Appendix B: Publication Bias Tests

Publication bias tests for each analyses are reported below. Overall, the analyses suggest that the publication bias was minimal among all three analyses, and that publication bias correction procedures are not warranted; however, given the limited number of studies in each analysis, theses results should be interpreted cautiously.

*Proactive Interference*

*Publication bias.* Three tests were conducted to determine the likelihood that missing studies would significantly influence the obtained mean effect sizes (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001; Rosenthal, 1991). The *fail-safe N* was not calculated for studies because the obtained mean effect size confidence interval included 0.0. The rank correlation test (Begg & Mazumdar, 1994) for publication bias, Kendall's *tau b* = -0.44, *p* = .047, was marginally significant, and Egger’s test of the intercept, *t* (10) = 2.58, *p* = .03, was significant. The Trim and Fill procedure suggested that 0 studies were missing from the analysis based on expected symmetry when plotting effect sizes by the inverse of their standard errors (Duval & Tweedie, 2000). Collectively, these analyses suggest that publication bias was minimal, and that publication bias correction procedures were not warranted (Duval & Tweedie, 2000).

*Retroactive Interference*

*Publication bias.* Four tests were conducted to determine the likelihood that missing studies would significantly influence the obtained mean effect sizes (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001; Rosenthal, 1991). The *fail-safe N* indicated that 5 studies finding no between group differences in retroactive interference would be needed to reduce the confidence interval of the mean effect size to include zero. The rank correlation test (Begg & Mazumdar, 1994) for publication bias, Kendall's *tau b* = -0.22, *p* = .300, and Egger’s test of the intercept, *t* (11) = 1.05, *p* = .315 were both non-significant. The Trim and Fill procedure suggested that 0 studies were missing from the analysis based on expected symmetry when plotting effect sizes by the inverse of their standard errors (Duval & Tweedie, 2000). Collectively, these analyses suggest that publication bias was minimal, and that publication bias correction procedures were not warranted (Duval & Tweedie, 2000).

*Memory Control*

*Publication bias.* Four tests were conducted to determine the likelihood that missing studies would significantly influence the obtained mean effect sizes (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001; Rosenthal, 1991). The *fail-safe N* indicated that 21 studies finding no between group differences in memory control would be needed to reduce the confidence interval of the mean effect size to include zero. The rank correlation test (Begg & Mazumdar, 1994) for publication bias, Kendall's *tau b* = -0.04, *p* = .880, and Egger’s test of the intercept, *t* (5) = 0.39, *p* = .711 were both non-significant. The Trim and Fill procedure suggested that 1 study was missing from the analysis based on expected symmetry when plotting effect sizes by the inverse of their standard errors (Duval & Tweedie, 2000). Collectively, these analyses suggest that publication bias was minimal, and that publication bias correction procedures were not warranted (Duval & Tweedie, 2000).