Supplemental Materials

Social Remembering in the Digital Age:

Implications for Virtual Study, Work, and Social Engagement

Garrett D. Greeley*, Tori Peña*, and Suparna Rajaram

Department of Psychology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-2500, USA

These supplemental materials contain more detailed information about the participants and our methodology for Experiments 1 and 2.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants

In total, 175 potential participants accessed the web link to the online experiment from remote locations. Seventy-nine participants were excluded for the following reasons: $N = 2$ did not consent, $N = 14$ in the Nominal condition gave unusable data (only chatting [8], only recalled distractor task items [2], appeared twice in a single recall [1], or only completed a single recall [3]), and $N = 17$ in the Collaborative condition gave unusable data (only social chatting). An additional 24 participants assigned to the Collaborative condition started the experiment but, due to procedural constraints, could not be matched with group members and could not perform the recall task. The rates of non-completion in these remotely accessed, online experiments are much higher than what we observe in our in-person studies; these rates are consistent with the particulars associated with running online studies and participants' distraction and reduced engagement we discuss in the manuscript (e.g., Arechar et al., 2018; Mason & Suri, 2012)..

The final sample consisted of 52 (54.17%) women, 40 (41.67%) men, 2 (2.08%) participants who indicated "Other," and 2 (2.08%) participants that did not report their gender. Further, our sample included 49 (51.04%) Asian, 29 (30.21%) White, 6 (6.25%) Black/African American, and 12 (11.46%) multiracial participants. Finally, 14 (14.58%) participants identified as Latino/Hispanic.

Materials

Stimuli. All participants worked alone to study 94 categorized words. These words were originally selected from Van Overschlede and colleagues (2004). This exact study list has been used previously in similar collaborative memory research (for details, see Congleton & Rajaram, 2011). Ninety of these words were targets and four were buffer words (two primacy, two recency). The 90 targets were derived from 15 categories, with each category contributing six words. We created two pseudo-random lists with the same words in different orders such that no two words from the same category appeared in adjacent positions (i.e., to prevent order effects).

Software. Qualtrics Survey Software (2021) was used for the consent procedure, study phase, and questionnaire portions of Experiment 1. Chatplat (2021) was used to collect responses (and facilitate collaboration) during the recall phases. We embedded online chat rooms, hosted by Chatplat, into the Qualtrics programs for researchers and participants to collaborate via chat in live time. Both experiments used the same software setups.

Experiment 2

Method

Participants

Just as in Experiment 1, the online nature of the study rendered a portion of the data unusable for a variety of reasons. In total, 161 participants accessed the weblink to our study

from their remote location. Forty-one participants were excluded for the following reasons: $N = 6$ did not recall any correct items, $N = 22$ did not receive the instructions due to a glitch in experiment administration, and $N = 13$ started the experiment but did not continue to the recall phase. As in Experiment 1, an additional 24 participants assigned to the Collaborative condition started the experiment but, due to procedural constraints, could not be matched with partners and could not perform the recall task. Lastly, we replaced two groups (one collaborative and one nominal group) because their recall was two standard deviations above the mean for their respective condition.

The final sample consisted of 57 women (59.38%), 37 men (38.54%), and 2 participants did not report their gender. Additionally, this sample included 41 (42.71%) White, 41 (42.71%) Asian, 8 (8.33%) Black or African American, 3 (3.12%) multiracial, 1 (1.04%) Native American or Alaskan Native, and 2 (2.08%) participants who did not report their race. Additionally, 17 (17.71%) participants identified as Latino/Hispanic.

References

Arechar, A.A., Gächter, S. & Molleman, L. (2018). Conducting interactive experiments online. *Exp Econ* 21, 99–131 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-017-9527-2

Mason, W., & Suri, S. (2012). Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Behavior research methods*, 44(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0124-6