In the present study we used a novel variation of the plurality option with the addition of a final phase with the report option. The plurality option approach studies the regulation of the accuracy-informativeness trade-off by manipulating the range of selected answers (Luna, Higham, & Martín-Luengo, 2011). Participants are presented with a question (e.g., “What was the former currency of Spain?”) and several alternatives (e.g., Ducados, Liras, Pesos, Pesetas, Escudos). First, participants are instructed to select one answer (single answer, more informative). Then, participants are requested to add two other alternatives from the original list (plural answer, less informative). Finally, participants have to decide which answer, single or plural, they want to submit as their final response. Participants effectively modify the

1  
2  
3 informativeness of their choice by the strategic selection of the response: single or  
4 plural (Higham, 2013; Luna, et al, 2011; Luna & Martín-Luengo, 2012; Luna, Martín-  
5 Luengo, & Brewer, 2015). Single answers are less likely to be correct but they have a  
6 higher degree of informativeness (i.e., provide more specific information). Plural  
7 answers are more likely to include the correct answer among the alternatives. However,  
8 plural answers are less informative since they include a broader range of alternatives  
9 (Goldsmith, 2016). The *report option* approach (Koriat & Goldsmith, 1994) addresses  
10 the issue of the accuracy-informativeness trade-off by giving participants a binary  
11 option to report their response (informative answer) or to withhold it altogether. A  
12 typical finding is that the accuracy of the final report increases when participants  
13 withhold the answers that have low probability of being correct (Arnold, 2013; Arnold,  
14 Higham, & Martín-Luengo, 2013; Evans & Fisher, 2011; Higham, 2007; Higham, Luna,  
15 & Bloomfield, 2011; Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996; Lueddeke & Higham, 2011).

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Report option and plurality option procedures are explained by *the dual-*  
32 *criterion satisficing* model (Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2008; Goldsmith, 2016). Both  
33 approaches allow the combined measurement of the informativeness and the confidence  
34 on an answer. In a nutshell, this model states that two criteria need to be satisfied to  
35 provide an answer: confidence and informativeness. Once participants have rated the  
36 subjective likelihood of the alternatives' correctness, the likelihood of the best  
37 alternative is compared against a pre-established criterion (confidence criterion or a set  
38 report threshold). The answer that passes the confidence criterion must also transmit  
39 enough information to be reported. For example, an answer like "Michael is taller than  
40 150 cm" is not appropriate as the range of possibilities is too broad. The  
41 informativeness criterion is supposed to prevent people from providing such general and  
42 uninformative answers. If the answer passes the informativeness criterion, then the  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 answer is reported; otherwise, the answer is withheld (report option) or coarsened until  
4  
5 the criterion is met.

6  
7 The dual-criterion satisficing model (Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2008) has been  
8  
9 used as a theoretical basis in several studies that successfully addressed the accuracy-  
10  
11 informativeness trade-off (Higham, 2013; Luna & Martín-Luengo, 2012; Luna et al.,  
12  
13 2015; McCallum et. al., 2016). However, the specific constraints and details of the  
14  
15 model remain poorly understood (Goldsmith, 2016). The present research attempts to  
16  
17 shed light onto two parameters that may affect the dual-criterion satisficing model: (1)  
18  
19 The social context (see next section), and (2) the goals (see the introduction to  
20  
21 Experiment 2).  
22  
23

#### 24 **Cued-recall plurality option and report option**

25  
26 The plurality option is a flexible approach since it can be used with any type of  
27  
28 information. However, it has only been used with multiple choice recognition questions  
29  
30 which limits its usefulness to study conversational exchanges because multiple  
31  
32 alternatives are not usually provided in a conversation. To circumvent that limitation,  
33  
34 the current study employs a novel procedure where participants completed a plurality  
35  
36 option procedure and, instead of choosing their answers from a pool of alternatives, they  
37  
38 had to generate their own (cued-recall plurality option).  
39  
40

41  
42 Furthermore, our approach combines the plurality option with the report option.  
43  
44 Once participants have chosen the level of informativeness of their answer (single, one  
45  
46 alternative; plural, three alternatives), they also have to choose whether they want to  
47  
48 report or withhold the selected answer. Combined use of the plurality and the report  
49  
50 options will increase the ecological validity of our findings (Neisser, 1985) since in real  
51  
52 life we always have the option of not responding. In addition, a study by Koriat &  
53  
54 Goldsmith (1994) found increase in accuracy in a free recall test (as opposed to a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recognition test) by allowing participants to use the report option. Therefore, regarding  
4  
5 the report option, we expect that participants will sometimes report and sometimes  
6  
7 withhold their answers as a way to regulate the accuracy of their final report, and that  
8  
9 accuracy and confidence will be higher for reported than for withheld answers. This  
10  
11 way, we will obtain information from an experiment with forced answer and, by  
12  
13 introducing the report option, a more close-to-reality information about what happens  
14  
15 when people are free to withhold their candidate answers. Moreover, as stated earlier in  
16  
17 the introduction, both procedures, plurality and report option, were designed to study  
18  
19 the accuracy-informativeness trade-off. However, there is no research that studied the  
20  
21 differences/advantages (if any) of one method over the other (although, see Luna &  
22  
23 Martín-Luengo, 2017). This type of comparison might help future researchers to select  
24  
25 the most appropriate procedure for their purposes.  
26  
27

### 28 29 **Cued-recall plurality report option and social context**

30  
31 If we confirm that the procedural innovations introduced here do not negatively  
32  
33 affect the study of informativeness, we will be able to test the effect of social context on  
34  
35 informativeness. Based on the dual-criterion satisficing model (Goldsmith, 2016), and  
36  
37 regarding the social context, we expected a different distribution of responses in each  
38  
39 context. In an informal context, informative answers (single) would be preferred, and  
40  
41 thus more often selected (in the plurality option) and reported (in the report option). In  
42  
43 the formal context, however, we expected that participants would preferentially select  
44  
45 and report the plural answers as a way to avoid incorrect answers and maintain accuracy  
46  
47 high and, therefore, the single answer option would be selected less often. Although  
48  
49 selecting and reporting single answers might give the impression of mastering a topic,  
50  
51 we should take into account that we used difficult questions to create uncertainty in the  
52  
53 answers. Thus, we expected that participants would not be 100% certain about their  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 answers. As in a job interview, it is reasonable to expect that interviewers will know the  
4  
5 correct answers. Providing plural answers guarantees the highest accuracy for difficult  
6  
7 questions, but also reduces the cost of providing incorrect single answers and thus of  
8  
9 appearing too overconfident in one's knowledge. When the stakes are high, it may better  
10  
11 pay to show oneself as prudent and select plural answers than being bold in front of  
12  
13 those who may very well know that you are incorrect. In sum, we expected more single  
14  
15 answers to be selected, more answers to be reported overall, and more single answers to  
16  
17 be reported in the informal than in the formal, context. For these last two hypotheses,  
18  
19 we did not expect a parallel pattern of the confidence ratings. The dual-criterion model  
20  
21 states that the confidence criterion would differ depending on the situation. Hence, we  
22  
23 expect higher confidence ratings for the reported and for the reported single answers in  
24  
25 the formal than in the informal context.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 Experiment 1

### 32 Method

33  
34  
35 **Participants.** Twenty-four volunteers, mostly university students recruited on  
36  
37 social media and by posters on campus (23 females, mean age = 20.15,  $SD = 2.91$ ) took  
38  
39 part in this experiment in exchange for a small monetary compensation (250<sup>•</sup> ). The  
40  
41 sample size was computed based on the effect size of the main comparison that reflects  
42  
43 the success of the regulation of accuracy in the original paper where the plurality option  
44  
45 was reported (the comparison of the accuracy between the single selected and rejected  
46  
47 answers; Luna, Higham, & Martín-Luengo, 2011, Experiment 1). A power analysis with  
48  
49 alpha = .05 and power = .80 showed that to find a  $d = 1.37$ , 6 participants per cell were  
50  
51 enough to find a successful regulation of accuracy.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           **Materials and Design.** A normative study was conducted with 25 participants  
4 that did not take part in the main experiment and that took part in exchange for a small  
5 monetary remuneration (17 females, mean age = 22.00,  $SD = 7.20$ ). Participants were  
6 required to answer 86 general knowledge questions. For each question, participants  
7 provided three possible answers with a confidence rating for each question ranging from  
8 0% (totally unsure) to 100% (totally sure).<sup>2</sup> The questions were administered in a  
9 laboratory using a computer-based questionnaire with self-paced responses. We used  
10 general knowledge questions from several sources that were sufficiently difficult so that  
11 participants did not always select a single answer, but, at the same time, at a difficulty  
12 level that our participants would likely know some of the correct answers. This helped  
13 us ensure that some responses would be provided under uncertainty. Forty questions  
14 were selected for the main experiment taking into account the criteria that overall  
15 accuracy should be lower than .30, and that the provided alternatives had a close  
16 relationship with the topic of the question and were reasonable guesses. The actual  
17 overall accuracy of the 40 selected questions was:  $M = .23$ ,  $SD = .20$  (see the  
18 Supplemental Materials for the full list of the questions selected for the main  
19 experiment)<sup>1</sup>.

20  
21           The experiment had a single independent factor – social context (formal,  
22 informal), manipulated within subjects. Dependent variables were: (1) proportion of  
23 single and plural answers (for the plurality option), (2) reported and withheld answers  
24 (for the report option), (3) confidence, either in the correctness of the answer (for single  
25 answers) or in that any of the answers generated was the correct one (for plural  
26 answers), (4) accuracy of the different types of answers provided, and (5) reaction times  
27 in the selection of the answer (during both the plurality and the report option phases, see  
28 below).

1  
2  
3           **Procedure.** Participants read and signed the informed consent form before  
4  
5 taking part in the experiment. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight  
6  
7 counterbalanced conditions. First, two orders of questions were used, so that half of the  
8  
9 participants answered the question in one order and other half in a different one.  
10  
11 Second, the context was also counterbalanced per each question (20 questions in each  
12  
13 context) such that for half of the participants Question 1 was presented in the informal  
14  
15 context, and for the other half it was presented in the formal context. Contexts were  
16  
17 randomly assigned to questions, with the only constraint that no more than three  
18  
19 successive questions were presented in the same context. This manipulation was  
20  
21 preferred over a block design to avoid participants developing a strategy for the given  
22  
23 context and then systematically applying it for the rest of the block (but see Experiment  
24  
25 3 where we presented blocks of questions in the same context). Third, we also  
26  
27 counterbalanced response key assignment to control for any effect that could be due to  
28  
29 handedness: Half of the participants used “p” for single answers and for report answers  
30  
31 and “q” for plural and withhold while the opposite was true for the other half. The  
32  
33 experiment was programmed using LiveCode (Version 7.1.3) and administered on a  
34  
35 desktop computer. After they provided basic demographics, participants read the  
36  
37 experimental instructions explaining every phase of the main experiment (for an outline  
38  
39 of the procedure, see Figure 1).  
40  
41  
42

43  
44           After that, both contexts were explained with the help of a background picture.  
45  
46 The picture exemplifying the formal (“job interview”) context portrayed three people  
47  
48 seated in front of a table with neutral face expressions and dressed formally. The picture  
49  
50 of the friends context also portrayed three people, all of them talking and laughing,  
51  
52 dressed in casual clothes. Both pictures were accompanied by general descriptive texts  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 stressing that they were either in an important job interview or having a good time with  
4  
5 friends (See Supplemental Materials).  
6

7           Next, participants completed a practice session consisting of three questions  
8  
9 similar to those used in the main experiment. After this, the experimental session  
10  
11 started. For each question, participants first provided a single answer and rated how  
12  
13 confident they were that the answer was correct on a scale from 0% (not confident at  
14  
15 all) to 100% (totally confident) in deciles. Second, they provided two further  
16  
17 alternatives (which, with the single answer, formed the plural answer) and also rated  
18  
19 their confidence that the correct answer was one of the three using the same confidence  
20  
21 scale. The next screen provided a short reminder about the two contexts as well as the  
22  
23 instructions about how to select the final response (single vs. plural) with the keys “p”  
24  
25 or “q”. Then, the context picture for that trial appeared in the middle of the screen. The  
26  
27 single and the plural answers were presented alongside the context picture and  
28  
29 participants had to select one of the two answers as their final response (plurality option  
30  
31 phase). After that, participants saw the context picture again together with the answer  
32  
33 they selected (either single or plural) and they were asked to decide if they would report  
34  
35 or withhold it as their final choice (report option phase), in this case using a computer  
36  
37 mouse. Each individual experimental session lasted approximately half an hour. Finally,  
38  
39 participants were debriefed and dismissed.  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Results**

45  
46           One participant was removed because they did not comply with the task. One  
47  
48 question was removed because it turned out to be ambiguous with regard to the  
49  
50 answer’s accuracy (there were two possible correct answers)<sup>3</sup>, thus answers to 39  
51  
52 questions were used in the analysis (producing the total of 897 answers across all 23  
53  
54 participants). Only the questions for which participants provided two or more different  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 answers (accounting for 758 out of 897 answers) were included in the analyses.

4  
5 Participants reported only one answer when they were certain that it was correct, thus  
6  
7 giving no chance to study the informativeness-accuracy trade-off because these answers  
8  
9 would be reported regardless of the context. Analyses of the reaction times did not  
10  
11 reveal any significant differences between conditions (all  $ps > .05$ ) and will thus not be  
12  
13 discussed further. In some analyses the number of participants was lower due to a lack  
14  
15 of answers in one of the conditions. We report two-tailed pairwise comparisons obtained  
16  
17 with the Student's  $t$  test, and Cohen's  $d$  (henceforth  $d$ ) as a measure of effect size, along  
18  
19 with 95% confidence intervals. ANOVAs were not conducted to avoid collinearity  
20  
21 problems: If an answer is not selected at single level, it is because it is selected at a  
22  
23 plural level. Exploratory analyses showed no effect between the different  
24  
25 plural level. Exploratory analyses showed no effect between the different  
26  
27 counterbalance conditions (all  $F_s < 1$ ,  $ps > .05$  ).

28  
29 **Cued recall test and the plurality option.** The main objective of this  
30  
31 experiment was to study conversational informativeness; the main results of the  
32  
33 plurality option with a cued-recall test are as such secondary to our objectives and are  
34  
35 presented in the Supplemental Materials (section Experiment 1: Cued-recall Plurality  
36  
37 option) to the interested reader. Overall, participants did not show a particular  
38  
39 preference to choose single answers, something that could have happened because they  
40  
41 produced the alternative responses themselves. Also, participants distinguished between  
42  
43 single answers with high chances of being correct and low chances of being correct  
44  
45 (accuracy of single selected answers was higher than accuracy of single rejected  
46  
47 answers), and strategically chose single or plural answers to increase the accuracy of  
48  
49 their final response. In sum, our results replicated existing studies using the plurality  
50  
51 option, in which alternatives were provided, and showed that the cued-recall test did not  
52  
53 affect the sensitivity of the plurality option to study informativeness.  
54  
55

1  
2  
3       **Cued recall test and report option.** We replicated the results from other studies  
4  
5 with the report option and a cued recall tests. There were more reported ( $M = .63$ ,  $SD =$   
6  
7  $.17$ ,  $CI [.56, .70]$ ) than withheld answers ( $M = .37$ ,  $SD = .17$ ,  $CI [.30, .44]$ ),  $t(22) =$   
8  
9  $3.43$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $d = 1.44$ . In the same vein, accuracy was higher for reported ( $M = .35$ ,  
10  
11  $SD = .15$ ,  $CI [.29, .41]$ ) than for withheld answers ( $M = .07$ ,  $SD = .09$ ,  $CI [.03, .11]$ ),  
12  
13  $t(22) = 7.78$   $p < .001$ ,  $d = 2.25$ , and confidence followed a similar pattern: higher  
14  
15 confidence for reported ( $M = 58.58$ ,  $SD = 16.25$ ,  $CI [51.79, 65.37]$ ) than for withheld  
16  
17 answers ( $M = 23.78$ ,  $SD = 17.69$ ,  $CI [16.39, 31.17]$ ),  $t(22) = 9.03$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 2.04$ . In  
18  
19 sum, these results show that the changes introduced in the procedure had no negative  
20  
21 effects on the usability of the report option for studying the accuracy-informativeness  
22  
23 trade-off.  
24  
25

26       **Social context and informativeness.** We expected that informativeness would  
27  
28 be more relevant in the informal context and that accuracy would be more relevant in  
29  
30 the formal context. Therefore, we expected more single answers, more reported  
31  
32 answers, and more reported single answers in the informal than in the formal context.  
33  
34 Concerning the selection of answers, the results from the plurality option alone showed  
35  
36 no reliable differences. In the informal context, participants selected the single answer  
37  
38 46% of the times and in the formal context 55% of the times,  $t(22) = -1.79$ ,  $p = .08$ .  
39  
40 However, we confirmed our hypothesis for the report option: there were more reported  
41  
42 answers (that is, all the answers reported independently of being selected at a single or  
43  
44 plural level) in the informal context ( $M = .76$ ,  $SD = .19$ ,  $CI [.68, .84]$ ) than in the formal  
45  
46 context ( $M = .50$ ,  $SD = .21$ ,  $CI [.41, .59]$ ),  $t(22) = 7.45$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.32$ .  
47  
48  
49

50       The associated confidence ratings showed the opposite pattern: We found a  
51  
52 significantly higher confidence in the reported answers in the formal context ( $M =$   
53  
54  $67.98$ ,  $SD = 16.05$ ,  $CI [61.42, 74.54]$ ) than in the reported answers in the informal  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

context ( $M = 54.36, SD = 17.20, CI [47.33, 61.39]$ ),  $t(22) = 3.528, p < .001, d = .82$ .

This suggests that participants were more willing to report their answers in the informal context and that in the formal context they set a higher confidence criterion. These results illustrate how the social context combined with the confidence in correctness influence the number of reported responses, that is, the information we decide to share with others.

We also expected more reported single answers in the informal than in the formal context (see Table 1; descriptive statistics for all answers are reported for completeness). To test this hypothesis, we computed the relative proportion of single answers that were reported ( $P(r/S)$ ). By computing relative proportions we ruled out any effects of the different proportion of single answers between conditions and incorporated the information from the different proportion of withheld answers. The results showed a higher rate of reported single answers for the informal context ( $M = .80, SD = .20, CI [.72, .88]$ ) than for the formal one ( $M = .58, SD = .27, CI [.47, .69]$ ),  $t(22) = 3.37, p = .002, d = .90$ .

We also confirmed that the confidence in the reported single answers was higher in the formal context ( $M = 42.31, SD = 24.01, CI [42.31, 24.01]$ ) than in the informal context ( $M = 31.80, SD = 18.09, CI [24.24, 39.36]$ ),  $t(22) = 3.34, p = .003, d = .49$ . This result confirms that participants set a higher confidence criterion for reporting, in this case, single answers, in the formal context.

## Discussion

There are three main outcomes of Experiment 1. First, participants chose different levels of informativeness and modified their willingness to report depending on the social context. Second, the context and the confidence in the answer's

1  
2  
3 correctness affected the amount and the quality of the shared information. Third, the  
4  
5 accuracy-informativeness trade-off can be studied with a cued-recall memory test.  
6

7         Considering that the questions were relatively difficult, we initially expected a  
8  
9 larger number of plural answers in the formal context (job interview) as a way of  
10  
11 increasing the accuracy of the reports. However, we found that participants withheld  
12  
13 more answers in the formal context than in the informal one, suggesting that they  
14  
15 preferred to regulate their accuracy by withholding answers, instead of reporting plural  
16  
17 answers. In addition, in the informal context participants based their willingness to  
18  
19 report on the confidence ratings, independently of the informativeness. On the contrary,  
20  
21 in the formal context the differences in confidence were not reflected in a similar pattern  
22  
23 at any informativeness' level. In the formal context, participants set a higher criterion to  
24  
25 report and reported fewer answers. The prediction that participants would set a different  
26  
27 confidence criterion depending on the situation was derived from the dual-criterion  
28  
29 satisficing model, but it had never been empirically tested. This is the first evidence  
30  
31 showing that different contexts promote different criteria. At the same time, these results  
32  
33 also show how the confidence is key to determining the informativeness' level in  
34  
35 conversational exchanges.  
36  
37  
38

39         Another interesting result is that participants did not limit themselves to the first  
40  
41 option they produced as they were almost equally likely to choose single and plural  
42  
43 answers during the plurality option phase, even though we used a cued recall test. In the  
44  
45 informal context (see Table 1) there was indeed no significant differences between the  
46  
47 proportion of single and plural reported answers,  $t(22) = -0,41, p = .69$ , but in the  
48  
49 formal context there were more single than plural reported answers,  $t(22) = 2,69, p =$   
50  
51  $.01$ , probably due to the implicit requirements of that context.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 answer would lead to a loss of 1 point in both single and plural cases. In this low-  
4  
5 informativeness payoff, participants typically select the answers at a plural level to  
6  
7 maximize accuracy. Goldsmith et al. found that participants in a high-incentive  
8  
9 informativeness payoff context were more willing to sacrifice accuracy and reported a  
10  
11 significantly higher number of fine answers (equivalent to single answers).  
12

13  
14 In this experiment, we expected to replicate the overall effect of context from  
15  
16 Experiment 1. Regarding the informativeness payoff, we expected more single answers  
17  
18 for the high-informativeness than for the low-informativeness condition in both  
19  
20 contexts. We also expected more reported answers for the high- than the low-  
21  
22 informativeness payoff. In this last case, the associated confidence will not necessarily  
23  
24 parallel the direction of the proportion of answers. If there is an effect of the payoff,  
25  
26 then the increase in the reported answers might be based on the confidence or not. If the  
27  
28 payoff reflects the subjective confidence, then we should find a similar pattern of  
29  
30 confidence and proportions, i.e., higher confidence for reported answers in the high-  
31  
32 than low-informativeness payoff. However, if the payoff does not affect the distribution  
33  
34 of the answers we expect no differences in confidence ratings of both conditions due to  
35  
36 the payoff.  
37  
38

39  
40 Finally, for both contexts we expected more reported single answers in the high-  
41  
42 informativeness than in the low-informativeness payoff. Regarding the associated  
43  
44 confidence for these answers, we expected either of the two following predictions. If  
45  
46 confidence has more weight in the decision than the payoff, we expected higher  
47  
48 confidence in the single reported than in the single withheld answers. However, if the  
49  
50 payoff has more weight than confidence, then we expected no differences between  
51  
52 confidence for single report and single withhold cases, because the payoff may prompt  
53  
54 to report some answers that have low confidence.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

## Method

**Participants.** Twenty-four volunteers, mostly university students (18 female, mean age = 21,  $SD = 3.89$ ) took part in this experiment in exchange for a small monetary compensation (250\* ). Volunteers were recruited on social media and by posters on campus. Participants were also told that their monetary remuneration would be doubled if they could achieve higher score than other participants. The extra-payment was included to boost participants' willingness to pay attention to the payoff.

**Materials and Design.** The same validated questions and the general procedures as in Experiment 1 were used. The main difference was the inclusion of the instructions about the informativeness payoff (see Supplemental Materials). The instructions appeared as a reminder before the plurality option phase, and at the bottom of the picture in both the plurality phase and the report option phase. The design was 2 social context (formal, informal) x 2 informativeness payoff (high, low), manipulated within subjects. The dependent variables were the same as in Experiment 1 but, as reaction times did not produce significant results in Experiment 1, they were not analysed.

**Procedure.** Participants followed the same steps as in Experiment 1 with the following exception: At both stages (plurality option and report option), participants were asked to consider the given social context and to take the informativeness payoff into account. For each question, the context and the payoff were assigned randomly. We had eight counterbalanced conditions as in Experiment 1, but in this case they were created from two orders of questions, two different contexts, in which the answers could be presented, and the two different payoffs that could be applied.

## Results

1  
2  
3 As in Experiment 1, only the questions, for which participants produced two or  
4 more different answers, were included in the analyses. Answers with only one  
5 alternative do not allow studying the informativeness-accuracy trade-off since it usually  
6 entails that the participant was certain in their answers veracity. These accounted for  
7 828 out of the total of 936 answers. Exploratory analyses showed no effects between  
8 the different counterbalanced conditions (all  $F_s < 1$ ,  $p_s > .05$ ). Below we present the  
9 analyses that test our hypotheses regarding the effect of the informativeness payoff. We  
10 report Analyses of Variance (ANOVA), two-tailed pairwise comparisons using the  
11 Student's  $t$  test with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons when appropriate ( $p$   
12 = .012), and  $d$  as a measure of effect size, along with 95% CI. We performed pair-wise  
13 comparisons in the absence of a significant interaction (Wilcox, 1987) because we had  
14 specific hypotheses based on the dual-criterion model (Goldsmith et al., 2002) that  
15 could not be tested otherwise. In addition, this is the first study in which the social  
16 context has been manipulated in relation to the informativeness-accuracy trade-off;  
17 therefore, it is theoretically important to fully understand the possible relation of this  
18 variable to other variables, e. g., the payoff.

19  
20 We expected more single answers for the high-informativeness than for the low-  
21 informativeness condition in both contexts. A 2 (context: informal, formal) x 2  
22 (informativeness payoff: high, low) repeated measures ANOVA on the mean proportions  
23 of the answers selected at a single level revealed no main effects, or interaction  
24 (context:  $F(1, 23) = .009$ ,  $p = .923$ ; payoff:  $F(1, 23) = 3.41$ ,  $p = .08$ ; context\*payoff:  
25  $F(1, 23) = 1.21$ ,  $p = .28$ ). To further test our hypotheses, we conducted planned  
26 comparisons between the two payoff conditions for each context. The results showed  
27 that in the informal context there was no difference in the rate of selection of single  
28 answers between the high- ( $M = .50$ ,  $SD = .26$ ,  $CI [.40, .60]$ ) and low-informativeness  
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



Running head: CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION 24

1  
2  
3 payoffs ( $M = .46, SD = .28, CI [.35, .57]$ ),  $t(23) = .57, p = .57$ . In the formal context,  
4  
5 however, participants provided significantly more single answers with the high- ( $M =$   
6  
7  $.53, SD = .27, CI [.42, .64]$ ) than with the low informativeness payoff ( $M = .39, SD =$   
8  
9  $.20, CI [.31, .47]$ ),  $t(23) = 2.42, p = .012, d = .61$ . Similar analyses with confidence  
10  
11 showed no differences between high- and low-informativeness payoffs for any of the  
12  
13 two contexts.  
14

15  
16 These results indicate that the inclusion of the informativeness payoff altered the  
17  
18 pattern of responses observed in Experiment 1. Supported by a moderate effect size, the  
19  
20 payoff affected the proportion of single answers only in the formal context. This result  
21  
22 may explain why we did not find differences in the distribution of the answers between  
23  
24 social contexts as in Experiment 1. Additional support for this is that we did not find  
25  
26 parallel confidence ratings with the high- and -low informativeness payoffs. This lack of  
27  
28 differences might suggest that, in formal contexts, participants base their selection of  
29  
30 answers mainly on payoffs, while confidence is of secondary importance.  
31  
32

33  
34 Considering now only the report option, we expected more reported answers in  
35  
36 the condition of high- vs. low- informativeness payoff, regardless of the context. We  
37  
38 performed a 2 (context: informal, formal) x 2 (informativeness payoff: high, low)  
39  
40 repeated measures ANOVA on the mean proportions of reported answers. This analysis  
41  
42 revealed a main effect of the social context,  $F(1, 23) = 12.89, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .36$  with no  
43  
44 further significant main effects and/or interactions. There were more reported answers  
45  
46 in the informal context ( $M = .76, SD = .19, CI [.68, .84]$ ) than in the formal context ( $M$   
47  
48  $= .63, SD = .21, CI [.55, .71]$ ). However, similar analyses with confidence ratings failed  
49  
50 to reveal any difference between confidence for the reported answers in the informal  
51  
52 context ( $M = 61.73, SD = 19.15, CI [54.07, 69.63]$ ) and in the formal context ( $M =$   
53  
54  $63.69, SD = 18.87, CI [56.14, 71.24]$ ),  $p = .23$ . This result indicated that participants  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 took the payoff into account, at least in the formal context, instead of deriving their  
4  
5 decision to report or withhold from the confidence ratings. However, it seems that the  
6  
7 effect of the payoff is not sufficiently strong to affect the results of the report option  
8  
9 procedure since we did not find a main effect of this variable and we only observed its  
10  
11 effect indirectly in the confidence pattern.  
12

13  
14 Interestingly, while the confidence ratings in Experiment 1 diverged in the  
15  
16 opposite direction from the proportion of the reported answers, the results of  
17  
18 Experiment 2 did not reveal a similar pattern. One possible explanation of this may be  
19  
20 that participants in Experiment 2 provided a higher proportion of answers in the formal  
21  
22 context ( $M = .63$ ) than in Experiment 1 ( $M = .50$ ), suggesting that the confidence  
23  
24 criterion in Experiment 2 was lower, possibly because of the introduction of the payoff  
25  
26 manipulation. In other words, participants might have tried to reduce the increasing  
27  
28 cognitive effort resulting from taking into account all the variables in a more complex  
29  
30 conversational context by simplifying the situation, e.g., by ignoring some of the  
31  
32 variables or highly reducing their weight in the decisions.  
33  
34

35  
36 Finally, to test the hypotheses that for both contexts there would be more single  
37  
38 reported answers in the high-informativeness condition, we performed an ANOVA that  
39  
40 revealed a marginally significant effect of the social context,  $F(1, 23) = 4.21, p = .051,$   
41  
42  $\eta_p^2 = .16$ . The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3 and 4. There were more  
43  
44 single reported answers in the informal context than in the formal context. Planned  
45  
46 comparisons showed no significant differences between the single reported answers in  
47  
48 the high- than in the low-informativeness payoff in either context.  
49

50  
51 We also computed the relative proportion of single reported answers, that is, the  
52  
53 proportion of single answers that were reported. Concerning the hypotheses of more  
54  
55 single reported answers for the high-informativeness payoff for each context, the  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 analyses did not show any significant difference. As there were no differences in  
4  
5 proportions, we did not analyse the associated confidence.

6  
7 Analyses regarding the cued-recall plurality test are presented in the  
8  
9 Supplemental Materials, section “Experiment 2: Cued-recall Plurality option for each  
10  
11 context and the informativeness payoff”. In short, we found a similar pattern as in  
12  
13 Experiment 1, showing that the addition of the payoff did not affect the sensitivity of the  
14  
15 procedure to study informativeness.

### 16 17 18 **Discussion**

19  
20 In summary, Experiment 2 replicated the results of the Experiment 1 with  
21  
22 respect to the social context and the use of the plurality option with a cued-recall test. In  
23  
24 addition, we found that the payoff only affected the informativeness of the answer at a  
25  
26 single/plural level and only in the formal context. Our tentative explanation for this  
27  
28 novel finding is that in informal conversational situations social norms are more relaxed  
29  
30 and flexible and, as a result, the payoff may be ignored. However, in a more formal  
31  
32 conversational situation, we have to follow certain social rules. Thus, the presence of  
33  
34 another rule, even if it is not properly a social one such as the payoff, may be perceived  
35  
36 as more “natural”; as a result, participants choose to take it into account.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Experiment 3**

43  
44 Two of the parameters used in Experiments 1 and 2 could be seen as  
45  
46 problematic: (1) the information accompanying the images depicting each context and  
47  
48 (2) the change of context from question to question. The information provided by the  
49  
50 verbose descriptions about how someone could behave in those contexts, while served  
51  
52 the purpose of making experimental instructions clear and unambiguous, might have  
53  
54 guided participants’ answers. If that were the case, the answer of the participants may  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 have reflected only their following the instructions, and not reacting to each context *per*  
4  
5 *se*. Also, in these two experiments we changed contexts from question to question as a  
6  
7 way to prevent the implementation of a fixed strategy per context. However, this  
8  
9 decision made the manipulation less ecological because in natural conversations we  
10  
11 usually do not change our context from one moment to the next (although it might still  
12  
13 be possible, e.g. when having a conversation with someone in person and at the same  
14  
15 time using instant messaging with another person). To rule out the possible effect that  
16  
17 the instructions and the alternation of contexts might have in Experiments 1 and 2, we  
18  
19 designed another experiment, in which we used the procedure similar to that used in  
20  
21 Experiment 1, but in which the problematic sentences in the descriptions were removed  
22  
23 and the context manipulation was presented in blocks (see below for details).  
24  
25

26  
27 Despite the changes, we expected to replicate the results of Experiment 1.  
28  
29 Regarding the cued recall test and the report option, that is regardless of the context, we  
30  
31 expected participants to report significantly more answers than to withhold them, that  
32  
33 the accuracy of these reported answers would be higher, and that the confidence would  
34  
35 be in line with the accuracy. Regarding the social context and the informativeness, we  
36  
37 expected a similar amount of single answers selected in both contexts but, a  
38  
39 significantly higher number of single selected and reported answers in the informal  
40  
41 context. In this case, confidence should be significantly higher for the single selected  
42  
43 and reported answers in the formal context.  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **Method**

49  
50 **Participants.** Twenty-eight university students (21 females, mean age = 18.75,  
51  
52  $SD = 1.74$ ) took part voluntarily in this experiment for a small monetary compensation  
53  
54 (250• ). Participants were recruited on social media and by posters on campus.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3       **Materials and Design.** Materials and design were the same as in Experiment 1,  
4  
5 with the change in the instructions. The descriptions for each context were re-written in  
6  
7 a way that would provide no reference to the type of the expected answers just describ-  
8  
9 ing the general depicted situation (see Supplemental Materials, section “Experiment 3  
10  
11 Instructions”).  
12

13       **Procedure.** The procedure was the same as in Experiment 1 except for the  
14  
15 following changes. The context was manipulated between four blocks of ten questions  
16  
17 each. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight counterbalanced  
18  
19 conditions: two orders of questions by four possible orders of the 10-question blocks  
20  
21 with the social context manipulation (1: informal, formal, informal, formal; 2: formal,  
22  
23 informal, formal, informal; 3: formal, informal, informal, formal; 4: informal, formal,  
24  
25 formal, informal). Prior to each block, the picture and the description of the context  
26  
27 were presented. Also, the picture, but not the verbal description, was presented in one of  
28  
29 the corners of the screen in all phases across the block. The answers in the plurality and  
30  
31 the report option phases were provided by selecting the appropriate radio button with a  
32  
33 mouse. The experiment lasted about 30 minutes.  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **Results**

38  
39       Only questions for which participants provided two or more different answers  
40  
41 (accounting for 910 out of 1092 answers) were included in the analyses suitable to study  
42  
43 the accuracy-informativeness trade-off as has been explained before. We report two-  
44  
45 tailed pair-wise comparisons with the Student’s *t* test, Cohen’s *d* (*henceforth d*) as a  
46  
47 measure of effect size, along with 95% confidence intervals. As before, exploratory  
48  
49 analyses showed no effect of counterbalancing (all *F*s < 1, *p*s > .05).  
50  
51

52       **Cued recall test, the plurality option, and the report option.** As for the report  
53  
54 option, there were more reported ( $M = .62$ ,  $SD = .18$ ,  $CI [.55, .68]$ ) than withheld  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 answers ( $M = .38$ ,  $SD = .18$ ,  $CI [.31, .45]$ ),  $t(27) = 3.45$ ,  $p < .002$ ,  $d = 1.30$ . Also,  
4  
5 accuracy was higher for reported ( $M = .40$ ,  $SD = .13$ ,  $CI [.35, .45]$ ) than for withheld  
6  
7 answers ( $M = .13$ ,  $SD = .08$ ,  $CI [.10, .16]$ ),  $t(26) = 6.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.75$ . Finally, the  
8  
9 confidence also followed the same pattern of results: higher confidence for reported ( $M$   
10  
11 = 29.46,  $SD = 16.30$ ,  $CI [23.46, 35.46]$ ) than for withheld answers ( $M = 10.30$ ,  $SD =$   
12  
13 11.72,  $CI [6.00, 14.60]$ ),  $t(26) = 5.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.35$ . Overall, we fully replicated  
14  
15 the pattern of results in Experiment 1.  
16

17  
18 **Social context and informativeness.** As in Experiment 1, we did not find a  
19  
20 preference for the single answers in any of the two contexts: participants selected this  
21  
22 type of answer similarly often: 43% in the informal and 45% – in the formal context,  
23  
24  $t(26) = -1.74$ ,  $p = .09$ ,  $d = .65$ . We also replicated the result that there were more  
25  
26 reported answers in the informal context ( $M = .69$ ,  $SD = .21$ ,  $CI [.61, .77]$ ) than in the  
27  
28 formal context ( $M = .54$ ,  $SD = .21$ ,  $CI [.46, .62]$ ),  $t(27) = 3.44$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.75$ .  
29  
30 Regarding the associated confidence, we found that numerically the confidence for the  
31  
32 reported answers in the formal context ( $M = 61.89$ ,  $SD = 14.81$ ,  $CI [56.39, 14.81]$ ) was  
33  
34 higher than the confidence in the reported answers in the informal context ( $M = 58.02$ ,  
35  
36  $SD = 15.41$ ,  $CI [52.32, 63.72]$ ), although this difference only showed a trend in that  
37  
38 direction,  $p = .09$ ,  $d = .26$ . Finally, we did not find any differences in the proportion of  
39  
40 reported single selected answers as a function of the context,  $p = .39$ . Therefore, we did  
41  
42 not compute the associated confidence.  
43  
44

45  
46 The full report of the results of the plurality option is presented in the  
47  
48 Supplemental Materials. In a nutshell, the results replicated those from previous  
49  
50 experiments.  
51

## 52 Discussion

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Experiment 3 showed that the overly verbose descriptions used in Experiments 1  
4 and 2, and the alternation of contexts between individual questions or groups of  
5 questions (blocks) did not have any major influence on the results. We fully replicated  
6 the pattern of results regarding the usability of the plurality and report option for  
7 studying the accuracy-informativeness trade-off: we replicated the main result of  
8 Experiment 1, namely the effect of the context on the report option and the preference  
9 of participants to use the report option to regulate informativeness. However, we only  
10 found a trend, in the same direction of the previous experiments, for the confidence of  
11 the reported answers in relation to the contexts.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **General Discussion**

26  
27 The results of the research reported here show, for the first time, that social  
28 context and, to some extent, a payoff for informativeness modulate the level of the  
29 informativeness of the information exchanged under uncertainty. We conducted three  
30 experiments in which difficult questions (validated in a separate study) were used to  
31 guarantee a degree of uncertainty in the participants' answers. Questions were placed in  
32 two different social contexts: informal ("conversation with friends") and formal ("a job  
33 interview"). In Experiment 2, we introduced a payoff manipulation, and in Experiment  
34 3 we ruled out some possible confounds of the procedures used in the first two  
35 experiments. Our main conclusions are as follows. First, social context affected the  
36 informativeness of the participants' responses as well as the decision about reporting or  
37 withholding them. Second, the selected informativeness and willingness to report an  
38 answer in informal contexts were driven by the associated confidence, whereas in  
39 formal contexts it was mainly driven by implicit norms. Third, goals, such as payoffs,  
40 seem to affect conversational exchanges in formal settings. And fourth, it is possible to  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 use a cued-recall memory test to investigate the accuracy-informativeness trade-off. We  
4  
5 will discuss these main findings and address their theoretical implications in more detail  
6  
7 below.

8  
9 Our results showed that the level of informativeness of our answers and the  
10  
11 willingness to report vary depending on the social context. The general metamemory  
12  
13 model of Nelson and Narens (1990; 1994) states that our answers are affected by both  
14  
15 monitoring and control processes. The monitoring process refers to the evaluation of the  
16  
17 correctness of our answers. The control process refers to the actions that we will  
18  
19 perform or not depending on the specific demands of the social context, our  
20  
21 expectations, incentives, goals, and the monitoring evaluation. To date, only one  
22  
23 published report used a social context manipulation (authority level) in an accuracy-  
24  
25 informativeness trade-off study, and it failed to find any effect (McCallum et al., 2016).  
26  
27 Unlike this previous unsuccessful attempt, we found an effect of context – probably  
28  
29 because the contexts we used were more easily perceived as different by our  
30  
31 participants.  
32  
33

34  
35 In particular, we found that in the informal context the selection of the level of  
36  
37 informativeness and the willingness to report are mainly related to the metacognitive  
38  
39 ratings. This is shown in the similar patterns of results between the proportions of the  
40  
41 selected answers and the confidence ratings. In the formal context, however,  
42  
43 participants based the decisions about the informativeness of the answer and the choice  
44  
45 to report on implicit social norms. The results show that the set criterion for the formal  
46  
47 context was generally higher than for the informal context, as seen in the confidence  
48  
49 ratings; however, participants decided to report single answers instead of reporting more  
50  
51 plural answers, likely trying to ensure the highest possible informativeness. That is, the  
52  
53 selection of the informativeness and the willingness to report (control processes) were  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 mainly determined by the implicit norms of that specific context, with a smaller role of  
4  
5 the monitoring evaluation.  
6

7 In Experiment 2, we used an informativeness payoff manipulation in order to  
8  
9 investigate how a conversational “goal” might modify the effect of a specific social  
10  
11 context. The high payoff for informativeness was hypothesized to increase the amount  
12  
13 of single answers in both contexts, but we only found differences in the formal context.  
14  
15 Additional confidence results also suggested that our manipulation was successful,  
16  
17 although its effect was not as strong as we expected. This was probably because in  
18  
19 Experiment 2 the benefit of considering the payoff was linked to the performance of  
20  
21 other participants, while it was only measured against the individual performance in  
22  
23 previous research. The manipulation we used was the same as in Goldsmith et al. (2002,  
24  
25 Exp. 3) except for a critical detail: we offered our participants to double the payment for  
26  
27 their participation if they achieved the best score. On the contrary, participants in  
28  
29 Goldsmith et al. (2002) received money depending on their individual performance, that  
30  
31 is, independent on the performance of others. It is possible that, once they realized that  
32  
33 all the questions were difficult, our participants stopped taking into consideration the  
34  
35 informativeness payoff because they thought that it was not possible to win the prize. In  
36  
37 Goldsmith et al. (2002), participants were not competing against others, so the benefit  
38  
39 of at least trying was more evident.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 We can conclude that the informativeness level of a conversation might be  
45  
46 affected by social context where it is expected to follow rules. Additionally, when there  
47  
48 are other norms presented in a conversational exchange, then choices may not be based  
49  
50 exclusively on the metacognitive experience, but they also incorporate these norms to  
51  
52 decide which answer is preferable. Future research should investigate the possible  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 differences between answers and confidence patterns in relation to the specific details of  
4 the operationalization of the payoff.  
5

### 6 7 **Plurality option cued-recall**

8  
9 The current study tested the possibility of using the plurality option with cued-  
10 recall questions. The first main outcome is that the regulatory processes in memory can  
11 be studied with memory tests other than recognition. This is a big step towards a better  
12 understanding of memory processes in realistic conversational environments. The  
13 recognition tests used until now restrict the generalization of previous results to applied  
14 contexts (Sauer & Hope, 2016). Here we showed how this limitation might be overcome  
15 with the use of the plurality option procedure combined with a cued-recall test.  
16  
17

18 The second outcome is that the cued-recall plurality option allows studying  
19 conversational exchanges in a controlled environment. While it is very important to  
20 study the nature of the conversational exchanges in naturalistic settings, the plurality  
21 option cued recall procedure can be successfully used in other, more controlled, set-ups  
22 (e.g., neuroimaging studies). However, although in Experiment 3 the block design better  
23 approximated the experimental set-up to how every-day conversations usually unfold,  
24 there is still a big gap between an interaction through Q&A, as in here,, and a real  
25 conversation where both parties request, provide, and share information; future studies  
26 are needed to develop controlled approaches to such more realistic situations.  
27  
28

### 29 **Social context and informativeness**

30 An interesting result regarding the effect of context on conversational  
31 informativeness is the preferential use of the report option to regulate the level of  
32 informativeness. Based on the dual-criterion satisficing model (Ackerman & Goldsmith,  
33 2008), participants were expected to report mainly plural answers in the formal context  
34 aiming at increasing their accuracy. However, our participants preferred to increase  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

1  
2  
3 accuracy of their answers by withholding responses in this context. That is, they used  
4  
5 the report option more often than the plurality option. Despite this, and considering that  
6  
7 the questions were difficult, participants did not maximize the use of the report option  
8  
9 by withholding the majority of the answers.  
10

11  
12 One possible explanation for this result is that participants considered this  
13  
14 strategy as socially less acceptable. This idea is in line with Ackerman and Goldsmith  
15  
16 (2008, Exp. 3). Their results showed that participants used the “don't know” option  
17  
18 more often when answering difficult questions than when answering easy questions  
19  
20 (45% vs. 30%). This difference, although reliable, was smaller than what the authors  
21  
22 expected given that they allowed participants to provide a response coarse enough to  
23  
24 include the correct answer. However, it does seem to indicate that admitting our  
25  
26 ignorance is perceived as more socially acceptable than reporting extremely  
27  
28 uninformative answers. Our results extend these previous findings by demonstrating  
29  
30 that the social norms applied to that type of situation (answering difficult questions)  
31  
32 vary depending on the context. Specifically, we found more withheld answers for the  
33  
34 formal than for the informal context, showing that the context, which the question is  
35  
36 presented in, does matter. Studying context effects in more detail to understand the  
37  
38 processes that underlie reporting or withholding answers may thus be a fruitful  
39  
40 directions for future research.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Another important result was that we did not observe preferential selection of  
46  
47 the plural answers in the formal context, considering that all the questions were rather  
48  
49 difficult. Participants in the formal context selected the plural answer 45% of the times  
50  
51 in Experiment 1, and 49% in Experiment 2, none of these differing significantly from  
52  
53 the single-answer selections. One possible explanation for this result is that participants  
54  
55 in the job interview (formal) context tried to present themselves as experts in the topic.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 From this point of view, selecting a plural answer most of the time is not the most  
4  
5 optimal strategy. Indeed, selecting the plural option increases the chances of being  
6  
7 correct, but it also implicitly denotes lack of knowledge. This explanation is consistent  
8  
9 with the idea that we try to present ourselves as experts in job interviews (Barrick et al,  
10  
11 2009; Roulin et al, 2015). Another explanation is that one may prefer to risk providing a  
12  
13 single answer because the alternative might be more embarrassing (Ackerman &  
14  
15 Goldsmith, 2008). In this case, potential social embarrassment could overcome the  
16  
17 confidence in one's memory for the sake of projecting a more favourable personal  
18  
19 image, at least temporarily.  
20  
21

22           These two strategies, maximizing positive personal impact and minimizing  
23  
24 possible negative impact, are directly linked to the notion of the theory of mind (Van  
25  
26 Overwalle, & Baetens, 2009). The ability of putting ourselves in other peoples' shoes  
27  
28 provides us with a rough estimation of what is expected from us and helps us to respond  
29  
30 accordingly. At the same time, this is in line with the approach of the relevance theory  
31  
32 that states that people provide the information they believe is relevant for the receiver  
33  
34 (Wilson & Sperber, 1981; 2004). Thus, the pattern observed here might result from the  
35  
36 beliefs about what the receiver considers relevant and about what we think might help  
37  
38 us present ourselves in a better way.  
39  
40

41           Finally, the fact that participants preferred to select single answers in the formal  
42  
43 context can be also explained via the notion of expectancy. When we are talking to our  
44  
45 friends (informal context), there are no explicit rules about how to select our answers.  
46  
47 However, in a job interview, it is expected that interviewees provide clear and concise  
48  
49 answers carrying specific information and not several diverging alternatives to the same  
50  
51 question. This third explanation suggests that people's behaviour in the job interview  
52  
53 context may not be driven by the need to present oneself as a clever person or the fear of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 looking ridiculous, but by the expectancy of what is “normal” in that situation. It has  
4  
5 been repeatedly shown that our knowledge is structured as a set of schemata that include  
6  
7 the objects and people involved in a given situation (Bartlett, 1932; Lampinen,  
8  
9 Copeland, & Neuschatz, 2001; Martín-Luengo, Luna, & Migueles, 2014, 2015) as well  
10  
11 a concept of what the expected behaviour is (Bower, Black, & Turner, 1979). Thus, once  
12  
13 participants activated their schema of a job interview, they may have tried to behave  
14  
15 accordingly. Further research should investigate which of these possible explanations  
16  
17 motivate people to select the answer they deem optimal for the given social context.  
18  
19

### 20 **The role of confidence**

21  
22 Our analyses also highlight the role of confidence in conversation. To the best of  
23  
24 our knowledge, this is the first attempt to take into account the confidence in our  
25  
26 memories in a study of conversational exchanges. Our results show that selecting an  
27  
28 answer is often guided by the confidence we have about its correctness. However, our  
29  
30 results also support the idea that in certain circumstances, confidence is disregarded and  
31  
32 that answer selection can be explained by the influence of other external demands (e.g.,  
33  
34 social norms). Specifically, the three experiments showed that in the informal context  
35  
36 the confidence ratings parallel the informativeness level selection, as well as the  
37  
38 willingness to report (although in Experiment 3 it does not reach significance threshold  
39  
40 in the confidence for the report option, so it can be only considered as a trend).  
41  
42 However, this is not the case in the formal context, in which the results generally  
43  
44 suggest a stronger effect of social norms. Future research will continue to study the  
45  
46 situations where we use our metacognitive experiences as the basis for our  
47  
48 conversational exchanges.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 To summarize, the current study demonstrates how we tailor the information we  
4 provide in a conversational setting depending on the audience and the specific social  
5 context (e.g., see the optimal relevance theory). Here, we showed how social context  
6 influences the informativeness of reported answers by tapping into the metamemory  
7 component. As such, the current results document the confidence in our memory as a  
8 key factor for our understanding of implicit principles of everyday conversations.  
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

### Acknowledgments

The study has been funded by the Russian Academic Excellence Project '5-100', and supported by the Lundbeck Foundation (Denmark). The authors want to thank Evgenia Lopukhova, Katya Stupina, Elena Kulkova, and Anastasia Liashenko for their assistance in the translation into Russian of the materials and in the recruitment of participants.

For Peer Review Only

**Footnotes**

<sup>1</sup> The original versions of all experimental materials (questions and the description of the contexts in Russian) are available on request.

<sup>2</sup> A full report of the results of the normative study are available on request from the first author.

<sup>3</sup> For the question: “What is the name for the domestic cat with three- or four-coloured pattern?”, in Russian both “calico” and “three-coloured” are correct.



### References

- Ackerman, R., & Goldsmith, M. (2008). Control Over Grain Size in Memory Reporting — With and Without Satisficing Knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *34*, 1224-1245. doi: 10.1037/a0012938
- Arnold, M. M. (2013). Monitoring and meta-metacognition in the own-race bias. *Acta Psychologica*, *144*, 380-389. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2013.07.007
- Arnold, M. M., Higham, P., & Martín-Luengo, B. (2013). A little bias goes a long way: The effects of feedback on the strategic regulation of accuracy on formula-scored tests. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *19*, 383-402. doi: 10.1037/a0034833
- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 1394-1411. doi: 10.1037/a0016532
- Bower, G. H., Black, J. B., & Turner, T. T. (1979). Scripts in memory for text. *Cognitive Psychology*, *11*, 177-220.
- Clark, H. H., & Murphy, G. L. (1982). Audience design in meaning and reference. In J. Le Ny & W. Kintsch (Eds.), *Language and comprehension* (pp. 287-299). Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing.
- Evans, J. R., & Fisher, R. P. (2011). Eyewitness memory: Balancing the accuracy, precision and quantity of information through metacognitive monitoring and control. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *25*, 501-508. doi:10.1002/acp.1722
- Gibbs, R., & Bryant, G. (2008). Striving for optimal relevance in answering questions. *Cognition*, *106*, 345-369. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2007.02.008

- 1  
2  
3 Gibbs, R. W., & Moise, J. F. (1997). Pragmatics in understanding what is said.  
4  
5 *Cognition*, 62, 51-74.  
6  
7 Goldsmith, M. (2016). Metacognitive quality-control processes in memory retrieval and  
8  
9 reporting. In J. Dunlosky and S. K. Tauber (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of*  
10  
11 *Metamemory* (pp 357-385), Oxford, Oxford University Press. doi:  
12  
13 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199336746.013.28  
14  
15 Goldsmith, M., Koriat, A., & Weinberg-Eliezer, A. (2002). The strategic regulation of  
16  
17 grain size in memory reporting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*,  
18  
19 *131*, 73-95. doi: 10.1037//0096-3445.131.1.73  
20  
21  
22 Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.  
23  
24 FeldmanHall, O., Raio, C. M., Kubota, J., Seiler, M. G., & Phelps, E. A. (2015). The  
25  
26 effects of social context and acute stress on decision-making under uncertainty.  
27  
28 *Psychological Science*, 26, 1918-1926. doi: 10.1177/0956797615605807  
29  
30  
31 Higgins, E. T. (1992). Achieving "shared reality" in the communication game: A social  
32  
33 action that creates meaning. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 11,  
34  
35 107-131. doi: 10.1177/0261927X92113001  
36  
37  
38 Higham, P. A. (2007). No Special K! A signal detection framework of the strategic  
39  
40 regulation of memory accuracy. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*,  
41  
42 *136*, 1-22. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.136.1.1  
43  
44  
45 Higham, P.A. (2013). Regulating accuracy on university tests with the plurality option.  
46  
47 *Learning and Instruction*, 24, 26-36. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2012.08.001  
48  
49  
50 Higham, P. A., Luna, K., & Bloomfield, J. (2011). Trace-strength and source-monitoring  
51  
52 accounts of accuracy and metacognitive resolution in the misinformation  
53  
54 paradigm. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 324-335. doi:10.1002/acp.1694.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

- 1  
2  
3 Huang, Ch. (2012). Referential choice and informativeness in mother-child  
4 conversation: A focus on the mother. *Language Sciences*, 34, 319-338.  
5  
6 doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2011.10.003  
7  
8
- 9 Huang, Y. T., & Snedeker, J. (2009). Online interpretation of scalar quantifiers: Insight  
10 into the semantic-pragmatics interface. *Cognitive Psychology*, 58, 376-415. doi:  
11  
12 10.1016/j.cogpsych.2008.09.001  
13  
14
- 15 Isaacs, E. A. & Clark, H. H. (1987). References in conversation between experts and  
16 novices. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 1, 26-37.  
17  
18 doi:10.1037/0096-3445.116.1.26  
19  
20
- 21 Koriat, A. & Goldsmith, M. (1994). Memory in naturalistic and laboratory contexts:  
22 Distinguishing the accuracy-oriented and quantity-oriented approaches to  
23  
24 memory assessment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 123, 297-  
25  
26 316.  
27  
28
- 29 Koriat, A. & Goldsmith, M. (1996). Monitoring and control processes in the strategic  
30 regulation of memory accuracy. *Psychological Review*, 103, 490-517  
31  
32
- 33 Lampinen, J. M., Copeland, S. M., & Neuschatz, J. S. (2001). Recollections of things  
34 schematic: Room schemas revisited. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*  
35  
36 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 27, 1211- 1222. doi:10.1037//0278-  
37  
38 7393.27.5.1211  
39  
40
- 41 LiveCode (Version 7.1.3)[Computer software]. Edinburgh, UK: LiveCode. Downloaded  
42  
43 from <https://livecode.com>  
44  
45
- 46 Lueddeke, S., & Higham, P.A. (2011). Expertise and gambling: Using type-2 signal  
47  
48 detection theory to investigate differences between regular gamblers and non-  
49  
50 gamblers. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64, 1850-1871.  
51  
52  
53 doi:10.1080/17470218.2011.584631.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Luna, K., Higham, P. A., & Martín-Luengo, B. (2011). The regulation of memory  
4 accuracy with multiple answers: the plurality option. *Journal of Experimental*  
5 *Psychology: Applied*, 17, 2, 148-158. doi:10.1037/a0023276  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Luna, K. & Martín-Luengo, B. (2012). Improving the accuracy of eyewitnesses in the  
11 presence of misinformation with the plurality option. *Applied Cognitive*  
12 *Psychology*, 26, 687-693. doi:10.1002/acp.2845  
13  
14  
15  
16 Luna, K. & Martín-Luengo, B. (2017). Using the regulation of accuracy to study  
17 performance when the correct answers is not known. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
18 *Psychology*, doi: 10.1111/sjop.12369  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Luna, K., Martín-Luengo, B., & Brewer, N. (2015). Are regulatory strategies necessary  
24 in the regulation of accuracy? The effect of direct-access answers. *Memory &*  
25 *Cognition*, 43, 1180-1192. doi:10.3758/s13421-015-0534-2  
26  
27  
28  
29 Martín-Luengo, B., Luna, K., & Migueles, M. (2014). The influence of thematic  
30 congruency, typicality and divided attention on memory for radio  
31 advertisements. *Memory*, 22, 759-769. doi:10.1080/09658211.2013.826673  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Martín-Luengo, B., Luna, K., & Migueles, M. (2015). Effects of interest, thematic  
37 congruence, and typicality on memory for television, radio, and press  
38 advertisements of new products. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 29, 560-572.  
39 doi:10.1002/acp.3139  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 McCallum, N. A., Brewer, N., & Weber, N. (2016). Memorial monitoring and control:  
46 How confidence and social and financial consequences affect eyewitnesses'  
47 reporting of fine-grain information. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 30, 375–  
48 386. doi: 10.1002/acp.3212.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Neisser, U. (1985). The role of theory in the ecological study of memory: Comment on  
4  
5 Bruce. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 114, 272-276.  
6  
7 doi:10.1037/0096-3445.114.2.272  
8
- 9 Nelson, T. O., & Narens, L. (1990). Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new  
10  
11 findings. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (pp.  
12  
13 1–45). New York: Academic Press.  
14
- 15 Nelson, T. O., & Narens, L. (1994). Why investigate metacognition? In J. Metcalfe & A.  
16  
17 P. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing* (pp. 1–25).  
18  
19 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
20  
21
- 22 Papafragou, A. & Musolino, J. (2003). Scalar implicatures: experiments at the  
23  
24 semantics-pragmatics interface. *Cognition*, 86, 253-282.  
25  
26
- 27 Roulin, N, Bangerter, A. & Levashina, J. (2015). Honest and deceptive impression man-  
28  
29 agement in the employment interview: Can it be detected and how does it im-  
30  
31 pact evaluations? *Personnel Psychology*, 68, 395-444. doi: 10.1111/peps.12079  
32
- 33 Sauer, J., & Hope, L. (2016). The effects of divided attention at study and reporting  
34  
35 procedure on regulation and monitoring for episodic recall. *Acta Psychologica*,  
36  
37 169, 143-156. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2016.05.015  
38
- 39 Van Overwalle, F., & Baetens, K., (2009). Understanding others' actions and goals by  
40  
41 mirror and mentalizing systems: A meta-analysis. *NeuroImage* 48, 564-584.  
42  
43
- 44 Vandierendonck, A., & Van Damme, R. (1988). Schema anticipation in recall: Memory  
45  
46 process or report strategy? *Psychological Research*, 50, 116-122. doi:  
47  
48 10.1007/BF00309211  
49
- 50 Wilcox, R. R. (1987). New designs in analysis of variance. *Annual Review of*  
51  
52 *Psychology*, 38, 29-60. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.000333  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance Theory. In Horn, L.R. & Ward, G. (eds.)

4  
5 *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 607-632.

6  
7 Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (1981). On Grice's theory of conversation. In P. Werth (ed.)

8  
9 *Conversation and Discourse*. London: Croom Helm. 155-78. Reprinted in

10  
11 Kasher (ed.) 1998, vol. 1V, 347-68.

12  
13 Yaniv, I., & Foster, D. P. (1997). Precision and accuracy of judgmental estimation.

14  
15 *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10, 21-32.

16  
17 Yoon, S. O., Koh, S., & Brown-Schmidt, S. (2012). Influence of perspective and goals

18  
19 on reference production in conversation. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4,

20  
21 699-707. doi:10.3758/s13423-012-0262-6

Table 1

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Proportions of Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context of Experiment 1.*

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
Single	.36 (.17) [.29, .43]	.10 (.09) [.06, .14]	.32 (.22) [.23, .41]	.23 (.15) [.17, .29]
Plural	.39 (.32) [.26, .52]	.14 (.13) [.09, .19]	.18 (.15) [.12, .24]	.27 (.21) [.18, .36]

Table 2

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Confidence Ratings in the Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context of Experiment 1.*

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
Single	31.80 (18.09) [24.41, 39.19]	9.18 (14.70) [3.17, 15.19]	42.31 (21.01) [32.5, 52.12]	12.93 (17.18) [5.91, 19.95]
Plural	20.90 (14.47) [14.99, 26.81]	7.54 (11.33) [2.91, 12.17]	18.70 (18.36) [11.20, 26.20]	11.32 (14.31) [5.47, 17.17]



Table 3

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Proportions of Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context and the Informativeness Payoff of Experiment 2.*

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
<b>High-informativeness</b>				
Single	.40 (.25)	.09 (.13)	.38 (.27)	.15 (.20)
	[.30, .50]	[.40, .14]	[.27, .49]	[.07, .23]
Plural	.33 (.23)	.17 (.20)	.26 (.21)	.20 (.21)
	[.24, .32]	[.09, .25]	[.18, .34]	[.12, .28]
<b>Low-informativeness</b>				
Single	.39 (.25)	.07 (.12)	.27 (.19)	.12 (.13)
	[.29, .49]	[.02, .12]	[.19, .35]	[.07, .17]
Plural	.38 (.29)	.16 (.17)	.34 (.19)	.27 (.18)
	[.28, .48]	[.09, .23]	[.26, .42]	[.20, .34]

Table 4

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Confidence Ratings of the Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context and the Informativeness Payoff of Experiment 2.*

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
<b>High-informativeness</b>				
Single	72.57 (20.80) [64.25, 80.89]	16.74 (27.64) [5.68, 27.80]	76.67 (20.86) [68.32, 85.02]	31.72 (27.70) [20.68, 42.73]
Plural	50.31 (27.26) [39.40, 61.22]	15.32 (10.13) [11.27, 19.37]	54.89 (27.36) [43.94, 65.84]	25.78 (20.65) [17.52, 34.04]
<b>Low-informativeness</b>				
Single	67.39 (20.90) [59.03, 75.75]	20.52 (29.13) [8.87, 32.17]	73.72 (23.46) [64.33, 83.11]	25.22 (20.89) [16.86, 33.58]
Plural	54.79 (22.23) [45.90, 63.18]	14.74 (12.20) [9.86, 19.62]	51.45 (23.10) [42.21, 60.69]	20.78 (16.20) [14.30, 27.26]

Table 5

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Proportions of Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context of Experiment*

3.

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
Single	.30 (.18) [.23, .37]	.13 (.14) [.08, .18]	.28 (.17) [.22, .34]	.17 (.14) [.12, .22]
Plural	.39 (.23) [.31, .47]	.18 (.13) [.13, .23]	.26 (.20) [.19, .33]	.29 (.21) [.21, .37]

Table 6

*Mean (Standard Deviation) [95% Confidence Interval] of the Confidence Ratings in the Answers in the Plurality Option and Report Option Depending on the Social Context of Experiment 3.*

	Social context			
	Informal		Formal	
	Reported	Withheld	Reported	Withheld
Single	26.74 (18.44) [19.94, 33.54]	7.73 (12.72) [1.73, 13.73]	34.02 (18.93) [27.02, 41.02]	9.47 (11.52) [5.17, 13.77]
Plural	23.62 (16.29) [17.62, 29.62]	11.69 (9.20) [8.29, 15.09]	21.71 (14.07) [16.51, 26.91]	12.26 (9.62) [8.66, 15.86]




Figure 1. Stages followed for answering the 40 general knowledge questions in Experiment 1. First, participants provided one answer and confidence rating. Second, they added two more alternatives and also provided confidence rating. Then, they completed the plurality and report option procedures.

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

**Supplemental Materials**

Different answers to different audiences: Effects of social context on the accuracy-informativeness trade-off

For Peer Review Only

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

2

**Translation into English of the original questions in Russian language (correct answer).**

- 1.- What is the term for hitting a volleyball down hard into the opponent's court? (spike)
- 2.- What is the name of the small Japanese stove used for outdoor cooking? (hibachi)
- 3.- What is the name of Pluto's largest moon? (Charon)
- 4.- Which hills separate Scotland and England? (Cheviots)
- 5.- What is the last name of the scientist who discovered Radium? (Curie)
- 6.- In what ancient city were the "Hanging Gardens" located? (Babylon)
- 7.- In which city is Heathrow airport located? (London)
- 8.- What would you be doing if you were spelunking? (exploring a cave)
- 9.- If you have a deficiency of vitamin C, what condition might you get? (scurvy)
- 10.- What is the largest planet in the solar system? (Jupiter)
- 11.- How often enters Halley's Comet orbit the earth? (every 76 years)
- 12.- What was the name of the Zeppelin that exploded in Lakehurst NJ in 1937?  
(Hindenburg)
- 13.- Who was the painter of the Guernica? (Picasso)
- 14.- Who was the painter of the Sistine Chapel? (Michelangelo)
- 15.- What is the name of the first artificial satellite put in orbit? (Sputnik)
- 16.- Who was the discoverer of the vaccination? (Louis Pasteur)
- 17.- What is the capital of Jamaica? (Kingston)
- 18.- What was the name of the ship upon Charles Darwin made his scientific voyage?  
(HSM Beagle)
- 19.- Before the Euro was introduced, which currency was in Portugal? (escudos)

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

3

20.- What is the name of the astronomical bodies that enter the Earth's atmosphere?

(meteors)

21.- What is the unit of the sound intensity? (decibel)

22.- What is the country with capital in Baghdad? (Iraq)

23.- What is the organ that produces insulin? (pancreas)

24.- What is the capital of Australia? (Canberra)

25.- What is the name for the domestic cats with three- or four-coloured pattern?

(calico)

26.- What is the name of the constellation that looks like a flying horse? (Pegasus)

27.- From which country was the composer called Liszt? (Hungary)

28.- Where is the Sea of Tranquillity? (Moon)

29- What is the main award of the San Sebastian Film Festival? (Golden Shell)

30.- What was the earlier name of the city of New York? (New Amsterdam)

31- In the ancient India, which was the standard language? (Sanskrit)

32- Which number represent 111 in Binary System? (7)

33- What is the name of the first man to reach North Pole? (Robert E. Peary)

34- What is the name of the Japanese floral art? (Ikebana)

35.- What is the colour of the gemstone jet? (black)

36.- What is the name of the paradise in the Viking mythology? (Valhalla)

37- How long lasted the World War I? (4 years)

38- Which is the only South American country that has coast in both Atlantic and

Pacific oceans? (Colombia)

39- What is the focus of study of herpetology? (amphibians and reptiles)

40- Which are the colours of the flag of Finland? (blue and white)



## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

4

**Translation into English of the original descriptive texts in Russian language for  
Experiments 1 and 2.**

“The job interview context” (formal)

Imagine that you are in an important job interview. You feel nervous and stressed, but focused on the task. During the interview, you have been questioned on different topics. You noticed that some of your answers could have been more accurate. However, you really need the job, so you keep trying to do your best to show that you are an expert in the topics the interviewers are asking you about. You know that you still have a chance of improving the situation and getting the job.

“The friends context” (informal)

Imagine that you are with some of your close friends and that you are having a good time. You are relaxed, you feel comfortable and pleased to be able to share this good moment with them. You are talking about shared memories and other different topics knowing that you are totally free to openly speak even when you feel that you are not an expert in the specific topic. The atmosphere is relaxed and the important thing is that all of you are together.

**Translation into English of the original descriptive texts in Russian language for  
Experiment 3.**

“The job interview context” (formal)

"Imagine that you are in an important job interview. You feel nervous and stressed, but focused on the task. During the interview, you have been questioned on different topics. You really need the job, but you know that you still have a chance of getting it."

“The friends context” (informal)

"Imagine that you are with some of your close friends and that you are having a good time. You are relaxed, you feel comfortable and pleased to be able to share this good moment with them. You are talking about shared memories and other different topics, and enjoying that all of you are together."

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

6

**Informativeness payoffs instructions used in Experiment 2.**

“High informativeness payoff instructions”

+5 points if you choose the answer with one alternative and it turns out to be the correct answer

+1 point if you choose the answer with three alternatives and it turns out to be the correct answer

-1 point for choosing an incorrect answer

“Low informativeness payoff instructions”

+1 point for choosing the correct answer

-1 point for choosing an incorrect answer

### Additional analyses.

#### Experiment 1

##### Cued-recall test and plurality option

The strategic regulation of accuracy is derived from the fact that participants sometimes select the single answer and sometimes the plural answer as their final choice (Goldsmith, 2016). Participants selected single answers 52% of the time and plural answers 48% of the time (difference n.s.), that is, they did not select mainly the plural answer to maximize accuracy, nor did they select the single answer to maximize informativeness.

We also expected, and confirmed, that the accuracy of the selected single answers ( $M = .29$ ,  $SD = .20$ ,  $CI [.21, .37]$ ) was higher than the accuracy of the rejected single answers ( $M = .08$ ,  $SD = .09$ ,  $CI [.04, .12]$ ),  $t(22) = 5.47$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.40$ . This analysis showed that participants were able to distinguish between their correct and incorrect single answers, hence regulating response accuracy.

Our prediction about confidence was also supported: the confidence of the selected single answers ( $M = 50.38$ ,  $SD = 18.36$ ,  $CI [42.88, 57.88]$ ) was higher than the confidence of the rejected single answers ( $M = 31.48$ ,  $SD = 17.40$ ,  $CI [24.37, 38.59]$ ),  $t(22) = 5.96$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.06$ . This result is also in line with other research that states that the discrimination among the correct and incorrect answers is strongly based on metamemory judgments (Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996).

Finally, we also expected that the cued recall test would not interfere with the advantage of the plurality option over a more traditional memory test, in which only one answer is selected. To test this, we compared the accuracy of the final answers, that

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

8

could be either single or plural ( $M = .24$ ,  $SD = .11$ ,  $CI [.20, .28]$ ) against the accuracy of all the single answers ( $M = .19$ ,  $SD = .13$ ,  $CI [.14, .24]$ ). We found the expected increase in accuracy when participants used the plurality option,  $t(22) = 6.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.42$ .

**Cued-recall Plurality option for each context**

In the informal context, the accuracy for the selected single answers was higher ( $M = .14$ ,  $SD = .10$ ,  $CI [.10, .18]$ ) than the accuracy for the rejected single answers ( $M = .05$ ,  $SD = .07$ ,  $CI [.02, .08]$ ),  $t(22) = 3.96$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.11$ . In the formal context, we found a similar result. Accuracy was higher in the selected single ( $M = .15$ ,  $SD = .12$ ,  $CI [.10, .20]$ ) than in the rejected single answers ( $M = .02$ ,  $SD = .03$ ,  $CI [.01, .03]$ ),  $t(22) = 5.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.50$ . In both cases the discrimination between correct and incorrect answers was based on the associated confidence ratings. In both contexts, we found that the confidence in the selected single answers was higher than the confidence in the rejected single answers (in the informal context, confidence in the selected single answers:  $M = 23.97$ ,  $SD = 10.80$ ,  $CI [19.56, 28.38]$ , and in the rejected single answers:  $M = 13.72$ ,  $SD = 8.87$ ,  $CI [10.10, 17.34]$ ,  $t(22) = 3.87$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.04$ ; in the formal context, confidence in the selected single answer  $M = 26.40$ ,  $SD = 13.33$ ,  $CI [20.95, 31.85]$  and in the rejected single answer  $M = 9.83$ ,  $SD = 6.48$ ,  $CI [4.18, 9.48]$ ,  $t(22) = 6.51$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.58$ ).

Thus, we can conclude that the regulation of the accuracy with a cued-recall test was successful and worked independently of the context.

## **Experiment 2: Cued-recall Plurality option for each context and the informativeness payoff**

### **Cued-recall plurality option**

The results in this section replicated those from Experiment 1. Participants selected single answers 47% of the time and plural answers 53% of the time (difference ns). This result suggests that participants did not have a strong preference for the plural answers to maximize their accuracy, or for the single answers – to maximize their informativeness. In the formal context, the proportion of the single answer selection was 46% while participants selected plural answers in 54% of the trials. In the informal context participants selected single answers 49% of the time and plural answers 51% of the time.

Next, we assessed whether participants were able to distinguish between their correct and incorrect answers. We found that, pulling all conditions together, the accuracy in the selected single answers was higher ( $M = .38$ ,  $SD = .22$ ,  $CI [.29, .47]$ ) than the accuracy in the rejected single answers ( $M = .11$ ,  $SD = .23$ ,  $CI [.02, .20]$ ),  $t(23) = 6.15$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.50$ . The associated confidence ratings followed the same pattern. Confidence in selected single answers ( $M = 60.50$ ,  $SD = 19.17$ ,  $CI [52.83, 68.17]$ ) was higher than confidence in the rejected single answers ( $M = 37.06$ ,  $SD = 16.70$ ,  $CI [30.38, 4.74]$ ),  $t(23) = 9.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.30$ . Thus, participants discriminated their correct and incorrect answers based on their metamemory judgments.

### **Social context, payoff, and the cued-recall plurality option**

We also analysed whether participants were able to distinguish between their correct and incorrect answers for each context and payoff. Here, the alpha after

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

10

Bonferroni correction is  $p = .0125$ , because for these analyses there are only four comparisons.

**Informal context.** Participants in the informal context were able to distinguish between their own correct and incorrect answers for both the high and the low payoff. For the high payoff, the accuracy of the selected single answers ( $M = .37$ ,  $SD = .36$ ,  $CI [.21, .53]$ ) was higher than for the rejected single answers ( $M = .04$ ,  $SD = .09$ ,  $CI [0, .08]$ ),  $t(20) = 4.28$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.35$ . This was also true for the accuracy of the selected and rejected single answers for the low payoff (for selected,  $M = .45$ ,  $SD = .35$ ,  $CI [.30, .60]$ ; for rejected,  $M = .08$ ,  $SD = .14$ ,  $CI [.02, .14]$ ),  $t(20) = 5.35$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.34$ . These differences on accuracy were paralleled by their associated confidence ratings. For the high payoff, the confidence in the selected single answers ( $M = 18.49$ ,  $SD = 11.81$ ,  $CI [13.31, 23.67]$ ) was higher than the confidence in the rejected ( $M = 7.22$ ,  $SD = 4.74$ ,  $CI [5.14, 9.3]$ ),  $t(20) = 4.67$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.25$ . The same is true for the confidence in the selected single answers in the low payoff ( $M = 15.55$ ,  $SD = 7.88$ ,  $CI [12.1, 19]$ ) and its rejected equivalent ( $M = 8.21$ ,  $SD = 6.10$ ,  $CI [5.54, 10.88]$ ),  $t(20) = 4.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.04$ .

**Formal context.** Results for the formal context were in the same line. Participants in the formal context also distinguished their own correct and incorrect answers for both type of payoffs. For the high payoff, accuracy in the selected single answers ( $M = .34$ ,  $SD = .25$ ,  $CI [.23, .45]$ ) was higher than for the rejected single answers ( $M = .15$ ,  $SD = .25$ ,  $CI [.04, .26]$ ),  $t(21) = 2.77$ ,  $p = .011$ ,  $d = 0.79$ . Likewise, for the low payoff accuracy in the selected answers ( $M = .26$ ,  $SD = .27$ ,  $CI [.14, .38]$ ) was also higher than for the rejected answers ( $M = .14$ ,  $SD = .20$ ,  $CI [.05, .23]$ ),  $t(22) = 2.83$ ,  $p = .010$ ,  $d = 0.59$ . These differences on accuracy were also paralleled with

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

11

confidence. For the high payoff, confidence on the selected answers was higher ( $M = 16.76$ ,  $SD = 8.90$ ,  $CI [12.95, 20.57]$ ) than the confidence on the rejected answers ( $M = 6.85$ ,  $SD = 6.15$ ,  $CI [4.22, 9.48]$ ),  $t(21) = 4.20$ ,  $p < .0001$ ,  $d = 1.29$ . For the low informativeness payoff, the confidence on the selected answers was higher ( $M = 13.81$ ,  $SD = 8.17$ ,  $CI [10.32, 17.30]$ ) than the confidence in the rejected answers ( $M = 9.75$ ,  $SD = 8.27$ ,  $CI [6.21, 13.29]$ ),  $t(21) = 2.73$ ,  $p = .012$ ,  $d = 0.49$ . Here, as well as in the previous experiment, we found that the regulation of the accuracy might be studied by a cued-recall test and in different conditions such as different contexts or in the payoffs for informativeness. In both cases, the regulation seems to be grounded in the associated confidence to the selected answers, that is, participants as is stated in the theory, rely on the subjective confidence about the correctness of their answers to decide which answer they would select.

We also compared the accuracy for all the final the answers ( $M = .29$ ,  $SD = .14$ ,  $CI [.23, .35]$ ) with the accuracy for all the single answers ( $M = .23$ ,  $SD = .14$ ,  $CI [.17, .19]$ ). This analysis showed the benefit of using the plurality option instead of a conventional memory test,  $t(23) = 5.87$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.39$ .

In sum, we further validated the results of Experiment 1 by showing that plurality option is a suitable procedure to study the accuracy-informativeness trade off with a cued-recall test even when more than one variable is manipulated.



### Experiment 3

#### Cued-recall test and plurality option

All the results from Experiment 1 were replicated. Participants selected single answers 44% and plural answers 56% of the times, *ns*. Also, accuracy in the selected single answers ( $M = .30$ ,  $SD = .23$ ,  $CI [.21, .38]$ ) was higher than the accuracy of the rejected single answers ( $M = .18$ ,  $SD = .16$ ,  $CI [.12, .24]$ ),  $t(27) = 2.30$ ,  $p = .030$ ,  $d = 0.64$ . The confidence ratings also followed the same pattern of, higher confidence for single selected ( $M = 46.87$ ,  $SD = 15.72$ ,  $CI [41.07, 52.67]$ ) than for single rejected answers ( $M = 34.78$ ,  $SD = 13.74$ ,  $CI [29.68, 39.88]$ ),  $t(27) = 4.75$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.82$ , suggesting that confidence guided the answer selection. Finally, the accuracy for the final answers, regardless of being selected at a single or plural level ( $M = .34$ ,  $SD = .19$ ,  $CI [.27, .41]$ ), was higher than the accuracy of the single answers ( $M = .22$ ,  $SD = .11$ ,  $CI [.18, .26]$ ),  $t(26) = 4.65$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.81$ .

#### Cued-recall Plurality option for each context

In the informal context, the accuracy for single selected ( $M = .27$ ,  $SD = .25$ ,  $CI [.18, .36]$ ) was numerically higher than the accuracy of the single rejected answers ( $M = .17$ ,  $SD = .17$ ,  $CI [.11, .23]$ ) answers, but the difference was only marginally significant,  $t(27) = 1.69$ ,  $p = .10$ ,  $d = 0.44$ . However, in the formal context we found that the accuracy for the single selected answers ( $M = .32$ ,  $SD = .22$ ,  $CI [.24, .40]$ ), was higher than the accuracy for the single rejected answers ( $M = .18$ ,  $SD = .22$ ,  $CI [.09, .26]$ ),  $t(25) = 2.11$ ,  $p = .045$ ,  $d = 0.66$ .

Confidence in either context follows the pattern of Experiment 1. In the informal context, confidence was higher for the single selected answers ( $M = 47.06$ ,  $SD = 18.71$ ,  $CI [40.16, 53.96]$ ) than for the single rejected answers ( $M = 34.87$ ,  $SD = 15.32$ ,  $CI$

## CONVERSATIONAL PRAGMATICS AND METACOGNITION

13

[29.17, 40.57]),  $t(27) = 3.65, p < .001, d = 0.72$ . In the formal context, the confidence in the single selected ( $M = 48.61, SD = 14.48, CI [43.21, 54.01]$ ), was higher than for the single rejected answers ( $M = 33.36, SD = 14.89, CI [27.86, 38.86]$ ),  $t(25) = 6.18, p < .001, d = 1.04$ .

For Peer Review Only