Supplemental Materials Accompanying: When did this happen? Indicators of accuracy for dating recent and remote personal events

Aleš Neusar and Eva Rubínová

Method

Interviewer training

During training, all interviewers received the interview protocol and then conducted mock interviews with A. N. Interviewers asked clarification questions and received feedback during this mock interview before interviewing participants.

Coder training

A research assistant was provided with a coding manual containing descriptions of the three measures similar to those mentioned in this section. After reviewing the manual, the research assistant then coded data from two randomly selected participants. E. R. and the research assistant then compared their codes and discussed any discrepancies, which led to a refinement of the coding manual. The research assistant then coded data from twelve randomly selected participants. During this coding, several questions have arisen. Therefore, E. R. and the research assistant went through the codes and questions and further refined the coding manual. The research assistant then received data from twelve randomly selected participants for independent coding.

Public Events: Study 1

Four public events that occurred within the interview period were added to the personal events: (1) The Royal Wedding (Prince William and Kate Middleton); (2) a closure of a highly medialized case of a missing girl; (3) bronze medal for the Czech team in the Ice Hockey World Championship; and (4) the killing of Osama bin Laden. Performance and

participant confidence ratings for public events were not of central interest in this study and, therefore, are not reported here.

Public Events: Study 2

Eight public events (six from the years 2006 and 2007 and one each from the boundary years 2005 and 2008) were added to the personal events: (1) the death of pope John Paul II, (2) Czech parliamentary elections, (3) Olympic games in Torino, (4) Hurricane Kyrill, (5) introduction of the driver penalty point system, (6) same-sex registered partnership law came into effect, (7) Czechia joined the Schengen area, and (8) introduction of healthcare service charges. Performance and participant confidence ratings for public events were not of central interest in this study and, therefore, are not reported here (for more information about results pertaining to dating accuracy of public events, see Neusar et al., 2011; Neusar, 2012).

Results

Tables SM1 and SM3 show Spearman correlations between measured variables in Study 1 and Study 2, respectively. Tables SM2 and SM4 list complete multivariate model results.

Table SM1

Correlation matrix for measures used in Study 1

Measure	Recency	Dating Strategy	Landmark Association	Frequency	Regularity	Importance	Sharing	Intensity	Valence	Confidence	Self/ Other
Dating Strategy	**-.08**	-									
Landmark Association	.04	.22	-								
Frequency	-.03	-.04	-.04	-							
Regularity	-.01	**.09**	.03	**.25**	-						
Importance	**-.06**	**.17**	**.11**	-.05	-.02	-					
Sharing	**-.07**	**.14**	**.06**	-.05	-.01	**.42**	-				
Intensity	.02	**.06**	.05	**-.08**	-.03	**.23**	**.22**	-			
Valence	-.03	-.01	.00	.00	**.06**	-.02	**-.09**	-.01	-		
Confidence	**-.10**	**.46**	**.26**	**-.07**	**.08**	**.21**	**.18**	**.08**	.06	-	
Self/Other	.00	**.08**	.03	-.03	.02	-.01	-.01	**.06**	**.09**	**.12**	-
Single Day/ Extended	**.06**	**.16**	**.15**	.02	**.06**	**.07**	**.06**	**.06**	-.05	**.17**	**-.06**

Note. Correlations that were significant after Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple tests are bolded.

Table SM2

Results from the Memorability characteristics model and the Dating strategy and metacognition model

Model/Predictor	*OR* [95% *CI*]	*SE*	*z*	*p*
Memorability				
Recency	1.02 [1.01, 1.04]	0.01	4.51	< .001
Single/Extended	4.41 [3.01, 6.46]	0.20	7.60	< .001
Self/Other	3.99 [2.30, 6.93]	0.28	4.91	< .001
Regularity	2.17 [1.27, 3.72]	0.27	2.84	.004
Importance Moderate	1.41 [0.98, 2.04]	0.19	1.84	.066
Importance High	1.83 [1.34, 2.51]	0.16	3.76	< .001
Sharing Moderate	1.07 [0.78, 1.48]	0.16	0.42	.672
Sharing Frequent	1.47 [1.02, 2.11]	0.18	2.09	.037
Emotional Intensity Moderate	1.46 [1.02, 2.09]	0.18	2.05	.040
Emotional Intensity High	0.85 [0.62, 1.18]	0.17	0.95	.341
Negative/Ambivalent	1.33 [0.83, 2.14]	0.24	1.19	.236
Ambivalent/Positive	1.12 [0.78, 1.60]	0.18	0.62	.536
Frequency Moderate	1.53 [1.00, 2.35]	0.22	1.96	.050
Frequency High	0.84 [0.40, 1.78]	0.38	0.46	.649
Dating Strategy and Metacognition				
Confidence (Yes/No)	6.79 [5.06, 9.11]	0.15	12.77	< .001
Date Known/Reconstructed	4.70 [3.22, 6.85]	0.19	8.05	< .001
Landmark connection	4.76 [2.87, 7.88]	0.26	6.06	< .001

Note. Only p-values ≤ 0.010 were considered significant after correction for multiple comparisons.

Table SM3

Correlation matrix for measures used in Study 2

Measure	Recency	Dating Strategy	Landmark Association	Importance	Vividness	Uniqueness	Confidence	Self/Other
Dating Strategy	.02	-						
Landmark Association	-.03	**.11**	-					
Importance	**.11**	**.27**	.04	-				
Vividness	-.05	**.22**	**.11**	**.38**	-			
Uniqueness	.05	**.24**	**.08**	**.60**	**.55**	-		
Confidence	-.03	**.39**	**.21**	**.26**	**.29**	**.27**	-	
Self/Other	.01	.05	.05	.06	**.20**	.06	**.09**	-
Single Day/ Extended	.01	.05	-.01	.01	**.12**	**.08**	.05	**.11**

Note. Correlations that were significant after Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple tests are bolded.

Table SM4

Results from the Memorability characteristics model and the Dating strategy and metacognition model

Model/Predictor	*OR* [95% *CI*]	*SE*	*z*	*p*
Memorability				
Recency	1.01 [1.00, 1.03]	0.01	1.53	.127
Uniqueness Moderate	0.75 [0.48, 1.19]	0.23	1.20	.229
Uniqueness High	1.46 [1.00, 2.13]	0.19	1.97	.049
Vividness Moderate	1.26 [0.79, 1.99]	0.24	0.97	.334
Vividness High	1.71 [1.19, 2.45]	0.18	2.91	.004
Importance Moderate	1.36 [0.93, 1.99]	0.20	1.57	.116
Importance High	1.42 [0.98, 2.05]	0.19	1.85	.064
Dating Strategy and Metacognition				
Confidence (Yes/No)	4.06 [2.87, 5.74]	0.18	7.93	< .001
Date Known/Reconstructed	2.91 [1.91, 4.45]	0.22	4.95	< .001
Landmark connection	2.06 [1.35, 3.15]	0.22	3.35	< .001

Note. Only p-values ≤ 0.004 were considered significant after correction for multiple comparisons.

References

Neusar, A. (2012). Memory for unique events. Predictors of dating accuracy [Doctoral dissertation, Masaryk University]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276172512_Memory_for_unique_events_Predictors_of_dating_accuracy

Neusar, A., Hoferková, J., & Ježek, S. (2011). Přesnost datace mediálně známých veřejných událostí [Dating Accuracy of Well-Known Public Events]. *Mediální Studia, 5*, 120-152. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276173478_Presnost_datace_medialne_znamych_verejnych_udalosti