

Supplemental Material

Supplement A: Study 1 Coding of Citations of Tulving (1985b) in R/K Studies

The majority of sources in the database (81%) did include a citation of the 1985b paper. Of the papers assessing episodic/semantic memory, 71% included a citation, and of the papers assessing recollection/familiarity, 82% included a citation. This indicates that, regardless of how the paradigm was used, the influence of Tulving's work was acknowledged. However, these results also suggest that approximately one fifth of sources using the R/K paradigm do not credit the primary source in which the distinction was proposed.

Supplement B: Study 1 Coding of Instructions Used in R/K Studies

We recorded whose instructions had been used to explain the paradigm to participants. Of the 858 papers assessing recollection and familiarity, 352 (41%) did not clearly state whose instructions were used or adapted. [Among the papers that did indicate whose instructions were used \(or whose instructions they modeled their scripts on\), the majority \(n = 364, 72%\) only indicated one source. One hundred and six papers \(21%\) included citations of two sources and the remaining papers used three or more sets of instructions as providing wording for the instructions used. When multiple sources were indicated, they were coded for all reported instances \(e.g., if a paper mentioned using Gardiner & Java, 1990, and Rajaram, 1993, both were counted\).](#) Approximately 45% (n = 229) of the sources that clearly indicated whose instructions were used, used instructions similar to or provided by Gardiner and colleagues. Although we initially searched for sources citing the Gardiner (1988) and Gardiner and Java (1990) papers, Gardiner and his colleagues have published extensively in this field; thus, we included a broader range of his work in this count. Two-hundred-and-three (40%) sources reported using the

instructions from Rajaram (1993) or Rajaram (1996). Fifty-five sources (11%) reported using instructions modeled on Tulving (1985b). Thus, although a majority of papers did cite the Tulving work, relatively few explicitly referred to his work in describing the actual instructions provided to participants. A substantial minority of work citing the R/K paradigm did not explicitly indicate whose instructions they used or relied on those by Gardiner and colleagues and Rajaram – in fact, these are the sources that provided much of the impetus to use the paradigm to assess recollection and familiarity.

When using the R/K paradigm to measure episodic vs. semantic memory, the majority of papers did not explicitly state whose instructions they were using or basing the distinction on ($n = 25$, 61%). This may be because as mentioned above, *remembering* and *knowing* were sometimes measured on a continuum or in a questionnaire wherein the various standard sets of instructions would not apply. Six papers (15%) used Tulving's (1985b) definitions, three (7%) used Rajaram's (1993), and 11 (27%) used Gardiner and colleagues' work (e.g., Gardiner, 1988; Gardiner & Java, 1990). Seven sources (17%) used instructions from other sources. Thus, even when the paradigm was being used to measure retrieval from episodic and semantic memory, many of the sources that identified whose instructions they were using relied on instructions developed primarily to assess the difference between recollection and familiarity in episodic retrieval tasks.

Supplement C: Study 1 Coding of R/K Studies for Tapping Episodic/Semantic Memory

Label Use. Of the 41 papers assessing episodic/semantic memory, only three (7%) modified the labels, although we note that studies of autobiographical memory tend to use variants of the paradigm more generally. For example, *remembering* and *knowing* are sometimes

measured on a continuum (e.g., on a 1-7 scale; Wilkinson & Hyman, 1998) or via a questionnaire (e.g., Rubin, Schrauf, Gulgoz, & Naka, 2007). One paper (El Haj, Antoine, & Kapogiannis, 2015) used *relive/recognize*, one used a modified version of the paradigm in which participants responded yes or no whether they recollected specific events in addition to the standard R/K judgment (Harris, O'Connor, & Sutton, 2015), and the third used Type A and Type B as labels (Levine, Svoboda, Turner, Mandic, & Mackey, 2009). Rationales for the modification were, respectively: Because participants had imagined events, which could not thus be remembered or known; to avoid bias; and for simplicity.

Training. Among the 41 papers assessing retrieval from episodic/semantic memory, only six sources (15%) provided additional training. These included a combination of providing additional examples (n = 2), administering a practice test (n = 2), having participants repeat or explain the instructions in their own words (n = 2), having participants justify their responses (n = 2), or providing a visual reminder of the distinction for the duration of the task (n = 2). As is evident, multiple types of additional training were provided by most sources.

Post test assessment. Among the studies using the R/K paradigm to measure episodic/semantic memory, five (12%) administered some form of post-test assessment of participants' comprehension and use of the paradigm. All five required participants to justify their use of R and K responses. Of note, only one of these sources also administered additional training in the use of the paradigm at the outset of the study.